

Truth vs. facts vs. journalism: an editorial

I just watched the movie “Truth,” starring Cate Blanchett and Robert Redford, about questionable documents, used by producer Mary Mapes and reported by Dan Rather on *60 Minutes II*, which purported to prove that George W. Bush may not have served his full duty in the National Guard.

The movie came out last year around the same time as “Spotlight,” also a movie about journalists. “Spotlight” (which I saw last year) tells the story of the *Boston Globe* reporters who investigated child abuse by Catholic priests in Boston, and the subsequent Church cover-up. Both movies are based on real stories, and both deal with reporting, but that is where any similarity ends.

“Truth” portrays a major screw-up at CBS. “Spotlight” portrays a major triumph by the *Boston Globe*.

Also, “Truth” is about broadcast journalism and “Spotlight” is about print journalism and the differences are stark. In “Truth,” facts are not properly sourced essentially because of time constraints associated with broadcast deadlines. In “Spotlight,” the reporters are told they have to dig out and track down the sources until the story is right.

The bottom line is that having enough time to fact check and substantiate a story is the deciding factor between getting things right and screwing up.

These movies also show a different understanding of what a journalist’s role is. As the title implies, “Truth” is about getting at a truth, even though the facts may not be right. “Spotlight” is about not only getting the facts right, but getting enough information so that what is being presented can’t be easily challenged.

Facts and truth are not the same.

Facts are provable. The high temperature in Washington, D.C. on February 15th was 29F as recorded by the weather watchers at Reagan National Airport. You can check that.

Truth is a belief, and it is changeable. What is true to someone, such as he/she believes that chocolate is the best flavor may not be true to someone who prefers vanilla. The only facts here are that chocolate and vanilla are flavors.

When we write, and especially when we edit, we have to check the facts. Are names spelled correctly? Are the numbers used accurate? And further, we have to check the sources. Just because many people are saying something on social media does not make it factual. Not being careful with fact-checking leads to a story blowing up as it did in "Truth." It may or may not be true that President Bush skirted his National Guard service, but it will never be proven without checking sources (are they reliable?) and facts carefully and thoroughly.

Is the campaign trail a fact-free zone?

And that brings me to political journalism today. As has been evidenced countless times on the campaign trail, many of the candidates are not dealing in facts, but rather in their own truths or beliefs. And many political journalists are caught up in trying to question the "truth" without knowing or researching or checking the facts. So we hear statements that are not fact-based such as America is "less safe" today because of Barack Obama's policies or that Obamacare is hurting the economy. These are not facts. They are beliefs and they are not provable.

Journalists who are covering the campaign have a duty to find and point out the facts. Sometimes we'll see them do this. For example, on *Fox News Sunday*, Chris Wallace pushed back against Ted Cruz's assertion that Obamacare has been a job killer by

quoting the jobless rate, which is the lowest it's been since 2008. Cruz then punted and blamed the fact checkers, saying they were not impartial. You can read more [here](#).

But not all journalists point to facts. We've seen many debates where the candidates' assertions are not challenged. This is partially because there are so many such assertions, and partially because journalists do not necessarily know the facts. Just this weekend during the Republican debate, most of the candidates said that Obama should not (could not?) appoint a justice to the Supreme Court to replace Antonin Scalia (who died Saturday). Some claimed there was precedent for this. We've since learned of the so-called Thurmond rule, where, according to Senator Strom Thurmond, no appointments would be confirmed in the summer previous to the end of a president's term. However, this is not actually a "rule" but rather a tradition, and one that is not really enforced. But, facts aside, Republican candidates keep insisting there is precedent. We even saw Ted Cruz state that if Obama appoints someone, the Second Amendment would "die." I didn't see any push back, perhaps because this is so belief-based there are no facts to counter the argument with.

And then, if journalists do push back...

Remember when Donald Trump claimed he saw Muslims celebrating the 9-11 attacks in the streets of New Jersey? To him, the truth was United States Muslims celebrated the country being attacked. The facts were that no such outdoor celebration occurred in New Jersey. None. Some journalists pushed back, citing the facts, but Trump doesn't care about facts, especially if they do not substantiate his beliefs. And especially if continuing to refute facts gives him more publicity, but that's another story.

Our democracy is in real danger when beliefs trump facts. Journalists must do their job make sure that they are presenting facts and not beliefs. They should not let the

pressures of the 24-7 news cycle make them into Mary Mapes, seeking some higher truth but not checking the facts. They should not let candidates' questionable assertions go unchallenged. Many people—voters—get all their information from one source, their favored news outlet, and don't fact check or examine the source of the information. They assume the information is reliable and make decisions based on it. Those decisions help elect presidents and do have consequences.

Do you feel that journalists are doing the best they can? Could they do better? What makes a good journalist? Please share your opinions in the comments.

Six trends I don't want to see in 2016

I don't know what happened to 2015. It started with such potential, all shiny and bright (and cold here in the Washington, DC area). And it went downhill fast.

Here are six "trends" that were everywhere in 2015 and that I hope we don't see in the coming year:

1. Overuse of emojis and gifs (they are especially egregious in professional communications). Oxford Dictionary even chose an emoji as "word" of the year. Enough said.

2. Multiple emails asking for money, especially on New Year's Eve (today alone I have already deleted at least a dozen) from organizations that have already sent multiple emails at

Thanksgiving, on Giving Tuesday, before Christmas, after Christmas. If I wanted to give, I would have already.

3. And speaking of email, too many were not responsive/mobile-friendly. This wasn't good in 2015 and it certainly won't fly in 2016. Most people read email on their smartphones or tablets. Deal with it.

4. Auto-video/audio on websites. This year I felt that every website I went on had a (loud, obnoxious) video pop-up. Having the video or audio auto-play ensures I will click out of your website really fast.

5. Over-capitalization. In American English, we have simple rules for capitalizing words: we use capitals to start a sentence and in proper names. We don't capitalize to show something is important, even if it sounds important (e.g., "we elect a president every four years" not "we elect a President every four years"). And unlike Germans, we don't capitalize every single noun.

And last, but not least:

6. Obsessive news coverage and its partner, endless speculating. It didn't start this year, and probably won't end this year, but we saw too many examples of obsessive coverage of selected news stories this year. Going all out on one news story, like the Paris bombings, sending every reporter and anchor to the scene, and then providing all sorts of baseless "analysis" does not qualify as actual journalism. It does not clarify the story. Instead, it gives rise to fear and uncertainty. This is what's given rise to blowhard politicians such as the millionaire real estate developer who will say the most outrageous things because he knows it will attract attention and speculation.

What trends got your goat in 2015? Share them in the comments.

Let's hope for a better 2016. Happy New Year everybody!

How to sell 1000s of cupcakes

You've heard of Georgetown Cupcake, right? In case you haven't (seriously?), the company started in a small space in Georgetown back in 2008 and has now expanded to six locations, including stores in New York City, Los Angeles, Boston, and Atlanta, plus a thriving mail order business. The founders—sisters Katherine Kallinis Berman and Sophie Kallinis Lamontagne—even starred in a reality TV show for TLC called “DC Cupcake.”

But getting to a point where Georgetown Cupcake sells 25,000 cupcakes a day on average did not happen overnight. It took a lot of hard work. Katherine and Sophie shared how they did it at the Inc. Magazine/Capital One Founders Forum last week in Washington, DC, which I attended (it was free and yes, they served cupcakes).

The Georgetown Cupcake ladies shared a lot of information about what it really takes to get a business off the ground (working all hours, every day, and incurring a lot of debt for starters). Their success seems to be tied to how hands-on they are and how personal their motivation is (they learned to make cakes from the grandmother and wanted to recreate that).

They also shared some very interesting marketing insights. From my notes, following are six marketing and communications takeaways:

Use data to drive your business processes and collect data wherever you can

Everyone keeps talking about metrics and analytics. Well, here's why: data can fuel your bottom line. In Georgetown Cupcake's case, they used shipping data to choose the locations where they have opened stores. The sisters say you need to ask yourself what information you need, and then collect it.

Prove your business model and have a good product before getting marketing help

You have to have something people want to buy before you market it. The sisters got great publicity early on because lines were forming out the door at the first (and at the time, only) Georgetown location. They were able to get stories in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* without public relations assistance.

Word of mouth is the best advertising

You haven't seen ads for Georgetown Cupcake because they don't advertise. Instead, they rely on word of mouth. Which is how they got those lines out the door in the first place. Which is what led to the major newspaper coverage. Which is what led to the TV show. Which has led to their success.

Use social media (and do it well)

From the start, Georgetown Cupcake has been on social media. First they had a Facebook page, then Twitter, and now Instagram and Pinterest. One of their early social media innovations was to announce a special flavor of the day which you could mention at the store to get a free cupcake. They are still doing it—in fact, I just checked and today's free flavor is Apple Caramel. Why this works is that it gives people a tangible reason to follow, giving them "inside" knowledge. Katherine says she PERSONALLY handles their Twitter feed,

which has 101,000 followers.

Stay true to your brand experience and mission

It was important to the sisters that each new store reflect exactly the brand experience that the first store embodied. They wanted customers to feel a certain way when they walked through the doors, whether in New York or Atlanta. Because brand experience is not easy to replicate, the sisters are not rushing to expand nationwide (although you can order the cupcakes to be shipped anywhere in the U.S.).

Focus on employee communications

Because the sisters cannot be at all the locations every day, they keep in touch with their employees constantly. They have a weekly internal newsletter, and they email each store several times a day. All employees are trained to understand the company's mission.

In a world where cupcakes chains have come and gone, it is interesting to see that Georgetown Cupcake is still doing well. Perhaps it's because the sisters are so involved and committed to their business. In any case, it was fascinating to hear them talk about their business.

You are competing for

attention with attention itself

Last night, I happily attended the latest Kalb Report at the National Press Club. The topic was the Sunday morning public affairs shows and the guests were Chuck Todd of Meet the Press and John Dickerson of Face the Nation (and in case you didn't know, moderator Marvin Kalb was moderator of Meet the Press in the 80s). As is usually the case, the program was very interesting, especially to someone like me, who always watches Meet the Press or Face the Nation on Sunday and has been doing so for decades.



Chuck Todd and John Dickerson at Kalb Report, November 9, 2015

Not paying attention

But apparently, not everybody else was as interested or at least, not everybody was giving the program their full attention. Next to me, two women were whispering to each other during most of the program. On my other side, a woman was busy on her iPhone. I wasn't sure what she was doing—maybe texting or maybe taking notes—but she was at it the whole time. Behind me, a gentleman kept fiddling with his camera. In front of me, two women were whispering to each other every few minutes. An

official-seeming photographer (although I am not sure he was there officially) kept photographing the stage (and annoyingly, had his camera set to make clicking noises as though it were an old-fashioned camera).

Distracting others

Even though I was very interested in the program, I was getting distracted by what was going on around me. Other people's lack of attention (or perhaps, it was lack of manners) was attracting my attention!

Lack of manners or short attention span?

I have been seeing this lack of attention a lot and in many different types of venues. Just last week, I took an email marketing class along with about 15 other people. Two women were busy whispering for a good portion of the class, while the instructor was explaining something. These women showed a complete disregard for the instructor, and also for the rest of the class. Were they just completely unaware of how distracting they were being? Were they bored? Was something else more important happening that had to be discussed right there and then? I don't know, but again, their rudeness (because talking while someone else is presenting is just plain rude) was distracting me.

More and more, short attention spans are making it hard for anybody or anything to retain attention for any length of time. If people watch live television, they start fiddling with their tablet or phone during the commercials. If people are at the movies, they fiddle with their phone during the trailers (and sometimes, during the movie too).

A real challenge for marketers

People seem more restless and less able to focus and that's a real challenge for communicators and marketers. We've seen an increase in image-based marketing precisely because people are

not reading text. Marketing materials must grab attention quickly and only hope to hold on to it for seconds.

The impact

1. Shorter messages. Marketers have to keep in mind that their messages are competing with thousands of other messages and with a shortened attention span. This means we really have to know what we are selling (or advocating), and how to distill it into as few words as possible.

2. Customization. We also need to realize that people are living in little bubbles, where they choose to pay attention to only what they want to pay attention to. Mass messaging doesn't work anymore. People are demanding to get only what they want to get.

3. Becoming part of the discussion. Messages alone don't do it. Now, you have to become part of the conversation. Take the REI announcement a couple weeks ago that it was closing on Black Friday "to let associates be outside." Everyone got in on this conversation. REI used the hashtag #OptOutside in the announcement. Discussions on social media and mass media ensued. Brilliant!

Have you noticed the drop in attention? What are you doing to counter it? Can you? Please let me know in the comments.

5 communications lessons from The Great British Baking Show

If you haven't been watching PBS' The Great British Baking Show (which is called the Great British Bake-Off in the UK, where it originates), you are missing out on one of the most charming competition shows out there. Each season begins with a baker's dozen contestants, who are asked during each episode to complete three tasks: a specific type of baking task (cookies, pies, sponge cakes, etc.) , a technical challenge, and lastly, a "signature bake." Their "bakes" are judged by Mary Berry and Paul Hollywood, who each week choose a star baker, who has distinguished him/herself that week, while also asking one of the contestants to leave. At the end of the season, only one contestant will remain.

1. Focus on form AND function

During the "Biscuits and Traybakes" episode that aired this past Sunday, the signature bake challenge was to create a beautiful tower made of biscuits. The tower had to measure around 10 inches and be creative, using different types of biscuits. Frances, who has been distinguishing herself for her creativity during the previous weeks, had a bad bake—her tower of biscuits collapsed right before the judging, prompting Mary to tell her that the "brief" was to build a tower and that it didn't matter if her biscuits were tasty or her idea creative.

It's not enough to look good or to be very creative, if the communications vehicle does not fulfill its mission. We've all seen beautiful websites that don't have the correct information or that are difficult to navigate (which is what UX/UI tries to correct). This is why overly creative ads that don't "convert" are a waste of money.

2. Technique and precision matter

Every episode of The Great British Baking Show has a technical challenge. The “Biscuits and Traybakes” episode required bakers to create tuiles, a delicate French cookie. A lot goes into creating tuiles—the batter must be of a certain consistency, you have to be careful to not over or under bake them, and they are very delicate, so you must know how to handle and shape them properly.

The lesson for communicators is simple: you can't rely on creativity alone. You have to learn the craft too. And you have to be precise with what you want to achieve.

3. Consider who you're baking for

During the show, it's clear that the contestants have to win Mary and Paul's approval. It doesn't matter if the contestants have been baking for years and their families love their stuff, if Mary and Paul don't think it tastes good or it is not properly baked.

The audience matters. How sophisticated are they? What are they looking for? What will appeal to them?

4. You have to bake a lot of cookies

Baking well takes both knowledge and practice, but especially practice. The more you bake, the more you know what works and what doesn't. You learn how to judge whether something is baked enough. You figure out your own shortcuts or how to switch up a recipe to make it taste right.

Experience matters in communications. That's not to say you can't try new ways of doing things, but only that you can do it better if you've been doing it for a while.

5. You have to taste it!

During the “Pies” episode, contestants were asked to bake a fruit pie. One of the contestants, Ali, found fruit pies so disgusting that he didn't even bother to taste the filling for

his own apple pie. When tasting the pie, Paul reminded Ali that it is a must to taste your food. Ali was voted off the show because his pie didn't taste good (and he had a couple of other technical issues too).

Perhaps we don't actually taste stuff in communications, but we do have to understand what is going on with our "ingredients" and our "bake." We have to do some research to understand what our audience wants and what is important to communicate. And of course, we measure: we look at the results for a campaign or at the Google Analytics for a website.

Do you watch this show? Would you add anything else? Let me know in the comments.

Guilty appeal

A couple of weeks ago I went into a small local specialty store that does not get a lot of foot traffic. The store sells lots of expensive gift items, and a few lower cost items such as cards and candles. I needed to buy a greeting card and like this store's small but unique selection. I found what I wanted and when I went to pay the store owner, she asked me, quite pointedly, "that's it?" Then she started asking whether I wanted to look at the handcrafted candlesticks and other gift items. Her remarks made it clear that she needed more business and that my one \$3 card was not going to cut it.

She was trying to give me a guilt trip.

If you look up the term "guilt trip" you will come up with several psychology-based articles such as "7 ways to get out of guilt trips", which define what a guilt trip is and why people use it. Basically, people use guilt trips in *an effort*

to control behavior. Although guilt trips may reach their mark, they often cause resentment and anger toward the “guilt tripper.”

And I definitely felt resentment when I left the store. On the one hand, I felt bad for the store owner and wondered how she was going to stay in business. On the other hand, I felt angry since I had specifically gone to this store to buy a special card and this woman seemed to think that it was my responsibility to spend more than a few dollars to help save her business.

But is the guilt trip an effective strategy?

This got me thinking about how some charities –specifically those dealing with hunger, homelessness, and disaster relief– use guilt as an appeal for donors. These charities generally intend to appeal to your feelings of guilt for having access to comfort and food while others, who are much less fortunate, starve and suffer.

I am sure you remember the TV commercial for a children’s charity that would show pictures of starving children in Africa, often focusing on their distended stomachs and the horrible conditions around them. We were told that we could ease the suffering simply by sponsoring one child for the price of a cup of coffee a day. The underlying message was clear: you should feel guilty buying your daily coffee when that money could save a child’s life.

Do you feel manipulated by these type of appeals? Or is this appeal to your feelings of guilt an effective way to break through the clutter and inspire action (a donation)?

Guilt trips have consequences

Guilt trips *are* effective in *forcing* action (after all, how many parents have used the line about starving children in Africa to get kids to finish eating their meals) but they may

have negative consequences. Perhaps you **stop feeling guilty** once you've made a donation and then never donate again. Or perhaps, you **resent** being made to feel guilty and you **ignore the appeal** altogether. In some cases, an appeal to guilt has been so many times that the **audience has become jaded**.

What's the alternative?

For charities, an alternative is to emphasize how *helping is a benefit* to the donor. This way, the potential donor is not doing something out of guilt, and therefore feels good about his or her act. As a bonus, there's no chance that the donor will feel resentment afterward.

Have you used the guilt trip as a marketing tool? Why or why not? And if yes, how did it work for you?

P.S. As I was writing this post, I got an email donation appeal that started with these words (emphasis mine):

*In this moment when we are bombarded by **shocking images of refugees risking their lives in search of safety**, we must do all we can to help.*

*I know this because **I have seen the fear in the eyes of refugees as they describe fleeing their homes in the dark of night**.*

I have sat with refugees as they shared their stories of being resettled in my home state of Ohio, and elsewhere in the U.S., overcoming language and cultural barriers to live their lives with freedom and security.

Hidden benefits are not beneficial

It seems fairly straightforward: if you offer something, especially if it's of benefit to your customers/members/audience, you should make it known. And yet, I would bet good money that you aren't reaping the benefits from various companies and associations simply because you don't even know what they are.

Case in point: I called my car insurance company today about renewing my policy. The very efficient and pleasant (almost shockingly so) customer service agent helped me out and informed me that with my policy came various discounts at car rental agencies, oil change shops, and even restaurants.

If you don't know about it, it's as if it doesn't exist.

Say what? I had absolutely no idea. None. Zip. Mind you, I have been a customer of this company for ages. And in that time, not once has anybody pointed out that I could be saving 20% on my car rentals or getting \$25 oil changes.

Turns out that this insurance company is doing a very poor job of showcasing these great perks. Which leads me to wonder why it bothers negotiating these deals with vendors if it isn't sharing them with customers.

Hidden benefits or perks don't benefit anybody.

Your customers/members/associates should understand why they do business with you, in other words, what is in it for them. If they don't know what benefits are derived from their association with you, there's no reason for them to stay.

Do you know what benefits you offer?

Right now, answer this question: what are the top five reasons

that made your customers/members do business/become affiliated with you? These are your primary benefits, and should be absolutely, 100% obvious.

Are there any secondary benefits? Are you offering special discounts or deals like my car insurance company? Are your customers entitled to anything special such as annual policy reviews, information sessions, special access to museums or cultural events, etc.?

Benefits don't communicate themselves!

In order to maintain your customer/membership base, you must communicate all of the benefits you offer.

Don't just assume your audience knows. Audit your marketing materials (website, social media sites, printed materials, enewsletters, etc.) to see if you are letting your customers/members know what's in it for them when they do business with you. Survey your people to see what they know about your offerings, about why they do business with you.

Do this one thing!

You have to do PR if you want to get new clients!

You have to have an optimized website if you want to get new customers!



number 1 by Jon Jordan on
Flickr

You have to do content marketing if you want to get new leads!

And most recently,

You have to try Periscope to get some exposure!

In the new world of marketing communications, there is a growing array of standard and innovative possibilities for getting the word out about your business.

From the pre-Internet era we have good old advertising/public relations/marketing, including the use of print materials, broadcast, outdoor, direct mail, etc.

From the Internet-era, we have websites and email marketing.

From the social media-era, we have content marketing, and a seemingly endless stream of networks (Twitter, Pinterest, Instagram, and so forth) and video in short format (Vine) and in long format (Periscope). And I am sure as I write this, something else is bubbling up to capture our short-attention span.

Here's the thing: all of these work. They work differently, with different audiences and with different levels of

“engagement.” But the uncomfortable truth is that no one thing will get you leads/customers.

Back in the old days, we had a concept called “integrated marketing communications.” It posited that in order to be successful, you had to use a variety of marcomm tools and make sure they were playing nice with each other. For example, if you were using sponsorship and public relations, the PR folks would know what you were sponsoring and the sponsorship folks might in turn get a bit of PR for the sponsorship. You know, everybody working together toward a common goal.

Now it seems that people want a shortcut. They want to try the one thing that will “guarantee” results. Everybody seems to be lurching from one platform to the next, one tactic to another.

If you want to achieve results from your marketing communications efforts you are going to have **to stop being tactical and start being strategic**. Stop thinking in terms of doing one thing to get audiences interested today and start thinking in terms of objectives and actions you want from said audience.

You can't do just one thing.

If you need help figuring out what your communications efforts should be, contact me today! Let's talk.

It's a 2for1 blog post

There's been two blog post ideas floating around in my head, so I thought I would combine them since they are both short.

Details please!

A few weeks ago, I saw a query from a woman to a group we're both in. She was asking about "affordable" meeting space that would allow her to charge for admission. Predictably, the questions started rolling in: How many people would she be hosting? Would she be serving food? And from me, what did she consider affordable?

Her question was fundamentally flawed because she did not provide enough detail.

Imagine if before asking a vague question, this woman had taken a few minutes to think about what is necessary in booking a meeting space (you know, those pesky details):

- Number of attendees/space needs
- Location
- Budget
- Amount of time needed
- Schedule (date and time)
- Ability to charge attendance
- Catering (needed or not)

She would have saved time (hers and ours): getting better suggestions and fielding fewer questions.

Next time you are looking to get information about anything, take a few minutes to think about the details that may be relevant. Make it easy for others to provide you with the information you need.

It's all about him!

Saw this on Twitter:



The man stabbed on H Street this afternoon has died from their injuries. on.wusa9.com/1J0nSLa

Although it's become acceptable to use the plural for gender neutrality (I still prefer his/her because plural is plural), if you know the gender (male in this case) it is perfectly OK to use a gendered pronoun (his not their). It's worrisome that people are so intent on being gender neutral (which is good) that they forget that gendered pronouns can be used appropriately.

That's all folks. Catch you soon and let me know if you have any documents that need some copy editing.

Is content marketing necessary to business success?

Content must be the buzziest term in the communications /marketing field right now. Everywhere you turn it seem you find discussions of content strategy and marketing. There are articles on how to create or re-purpose content. There are discussions on what is the best content and what channel is it

ideally shared on.

But is content marketing absolutely necessary for you to achieve your business objectives?

What is content marketing exactly?

First let's start with a definition of content marketing. According to the Content Marketing Institute (I highly recommend you check it out for its excellent and useful information), content marketing is:

the practice of creating relevant and compelling content in a consistent fashion to a targeted buyer, focusing on all stages of the buying process, from brand awareness through to brand evangelism.

Basically, you create content in order to sell something (your ideas, your product, your service) or obtain something (support).

I agree wholeheartedly with the theory that you should be providing information for your potential customers or supporters to make informed decisions. I am a huge fan of blogs in particular as an easy way to create and share content.

But, what about those that don't "do" content

That said, how do you explain the success of a content strategist I know who doesn't even have a website, much less "content"? Or the digital media expert who has so much work she hasn't blogged in months? Or the public relations agency that last tweeted in 2012?

And then there are the many successful small businesses (e.g., plumbers, caterers, etc.) that may have websites but that don't usually have the staff, budget or time to handle blogging, tweeting, creating infographics, etc.

Another type of lead generation

What do these non-content producers have in common? Positive word-of-mouth. These business thrive on referrals and generally do not rely on internet searches as their main source of leads. (As an aside, there are referrals that come in the form of online reviews, and this is a subset of search engine optimization that relies on local search.)



Whispers by coolio-claire
on Flickr. Creative Commons
license.

Content is not always online

Here's the other thing: content is not always online. Content—a fancy word for information—can be shared face-to-face, in person. What you say to others about your business helps to market your business. This is why we develop key messages and elevator pitches. This is why we attend networking events. This is why we host coffees and get-togethers.

Yes, content works to achieve business objectives

The bottom line is that content marketing works, but it is not always the online and social media versions that are the most successful.

What are your thoughts? How much content do you produce? Is content at the heart of your marketing strategy? Let me know

in the comments