

Foreword: I resign!

It is January 4, 9:15 a.m. I walk into the town hall after 2 weeks of Christmas break. The New Year's reception is underway, but I was a little late. I had a doctor's appointment. An inflammation of the shins that I just couldn't get rid of. I had built it up over the previous months, and after the Christmas vacations I was the first person I could go to to get help. I had sustained the injury as a backlash I had from work. After my first day of work, I ran a half marathon out of sheer frustration. Today was the day that that frustration came to an end. I would quit my job that day.

While everyone was wishing each other well, I had come to the town hall with a spirited message. I was going to quit my job after a scant 5 months. Knowing that I still had no other gainful employment. my own business I had barely paid attention to. I had some savings though, after my first month's pay I had bought a coffee maker. You know one of those fresh bean things. But soon I found out that this provided only short-term happiness. I hoarded the rest. Now the salary of a 'trainee' is nothing to write home about, but for a recent graduate every euro is 1.

1 thing I knew for sure, I would no longer work here. I describe here my last days of salaried employment and you may be wondering, what happened before then?

After my graduation I was immediately approached by a hip posting agency. Halfway through my vacation together with my sister I drove to the city hall for the job interview. It was a good interview, but I came out with my armpit throbbing. I got the chance to work at the municipality as a finance trainee. YES!

After the vacation break, in early September I was able to start working there. On the first day of work I got the municipal budget & program budget thrown on my desk. "Good luck with it." Figures mean something to me, but there were so many figures in this that I didn't know where to start. Nor did it say much about the organization itself, except that a "product" had been created for every wipeout. I walked from one surprise to another, but in the meantime I had to make my hours neatly. In fact, my employer billed hours to the municipality (the client). I could be employed after 2000 hours. About 2 years, but as you could read, it never came to that.

I felt inclined to quit the job after only 3 days: to hell with their budgeting and excelsheet fetishism. That's not work anyway. I hadn't even finished my degree or I would have quit. I still managed to stretch it a bit.

"These youth of today who quit their jobs just like that." This is often blamed on my generation. You should know that I come from 1989 and during my studies (2008 started as a young business economist) I saw how especially in the market people were losing their jobs. That job for life was an illusion from then on. And the long-term relationship you entered into with an employer before that time had then become a thing of the past altogether.

"Okay, okay it might also be up to me" I thought. "I'll give it another chance." Secretly, of course, I knew I was out of place here. Not so much the issue: they had a problem with control, but the soggy swamp we call bureaucracy sucked my life energy out of me.

Every 2 weeks 1 day in which other young officials (all seconded) would meet. Sometimes I felt like I was at an AA meeting. How is it that such intelligent and talented young people have such problems with how work works...what was it that they had learned in college. Was this world really so different from student life, where you did have autonomy and responsibility? But after which, in a job, you suddenly had to "justify" your hours like adults and have an attendance requirement? Meanwhile, with me, the days seemed to last for weeks there was no end.

Do you know the joke about the official who kicked the snail to death? That one had been walking in front of his feet all week. You might laugh at that, but the slowness and bureaucracy in the organization kicked my motivation into the ground. Sham accuracy and the 5-year budget to the penny were an outgrowth of the way the organization was set up. And you can't blame them for that either. The way we look at a government organization is also quite complex. With an average application processing time of 12 weeks and 12 signatures further, the party of bureaucracy was complete.

On several occasions I felt that Frans Bauer would drop in and reveal that I was participating in bananasplit. No I am not from the generation before Frans Bauer, maybe you saw Ralph Inbar on TV (I was too young for that and have no active memory of it). At meetings I was mentioned several times as a new and refreshing talent for the organization but meanwhile I was dead and unhappy. Every day I came home with a little

less energy and every week it took longer for me to recover mentally from a deadly boring work week. Until the moment I got to the Christmas vacations. Before then, we had another Christmas gathering at a fancy restaurant where I was also told that they were very pleased with my performance. The joke was, I myself was not. I was not planning to take 2 weeks off, but once at the town hall in the week before Christmas packed up and extended my vacation by a week.

"Until next year."

Back to when I was going to quit my job. I walked up to my "supervisor. A cool guy who I also got along well with. I said "I need to tell you something, do you have a minute". What a relief that was. By mutual agreement, as it is called, we parted ways. In that last month I was even sick of it: a bore-out was in the pocket. I hadn't called in sick and since I wasn't making any hours it was "unpaid" leave. With the leftover vacation pay, I was still paid a meager monthly salary. I must admit that my stubbornness did not help. Anyway, if you voice your displeasure often enough, at some point it's enough. You take your losses and move on. During the Christmas vacations I had been able to work a little extra at my former employer but this time, of course, self-employed for a marketing project. Because of my savings strategy, I drove a small Twingot, I picked up over 150 euros every month on travel expenses and after buying the coffee maker I had hoarded the rest of the remaining salary. In fact, I also found out that it was only a short-term happiness. What would I purchase after this coffee maker?

So then, that was my salaried party.

That - never - again. While I had quit my job there were friends who lost their jobs & I was crazy enough to quit my job. While others then promoted, some were boasting how many miles they were on the road or how many hours they would or wouldn't make. I didn't have much to do with it and not at all at that time. It's kind of part of being a recent graduate and having a "circle of friends" who are all going to have "careers. Yuppies who want to prove themselves in a performance society. If you do the opposite, you can't count on much understanding, socially or otherwise.

I had already driven to the KVK to flesh out the knowledge I had gained while writing my thesis. I had done research on the effect of management control on motivation. I had started the blog to practice writing blogs more. No sooner said than done. What happened

was that I myself became demotivated to the bone. With this in my back pocket, I knocked on the UWV's door, but since I had started a business before then, it turned out that it was not income insurance but time insurance. I had to report every hour I worked 'extra' compared to the period of employment and that would be deducted from my WW. Urggh. You get the point, of course: again that deadly boring hours, but this time the incentive to be entrepreneurial (which also takes time) was at odds with the social safety net. Better to be passive, obediently applying for jobs 4 times a month, than to be busy outside the box.

Pro-activity is thus nipped in the bud. As soon as you become self-employed, you have declared yourself outlawed. For the employed you are either unemployed or a money-grubber and for the government you are someone who mainly wants to get out of obligations such as unemployment premiums and pension payments. 10 months later, after a lot of wrangling, I was paid the 5 months I had accrued, with a 20% penalty. And because of the bore-out and other private circumstances, I was already forced to give up my rental home. Mentally and emotionally, the mix of circumstances had also hit me hard. This organization was part of the problem and not the solution.

I had already made the choice because at that time my mother was in the hospital with heart failure & burnout. She had been treated for breast cancer the year before and reintegration did not go the way it should have...if you wonder about the importance of that (especially after cancer). Then I hope this excerpt can make a small contribution to that. I did not have to count on understanding. After all, in our current society where everyone is treated equally, it is soon down to yourself, not to mention the tyranny of merit (Sandel), where success is down to yourself (and so is bad luck). More on this later.

In short, that came on top of it, so for a while I didn't know how to keep those balls in the air. With the money from the UWV I bought a nice road bike (best decision ever) and put down a registration for the full triathlon of Almere.

F*ck it, if it has to be this way then so be it al the way. The rebellion rose as you can read to a climax. Fortunately mom recovered nicely, but still needed some support, call it informal care light. Meanwhile, I had given up my housing and moved back into my old room. 27 and instead of building a life everything went back on the pilot light. Contents in the attic and just hoping for the best. Perhaps this sounds pretty intense to you and you

will think: why buy a road bike if you can't afford the rent? I was in such dire straits that the outlook was not good. So it was either 3 more months on me or a new road bike. As a triathlete, that's an open door. It has been the best investment in my mental health that I could make.

Meanwhile, I also thought making hours was stupid and in many cases I could show up for free "to make a name for myself. It was a time of budget cuts so many semi-government organizations later said they had no budget but still wanted a nice speaker for the networking event and it was a good marketing tool. In the hurry I had parked in the car in a line of cars. They all had a printout under the windshield wiper upon my return. As it turned out, less than 50 meters away was a huge parking lot that I knew nothing about. I had come in from the other direction and had not passed the no parking sign either. On the way back I had to fill up with gas. The pump stopped after 10 liters. I had just sold out my bank account and the fine also had to be paid. Upon returning home, I received a positive email about the meeting. Whether I would like to come again, but you guessed it ... for nothing.

I politely declined this offer. I did not have to count on government support, salaried employment was out of the question, and if they took away my basic psychological need (autonomy) I would rather sleep under the bridge than use the system from which I had quit my job. Let's just say that I'm not very good at keeping the system happy. That the more they force you to do so, the more rebellious or functionally recalcitrant I become. There have been times when I have walked into the supermarket almost hyperventilating.

It was asking a pulmonologist to smoke a pack of cigarettes a day. Over my dead body that I would ever appeal to that. If there is 1 thing that has dragged me through this period it is my love of triathlon and the meters on the road bike oh yes and don't forget the little dachshund (Tessa the dachshund) we had bought in early February 2016. We have always had dachshunds and given my mother's situation she would no longer join the organization either. In the hospital I had suggested it and to this day it is probably 1 of the best choices we made, also for my mother's physical and mental recovery. By the way, it also did me very well.

It is also the time when I started looking further into basic income. I was doing the right thing, I wasn't holding onto a bullshit job (this one costing taxpayers over 7,000 euros a

month) and in the meantime I was "caretaker" and working to get my own business off the ground, but it was swimming against the current. So it is not illogical that if the current is strong enough, people will naturally go with the flow.

The world's needs more rebels is sometimes hiply said, but when we are creating and sustaining a system founded on old idea technology, it makes sense that intrinsic motivation is far away. With this background, you may know a little more about the drive I have to do something about the system and explain how it is possible that we have incentives that are diametrically opposed to intrinsic motivation. Now this is an insight into my situation as a recent graduate who is eager to do the right thing. But many are forced to keep the system happy. After all, they also want to pay the rent or mortgage. You have hardly built up any rights during that time, so you have to (don't forget student debt).

Perhaps you recognize something in this and have been in a similar situation, although I don't think so, then you must have made quite a mess 😊. Apparently in the Netherlands we often think it's your own fault if you can't quite figure it out with the government agency. You must have done something about it yourself. Whereas in other countries, they may find it worse if people are treated less well than them. In the Netherlands they often know how to point the finger at the stupid, stupid, stupid citizen. Now I am fairly positive-minded and as an endurance athlete I like the occasional challenge, but I too know my physical, mental and financial limits. Put simply, basic needs like every human being has. I have run up against them. Thus, this book will also be a challenge for me to bring you into the story I want to tell without you losing your way.

The thread of the book is our view of people, work & income. It is reflected in both our society and our organizations. I call this the factory mindset on people, work & income (the scientific management). From multiple perspectives & disciplines, I will take you through the changes of the economy & society in which I suggest solutions for a future-proof labor market that is centered on society. For those of you who know my repertoire, of course basic income & the 4 day work week will be covered. Organizations that do not switch to the 4 day work week will lose the battle for talent. They will fail to capitalize on their competitive advantage and fall behind. The government, on the other hand, is often engaged in stopgap measures but also fails to address the cause.

You have had an insight into my start in the job market, how it has affected my mental, physical and financial condition. In this chapter, we briefly discuss the facets covered in this book. The question is, where to start? There are some topics we will cover. Consider economics (Adam Smith, Karl Marx), but also consider our view of work & income. These are linked and reoccur in topics within behavioral economics (where psychology plays a big role). As a guide, there are the necessary blogs I have written on both www.werkvierentwintig.nl and www.controlandmotivate.nl it is about more professional space and a new foundation under work & income, of which the 8 hour work day and the 40 hour work week are a consequence. Some books will be covered a bit more here than others. For example, I'm a big fan of Andrew Yang's book, your job is going to disappear and this is the solution, but also consider Lennard Toma's book, 99 problems but the boss ain't one and their recent book, company bami slice. The 4 hour work week by Tim Ferris is of course also not to be missed and how about Kate Raworth's Donut Economy. The recently published book: the measuring society by Berend van der Kolk. Meanwhile, from the scientific literature I will mention some papers by scientists such as Dan Ariely but also think of Richard Ryan & Edward Deci. I also won't resist posting some excerpts from my thesis. So the book takes you through all facets of welfare and prosperity with some pragmatic solutions for the future of work & income. In short, there is plenty to discuss, sit back and attack the book! Be critical of what I say and write and sometimes take things with a grain of salt even though I try to put everything down as nuanced as possible.

Happy reading,

Louis Goulmy

Employment & income

Work & income are both pretty sacred cows. When we talk about income we hit people directly in their wallets. This also quickly makes it a political topic. Work, however, is more of a sacred house and we haven't canonized it just yet. Especially that 40 hour work week & the 8 hour work day. Although that belief in the 40-hour work week is slowly but surely beginning to erode.

In this book, I take you through a fresh perspective on people, work & income. How we can make our work week better, more fun and more effective. We do this by addressing the fundamentals we have under work. It's not just about working fewer hours (that's the superficial solution) as well as the whole discussion around where you work. Location and time are not causes but consequences.

If we address the foundation of thinking we will all be better off, both financially and socially. By all I mean employers/clients, employees, children, dependents. The idea that the 40-hour work week and the 5-day work week leads to the best results has proven to be outdated and it can be different.

Work did not always go the way we work today. Where industrialization drew us mostly to the nuclei to work as factory workers came urbanization. The countryside, where you still had the family farms, with master and mate relationship became separate from the factory workers. Where we began to separate thinking and doing entirely in accordance with scientific management. Scientific management is the brainchild of Frederick Taylor (1856 -1915). He wrote down his findings in the book *The principles of scientific management*. A management philosophy that would forever change the way we work.

So you got "the shop floor" and "management. The people on the shop floor were not to think, but to do; management was there to come up with the greatest plans. Work was extremely simplified which minimized errors and increased production. There was a deep-seated distrust toward the employee, everything was controllable and measurable and, according to Taylor, the employee was anything but intrinsically motivated. There had to be an incentive to work for. A lack of intrinsic motivation and the huge drive to make work measurable (including clocking) was the basis for a huge revolution of the manufacturing industry there. The example in which this is applied that most people are

familiar with is the example of Henry Ford. In 1914, his factory started producing cars. You could get any color as long as it was black is a well-known saying. He managed to bring about a huge increase in productivity, it now took not 12.5 hours to make 1 car, but only 1.5 hours. He reduced the working day from 12 to 9 to 8 hours and the work week from 6 days to 5 days. And to also double the salary to increase loyalty. After all, the outflow was also huge and he managed to bring that back as a result. The 8-hour shifts were also very convenient because there were 3 shifts to keep the plant running continuously 24 hours a day. Ford really did this not just out of idealism, but also because he thought it was good for business. That way people not only had disposable income but also free time. Time and money they could now spend on luxury goods, getaways (leasing) and, of course, his cars. At that time, Kellogg's came up with reducing the 8-hour workday to 6 hours, with very positive results.

This idea technology, for that is the social innovation of the time, is outdated and has proven to be anything but scientific. The fact that we now have a very different economy and society seems, for now, to have little impact on how we look at people, work & income. Barry Scharzt explains in his Ted talks why it is possible that we still work based on old foundations. In the way we think about work is broken and our loss of wisdom, he argues for giving back to thinking and doing, without trapping people in all kinds of rules. Because, he argues, of course we need rules, but too many rules prevent us from doing our work. It paralyzes, passivates and above all demotivates. But then how is it that we still use old idea technology, ideas about people that are not true, but become true because we treat them that way? Also at that time there was a counterpart Fayol, although there were many similarities with Taylor he was a bit more positive about people's work ethic and motivation. Those rooted beliefs about the economy, motivation and control play a very big role in this and we still see these ideological views today as well.

Postwar work ethic

The post-war generation is slowly leaving active working life, but the beliefs they brought with them from their upbringing is marked by the war. The Netherlands is in ruins; reconstruction is in full swing. We are all working together to rebuild the country as quickly as possible. The collective comes first, the individual is less important. Aches, pains, complaints, not feeling well, just keep going and be strong. This work ethic was

needed temporarily, but structurally it is not a good plan. "We believe that the longer we tough it out, the tougher we are, and therefore the more successful we will be. However, this entire conception is scientifically inaccurate"

Source : <https://hbr.org/2016/06/resilience-is-about-how-you-recharge-not-how-you-endure>

The Netherlands went into overdrive and, as with stress & adrenaline, it's not okay to have that structurally at a higher level. You then have a structurally too high cortisol production and that is not really conducive to your well-being now. It's functional for a while, but if that becomes the "new normal," we get other things in return. Think burnout and other mental or physical ailments. For example, it is still the case that a broken arm can often count on more understanding than issues with your mental health. Let me be very clear, what happened back then was not bad or wrong. It was necessary. It is often thought when you criticize this ethos that you are selling people of the past short; that is by no means the case. We stand today on the shoulders of the people who came before us from science to our institutions, our infrastructure to our democracy and it makes it possible for me to write this book now and it gives you the opportunity to think (and increasingly do) freely. I hope to contribute to that, because as Einstein wrote, **"Everything that is really great and inspiring is created by the individual who can labor in freedom."**

Paid & unpaid labor

In the 1970s, many women entered the labor market. Before then until 1956, a woman was even still incapacitated once she was married and were even fired. Until 1971, the law even stated that 1971 the husband was the "head of the conjugal union" and the wife "owed obedience" to him. Bizarre times and not that long ago at all.

Women entered the labor market and they were therefore taught to be strong & (economically) independent. From this follow beliefs that even today play tricks. Many people have internalized this with all its consequences. This does not only apply to women, because men too must be strong and not show weaknesses. Those who do are filleted. For men, it has less impact technically than for women. It is also from this mindset that we take a separate view of men's roles women. For example, if a man starts working

one day less it is a dad day, but if a woman starts working less we call it part-time work. And the woman is asked about family plans but the man is never asked. This is culturally deeply entrenched and high time we did something about it.

"To make progress for women we need to have a new debate on what are appropriate working times for all. The outcome of a push to limit long hours might also have the benefit of enabling more fathers to share childcare as well as providing more opportunities for women to combine work and care."

<https://www.hrmagazine.co.uk/content/other/why-part-time-work-is-not-good-for-women-s-pay>

Emancipation (equality) is of course a good development; with more women entering the labor market, the men hardly worked less. In other words, the work that women used to do now had to be outsourced or done quickly on weekends. From housekeeping to cleaning and from cooking dinner to taking care of the children. So we started working more for pay, but continued to add unpaid work (or we outsourced some of it and thus formalized it). Just by formalizing work, our economy grew, but nothing extra was actually "produced. All that happened is that an economic value was assigned to it in the form of an hourly wage.

With this we formalized a lot of work and often this was also encouraged by the government. In fact little changed, because the house was still cleaned, but this time paid. The women who used to have a cleaning address in the 80s came here (black) until we introduced a care subscription in 2016. Because of this, the black cleaning was soon more expensive than the subscription from the government. Here you can question yourself that we approach care like a phone subscription is a second. With 2 working parents, in addition to the household, there was no time left for childcare (for elementary school age). Many families rely on childcare. We made an allowance for it to still keep it somewhat affordable. This is an example where we have formalized work with yet another allowance system behind it. Which also makes it so that if you work more, you have to pay some of it back. Which sometimes leaves families in trouble, it doesn't pay to go to work more or chooses to leave the workforce altogether, which against all odds still leaves the standard gender roles. For example, the average work week for women in 2009 was still 27 hours and increased to 28.5 hours in 2019. Women with a college or university degree (the

theoretically educated) work 31 hours per week. Men, on the other hand, work an average of 39 hours in 2019, which was 1 hour less than 10 years earlier.

Source : <https://digitaal.scp.nl/emancipatiemonitor2020/gaan-vrouwen-steeds-meer-werken/>

"However, working women and men in the Netherlands remain 'European champions' of part-time work (see [Map 18](#))." Similarly, there is the Gender Equality Index of the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). This tracks gender equality within the EU for areas such as work and income, knowledge and health. The Netherlands ranks 7^e. Sweden is in the lead, which in itself is logical given their social provisions such as parental leave etc. We in the Netherlands are now also making great strides in this respect, and young parents are entitled to 9 weeks of parental leave with continued payment of 70% of salary as of August 2. Recently CBS headlined that it was precisely people with part-time jobs who had more sick leave, but that this was due to financial stress. "Stress due to financial problems also leads to additional absenteeism, according to research by the [Nibud](#). The solution, according to Vernet, would be to allow part-time care workers to work more. That is a solution to absenteeism and partly to the growing staff shortage in care."

This logic does not take into account people's existing activities/responsibilities outside of work. These are not hobbies that you just let go of or add for fun, these are often the social obligations that you do out of charity and cannot "resign" from. "A record number of women left the workforce due to school closures and the lack of affordable childcare. A big issue during the pandemic was that many working mothers felt the pressure to leave their jobs to take care of their children."

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackkelly/2022/02/23/if-companies-really-want-to-attract-candidates-offer-them-five-hour-workdays/?sh=797c9cc66152>

Although Vernet's logic seems logical at first, this has everything to do with our system of work and income. Precisely because this group already does a lot of unpaid work in addition to paid work, the logic > working more leads to less absenteeism and fewer staff shortages is flawed. During the lockdown, it was women who largely took care of the children. Of course there were lots of men who did this too, but by no means to the same extent.

Sophie van Gool writes in her book about the (un)explainable wage gap and why today most women still choose to be home more for the children than the man. After all, the man has a higher salary and so the choice is soon that the woman works less and is there for the children. She therefore advocates for parental leave for men and women (so as not to weaken the woman's position), after all now the man is also not employable for a while. As a result, the preference cannot be for a man and the disadvantage for women is gone. She advocates free childcare. This ensures that you can participate in the job market but also that you do not outsource your child from daycare. Some parents say they actually rest when they are at work, then those who want more day care may pay for it. Right now we are subsidizing the profits of a private sector that should never have operated as a private sector because of the public benefit. With work twenty-four, we advocate for 6 day parts (or 3 full days) of day care.

She also argues for the 4 day work week (you may be familiar with it by now) to reinforce equality in caring responsibilities for men and women as well. That 5^e day, by the way, is of no added value in the long run except the pay we get by "putting in hours. The trials with the 4 day work week show that you don't lose productivity, that people are actually healthier and happier and have more time for responsibilities outside of work that would otherwise have to be done on weekends. I myself have always found the 5 day work week to be nonsensical, partly because people are going to function less and thereby gain an attendance bonus. After all, work is about what you get done and not how long you spend on it. Similarly, she argues for a basic income, that way work always pays and we also value all unpaid activities. She also advocates a women's quota. This one is quite sensitive, but could be the solution to break the status quo. And fair is fair, I'm not waiting for it either, but maybe men are getting their share of unequal treatment and inequality now and we need it to achieve equality.

It turned out that informal care saves 22 billion a year for society. However, there are also social costs associated with informal care, think of higher absenteeism, missed "working hours," but the costs saved is still lower than if we had to do everything by "professional forces. This makes sense, of course. The cost of a professional force is not just the 'time' we pay for. The overhead of the organization, the management fee, the tax payments etc etc. Even today, a quarter of the Dutch combine paid work with care tasks that we call informal care, but parenthood is also a form of care to which we do not now attach any

economic values. That while a good upbringing and environmental factors are crucial for the development of the child (and the stability of the family). And that, of course, also has effects on the young adults who later enter the job market.

2/3 of a child's development has to do with parental attention and the situation at home. In this case, the cost comes before the benefit, but if we don't get it right, the bill comes to society afterwards. The employer who sees an employee out due to overwork. The child who has to care for his sick mother and has his studies on hold not to mention the causes of the higher demand for mental health care in the Netherlands. All studies on diversity show that a more diverse board creates better long-term results including shareholder values. The mediocre white man has the most to fear from it, after all, his position is more likely to be compromised. It was commonly thought that for a woman it was a kind of "excuse loop" position, but nothing could be further from the truth. It is necessary to break the status quo and improve the quality of both men and women. That way we will have better representation in the organizations, as well as the board, city council or association.

The scientific management

Therefore, the choice of name is genius: you call something that is not scientific scientific and thus buy credibility. That distrust and thus controllability, together with making work measurable brings us to all kinds of KPIs, useless activities, but above all a very rotten view of man. Frederick Taylor the originator of this movement became known because Henry Ford applied his methods in his factory. Now both men were not too positive about the view of man and Ford even supported Nazism. Everything was about efficiency, but what if today's economy is not like it was back then (by the way, you could question it back then too). Everything processes were measurable and controllable and had to be designed as efficiently as possible. Man was also a cog in a wheel, a cog in the wheel and had to do rather than think. We still see the artificial separation of thinking and doing, the shop floor and management today. When I told this to my running mate he shouted: yes they do! He is now a team leader himself and is able to reconcile thinking and doing (and he helps his colleagues to do the same). We deprive people of their responsibility and ability to think, but find it strange that they then become passive and docile.

How is that even possible? It is therefore not surprising that behavior that has not been asked for years does not return even with the first "implementation. It gave a certain peace, certainty and clarity, but it also deprived people of their freedom, responsibility and professionalism, and that kills people's motivation.

It is important, however, that we also stop HR (M). People are not a resource and that's not to mention the M you are thrown to death with. HRM studies do exactly what scientific management did, separate the thinking from the doing, see people as a resource of the organization and do not harness the motivation of people. So I strongly support changing HRM to HTM. HTM stands for Human Talent & Motivation. The Dutch version then is MTM, human, talent & motivation. HR is dead, written off and hopelessly outdated. If we address that foundation, the rest of our assumptions about work will naturally follow. That way the employee is not a resource of the organization but the organization is an instrument for the employee. That way you achieve more together than alone. We have wrongly drawn the connection between time and productivity. The latter is also a term that comes from the factory setting, measuring output was 1 of the elements of scientific management. Productivity is the purpose of work. There are those who stay late at their desks to impress colleagues, of course, but they do this as a display of productivity (imagined or not). Time and productivity have become mistakenly synonymous, damaging our work/life balance.

<https://www-independent-co-uk.cdn.ampproject.org/c/s/www.independent.co.uk/voices/four-day-work-week-covid-home-uk-b1995279.html?amp>

Time and productivity seem to be linked like Mark Rutte and the job of prime minister. Still, that's pretty weird. Yes also the latter, how does that man keep it up? But I am actually referring to the former. There is a misunderstanding from decades of industrial work from the last century in which we designed processes based on input (time) and linked that to productivity (output). "One thing that is already clear is that longer hours do not necessarily mean greater productivity."

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/07/working-fewer-hours-makes-you-productive-new-zealand-trial>

I call this the factory mindset on people, work and income. We still do and the old paradigm on people, work & income has had its day "[there is a mismatch between what science knows and what companies and organizations do.](#)" The idea that productivity and time are equal is a legacy from the factory mindset on work. We clock 8 hours. You have an output of 100 pins per hour, so 800 pins at the end of the day is your productivity. But, we know, people get tired, so after this groundbreaking discovery, you might wonder if that 8-hour workday and 40-hour workweek is the best result. Not just in productivity per day, per week or per month not to mention working until your 67^{ste}. If we apparently do have time to be sick then we also have time to take things a little differently. Henry Ford already knew that if you set people's salaries high enough that they would be able to buy a product from him. They also had to have the time to use it. Leisure: leisure is therefore good for the economy, but also good for people. Because what do you need in order to sit on the terrace: free disposable income, but also free disposable time (leisure). Ford managed to boost production with scientific management. He cut up all the work, making the work more monotonous, but more predictable and with less variety. They became more productive as a whole. Kellogg's went the extra mile and came up with the 6-hour workday resulting in a productivity boost. Now the joke is that during the pandemic, they too got bad news: **Kellogg's fires 1,400 striking employees after bitter fight over working conditions.** <https://nos.nl/artikel/2408643-kellogg-s-ontslaat-1400-stakende-medewerkers-na-bittere-strijd-over-arbeidsvoorwaarden>

Now Henry Ford and Frederick Taylor didn't do that out of idealism, Ford supported the Nazis and Taylor didn't really have a high opinion of people right now, but the attrition was still quite annoying. She wanted to avoid that, of course. So these were purely economic decisions that were made. We also simply know that most people are deployable between 3 and 5 hours. The rest is padding. Sometimes useful (social talk) but sometimes due to time-wasting like once bunch of Italians in the final of the European Championship.

Sitting on an office chair and staring at a screen does not equal working! Okay, it may be just me but I can sit on my butt for 30 minutes at most, 45 min then I'm at my limit. I MUST move, otherwise I go ram-crazy. The category: bangs head against laptop, gnaws on chair legs and grabs a stapler to whine into my arm. My mental and physical energy goes down the drain if I don't move. So I have sworn off offices. We are not made to sit still so much.

Überhaupt to sit at all. The more we move the more the body and mind are circulated and oxygenated. Oxygen you need to be able to think. That makes how effectively you can work, how quickly and accurately you can perform something or remember things at all. And fortunately, even the government is now coming up with a campaign to make exercise a little more normal. We still have a long way to go, because even the government is packed with old idea technology (coughs twice and mentions the hours criterion for entrepreneurs as an example). "Multiple experiments done in Ericsson's lab have shown that [people can commit themselves](#) to only four or five hours of concentrated work at a time before they stop getting things done. Past the peak performance level, output tends to flatline, or sometimes even suffer." <https://www.businessinsider.com/why-we-should-have-a-4-day-work-week-2016-5?international=true&r=US&IR=T>

That walk at noon we consider our own time and is deducted from your work time. Talk about invisible clocking. So **Lennard Toma and Cedric Muchall** write **in their book company bami disc** that things can be tolerated, but is it actually accepted or even encouraged? Bizarre though, I always wonder then: what is work really about? To make stale hours or to get things done? So that the next day you are also 100% fresh, fruity and employable. I choose the latter, don't you? The ideal working day is somewhere between 4 and 6 hours with a dose of autonomy and flexibility. Occasionally working longer hours really can't hurt, but structurally sticking to the 8 hour (with break 9 hour work day) is illogical. "Today, [83%](#) of American workers suffer from workplace stress, with Gallup finding that a similar number of people globally - [85%](#) - are not engaged at work." That has to hurt for a moment. If so many people are not engaged and experience so much work stress that there must be something wrong with the way we work.

Source : <https://hbr.org/2021/12/remote-work-should-be-mostly-asynchronous>

The **Jabra Hybrid Ways of Working: 2021 Global Report** asks 5,000 knowledge workers from around the world about what they consider important when it comes to work. 59% say they value flexibility over salary or other benefits, and 77% say a nice headquarters is less important than being able to work where they want. 61% say they consider it even more important that they want to be able to decide, where and when they work. In other words, autonomy is 1 and flexibility is 2. Flexibility is: as long as you make hours, autonomy is: letting go of time and location. They break it down into 5 categories

1: Little/no autonomy, low flexibility: you are required to be present at the work location (during the work day)

2: Little/no autonomy, medium flexibility: You work from home or at the office but the organization tells you which days you are at which place. We see this example emerging a lot now: the imposition of fixed workdays in the office or at home.

3: Limited autonomy, limited flexibility: You can work from multiple locations, but with one limited number of fixed days in the office.

4: Limited autonomy, high flexibility: You get the freedom to work where you want, but you still work "full-time" and thus on a time basis.

5: High autonomy, high flexibility: You can work anywhere, whenever and wherever you want with full access to the organization's resources.

Source: <https://hbr.org/2021/10/forget-flexibility-your-employees-want-autonomy>

Still, it's not crazy that we work this way. After all, we pay people on an hourly basis. Many companies bill that way to clients as well. So it has also become part of our business, part of HR and therefore a revenue model. I myself worked at one of those semi-hip secondment agencies and the only goal was to put away hours. What I managed there was of course important, but of course it had to take as long as possible. I am of the "basket" category: Just let writing a book require a little more context, content and sometimes literal words. Are you familiar with **the book the 4-hour work week by Tim Ferris**? You can easily eliminate time and work by, for example, throwing up the decision power: just call me from an amount of X. 90% of all issues fall under that limit and so you are left with only 10% of questions. Simplifying control structures gives people a lot of space and you don't have to respond, give (or ask) permission for every little thing. For example, I have greatly reduced the work as treasurer, where the previous one was still buffeting 10 hours a week, only the monthly consultations take me some time. Those who themselves rid their work of noise and nonsense and indicate that they are going to work one day less quickly sacrifice 20% salary, but if your output remains the same this will still feel a bit unfair. At least, that's true for me. Knowing that your colleague gets paid 20% more but manages the same amount in a traditional salary system doesn't do it for me We

appreciate working long hours and not working effectively (this sentence I hear almost weekly, for the record, from someone else's mouth).

For example, the following could have happened to me: Man fired for working more effectively, the quest writes. You don't make it up, but a man, who worked harder than his colleagues and often finished within 6 hours, was fired for "making too few hours. Even the judge agrees with the employer. Surely that gives you crooked toes. ["He worked faster and harder than his colleagues and therefore finished his work earlier. Therefore, he regularly had an hour to spare, a municipal official from Landgraaf declared in court in 2021. He challenged his dismissal in court. "](#) Most people already report being able to work between 3 and 5 hours effectively. The rest of the time is drudgery, distractions and, of course, social talk. The latter is kind of part of it, and since in a knowledge economy we can't determine whether you're working (and we don't have to), the 4 to 6 hour workday isn't so crazy. By the way, it doesn't matter if you do physical or cognitive work, either way the prick is out. "For many knowledge workers, it is not just the ability to work from either home or office, but the ability to work from anywhere, that is a true differentiator. With 75% of knowledge workers wanting to work from wherever they are in the future, organizations need to rethink benefit structures to remain competitive." <https://www.jabra.nl/hybridwork> . And you thought the 4 day work week was already too crazy. Are you over 40? Then the 3 day work week may be for the best. Research from the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economics and Social Research shows that people past 40 function best with a 3-day workweek or a 25-hour workweek (now let that be the 4 x 4 a 6 hours that I advocate with workfourteen).

*<https://www.hetkanwel.nl/driedaagse-werkweek/>

Moreover, with the more effective workday, space is freed up to better distribute care responsibilities. People have other commitments besides their work, and since time is a poor proxy for productivity, but is all the more important for one's personal life, we can make better use of these time savings so that everyone benefits. In a poll of me network of linkedin, over 75% said they would switch to their competitors if they switched to the 5 hour work day. Of course, this poll is anything but scientific but should still give one pause for thought. One's competitive advantage has to do with motivated people. (source: performance, the secrets of successful behavior, written by Robin Stuart-Kotze. People are not as likely to leave an organization because they have a connection with

colleagues. The manager has the most influence on people's motivation: 'my manager likes me' is a very important one. <https://motivationworks.com/>

Intrinsic motivation

Adam Smith already warned that if we left everything to the market (and market thinking) that we would lose intrinsic values, such as community spirit. The counterpart to that, of course, was Karl Marx; he hedged that people did have intrinsic motivation and would do the right thing from there. This moral aspect comes from intrinsic values.

In the movie a beautiful mind there is a scene where 5 gentlemen see 5 ladies walk in. 1 of the ladies is a very beautiful blonde lady. Suddenly it occurs to Nash that we would all be better off if no one went for the prettiest blonde lady. The competition would result in a loss for everyone except the one who hooks the blonde. If the blonde lady rejects him they are all empty handed, if they don't go for the blonde lady but for the 4 girlfriends they all manage to hook someone. Here he cites Adam Smith as the father of modern economics.

"In competition individual ambition serves the common good" but what turns out that is only the case if you also include the common good. This is what he demonstrates is an equilibrium, the nash equilibrium and is at the basis of game theory. So we benefit from not going for the optimal outcome for the individual but taking into account the collective. Dan Ariely explains very nicely that where we used to steer for efficiency (a big part of scientific management) we may now want to steer more for meaning, because people are more than a cog in a wheel. After all, people also have intrinsic motivation.

The discussion is often about intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Adler & Chen (2011) write about 4 types of motivation, curious to know what the 2 other types of motivators are? Here is a brief summary of the 4 types of motivation. They call this "perceived locus of causality" and use it to explain creativity and problem solving.

1 - Intrinsic motivation

Intrinsic motivation is one of the best known forms of motivation. It is the motivation to engage in an activity purely because the activity itself is fun and one gets satisfaction from

doing the activity. Creativity is highest when motivation is intrinsic. The purest form of intrinsic motivation is an [autotelic activity](#).

2 - Identification

One of the human needs is the urge to belong to a group. This is because a group provides safety, security and a certain identity. Here, an individual's goals, norms and values broadly match those of the group.

3 - Introjection

Introjection may not be immediately familiar to many. It is attributable to status. This type of motivation can be either positive or negative. A negative form of this is the fear of losing status. A manager can "motivate" people to work harder in this way. This, of course, is not a desirable situation. In a positive sense, it can be the achievement of a certain result.

4 - Extrinsic motivation

Extrinsic motivation is a type of motivation where the main role is not the activity but the reward. This can be in the form of money or other means of value. Extrinsic motivators can also have a sense of appreciation, recognition in them. Incidentally, this can be both positive (rewards) and negative (punishments).

Crowding out effect

A well-known result of using extrinsic motivators where intrinsic motivation was already present is the "crowding out effect" (Frey et al, 2013). This can happen when an intrinsically motivated activity has an extrinsic value attached to it. Consider volunteering or donating blood. Paying for such an activity can cause people who are intrinsically motivated to quit the activity, where as extrinsically motivated people are attracted to it.

So you donate blood because you want to help others. If they then give money for it, your intrinsic motivation may disappear and you may attract people who do it for the money. Whether this benefits the quality of blood donation is then questionable.

Those who originally did it from good intentions may feel scandalized. This effect is called the crowding out effect. Intrinsic motivation disappears because we put an extrinsic motivator against it. It may also be the case that if you take a particular way of working or view for just so long you internalize it.

Think of the soldiers who have to deliver the cabinets spick and span and there is a weekly inspection. They usually didn't do this from intrinsic motivation, but it can lead to them still using the same practices themselves from the military. This internalized tidiness and discipline. Of course, there was also punishment here (extrinsic as well as introjection).

Adler, P. S., & Chen, C. (2011). Combining creativity and control: Understanding individual motivation in large-scale collaborative creativity. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* (36), 63-85.

Frey, B., Homberg, F., & Osterloh, M. (2013). Organizational Control Systems and Pay-for-Performance in the Public Service. *Organization Studies*(0(0)), 1-24.

Everyone has them, values that are intrinsic or at least internalized. Either because you find it naturally or because you have internalized it. Intrinsic values are values like community spirit, caring for each other, love, doing your best (commitment), doing something because it's the right thing to do. For that, you don't need extrinsic values. Sometimes a second incentive is not always better or smarter. In the Ted Talk, Our Loss of Wisdom, Barry Schwartz cites the example of putting a nuclear waste depot in their municipality. It involves a study in Switzerland in the mid-1990s. Some psychologists asked citizens if they were willing to agree to it. 50% of the citizens said yes, despite the negative consequences such as the decrease in the value of their property. They took responsibility.

Then people were asked if they were willing for a compensation amounting to a fat month's salary whether they were now willing to host at the landfill in their community. Now only 25% of people indicated they were willing. You would expect that the responsibility + monetary reward would lead to a higher percentage agreeing. But what happened was that with a second incentive people were no longer thinking about taking responsibility (intrinsic) but what it would get them (extrinsic). Why, too, do you think you are intrinsically motivated but the other person is not or at least a lot less? Research shows that we have a false image of "the other."

A group of 500 ambitious law students were asked why they liked to pursue a legal career 2/3 indicated that they did it out of interest, it was a challenge for them. But when asked why the other students wanted to enter this profession 60% indicated they were doing it because of the money. Strange isn't it? For example, we think that if we ourselves receive

a basic income, we ourselves will continue to work, but the neighbor or neighbor will not. Who is lazy. Look at you, it gives you peace and stability and you do dedicate yourself to society, but the other person: the other person is cutting corners. The 'other' is just a little less motivated and to be trusted. The 'other' would have done something wrong. It is very strange how we think about the 'other'. You work because you like it, you don't do it for the money. Your colleague, on the other hand ... Surely he is a little less intrinsically motivated than you are. No one has a monopoly on working hard and doing their best. For example, people were asked if they would continue to work when receiving a basic income. A fixed amount per month that guarantees your livelihood. Whereby working always pays off, financially and or in fulfillment. Most people said they would. But when asked whether the neighbor would continue to work, more than half thought not. The other is lazy, needs to be motivated and no who does need prompting and structures. If the neighbor makes a mistake when applying for a dormer window, he or she must have done something wrong. If something happens to you, then it is extremely unfair. That we think this way is not strange, it has been taught to us and thus culturally well embedded in our society. It is as Barry Schwartz calls it old (persistent) idea technology. Things we think are true determine how we view others. It determines how we view and treat people. High time to take a critical look at ourselves toward the other. Perhaps that other is also motivated.

It is not surprising that we think this way: our whole view of man is built on scientific management (the more instrumentalism), theory X (McGregor) and agency theory, as well as Anglo-Saxon thinking (shareholder value). These theories are dominant even though their counterparts are stewardship theory (its creator was Fayol), theory Y (McGregor), self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci) but also Rhineland thinking. Many of the first mentioned ideas about people that are simply not true. A deep rooted distrust, the absence of intrinsic motivation and therefore everything had to be controllable (input) and outcomes measurable (output). Moreover, Taylor was convinced that money was the only motivation of people (Latham & Ernst 2006). Agency theory assumed that the interests of the owner would not match the interests of the employee. The agent (employee) is lazy and wants to do as little as possible, much less share the information that the agent has but the principal does not (it is distant). This is called a moral hazard (a risk). The agent acts out of self-interest and the principal wants to prevent or at least

minimize that. This is much more in line with scientific management, in which an employee is a resource of the organization that must be managed and controlled.

Theory X & Y by McGregor is also an interesting one. Theory X assumed a negative view of man, while Theory Y assumed a positive view of man. Both are right, and that has to do with the performativity of the theory (a theory can also affect). People mold themselves to the system. Then the stewardship theory, the employee is an ambassador of the organization and acts not only from his own interest, but also has an eye for the organization. The steward does something from intrinsic motivation and based on trust. The interest of the employee merges with that of the organization. In this, the organization is a resource of the employee and the employee is not a "resource of the organization. There is reciprocity here, a more relational way of working together, also called relational responsibility.

Today we still see the former in almost all organizations. Exceptions aside, think for example of Buurtzorg where employees work more according to the stewardship principle. How is it that even though science has confirmed it for 40 years we still think these things? Barry Schwartz calls the old idea technology and it holds back social innovation. The ted talk: the way we think about work is broken is highly recommended for those who want a quick look at this topic "When we say it that people do it for the money." Generally we think this is a very poor reason to go for something. If you say this at your job interview, chances are you won't be hired. At least you don't have to write it in your cover letter. If someone has a public service job and is doing it "for the money" we quickly find it questionable. At least you don't have to write it at the top of your letter: I want to work here because I need to earn money to buy a speedboat.

I don't need a fat lease car....

I don't need a fat lease car. I don't want a fixed office or to stand in traffic jams to and from work. I want to be able to work where I think I can work best. I want to get results, see and experience progress. I want to be able to act autonomously, I want to be able to collaborate with people, sometimes remotely, sometimes physically in 1 space. I don't want to see the walls coming at me, at home or in the office.

I want to be able to get enough sleep, spend time with my family. I want to be able to exercise, walk the dog and chew on that problem while running. I want to do my best and add value. I don't want to keep the system happy or nod yes when I think no. I don't want to be consumed by my schedule and be lived. I want direction over my own time, life and energy.

I sometimes want to come home from work completely physically broken and fall asleep like a log as I have with exercise from time to time. I also want to be able to go for a run in the evening with friends or swim in the morning before I get to work. Because then I am sharper, fitter, happier and more productive. I don't want to put in hours because I get paid in hours.

I want to be able to decide when I work best, where I work best and with whom I work best. Whether that's 3 hours, 6 hours or 9 hours that day. I want to be treated like adults. I want to be able to commit myself as an autonomous human being to the organization I work (for). I want to earn money from added value created by me and the organization.

I don't want to have to retire. I don't want to yearn for retirement with a worn out back or no motivation (I still have 3 years to go). I want to be active throughout my life. I want to always be able to learn and not just until I'm 25. I don't want to pay off student debt until I'm 50. I want to take a vacation once in a while.

I don't want to have to crave the weekend. I want flexibility to be able to go to the dentist during the week. I want to be able to do laundry and vacuum myself. I don't want to outsource my kids to daycare, I want to be able to take them there occasionally because it's good for them and good for me.

I don't want my parents to have more time for my children than I do. So that soon I will have time for my grandchildren when I retire, but never had time for my own children. I don't want to outsource my dog to the dog walking service because I have to be on the road so much to and from hour-

long appointments because I was busy then, and being busy was good (until corona).

I want to learn and develop not from numbers and certificates, but because I want to and I want to be stimulated by new knowledge. other insights and other people. I want to have at least 1.5 meters of freedom of movement as a professional and as a human being, without anyone watching my every move.

I want to be able to make mistakes and learn from them. I sometimes want to be the one who does get in that 5 feet and be told to keep my hands off it because I wasn't cooking. I want to be able to argue and make up again. I would like to do something for someone else, but also something for myself.

Money is seen as an extrinsic motivator. Say motive (movement) but that would be too narrow a representation of money. Money can also be seen as a means of exchange and appreciation. It offers you the opportunity to move forward in life. To improve your (financial) position and thereby strengthen the future of yourself and your children. It is therefore a means and not an end in itself. Yet sometimes we seem to lose sight of that. What was actually the intention? You probably know the story of the fisherman who is addressed by the rich American. The fisherman is taking a nap on the beach after going fishing, and the American, who is there on vacation, asks why he doesn't catch more fish so he can sell more and expand his fleet. If he does that, he can get an office in a New York to manage his fleet.

To which the fisherman replies: and then what?

To which the American replies: if you do then you can spend 2 weeks a year lying on a beach and enjoying the sea.

The fisherman says: I'm already doing that.

We see that we are shifting from masculine values such as status, money and ego to more feminine values such as caring, peace and commitment. For example, there is no relationship between the amount of pay and one's performance. Daniel Pink's video: the

surprising truth about what motivates us is highly recommended here. The RSA animation takes you through his plea for a different view of motivation. There are still many organizations that attract mostly young people with a laptop, a car and a company phone. Once a hook through the lip they are not only sad when they have to hand it in, the rent and mortgage that has to be paid makes people dependent on it.

After all, we start living by the salary we earn (that too is Parkinson's Law). This leaves people stuck in jobs that may pay well but give little satisfaction. Money and salary is a hygiene factor for many and it doesn't make you run faster or get you more accomplished. An overly dirty toilet we like to skip, but a toilet with gold faucets, we are not so quick to complain about that. However, it does not make you go from a clean neat toilet to a toilet full of luxury tastier. This is called Herzberg's two factor theory. Herzberg points out that if you give an extrinsic motivator (a motive) then it is not the employee who is motivated (which is essentially always intrinsic) but the manager or organization that comes up with the incentive. So flattening the discussion by making intrinsic motivation the holy grail and condemning extrinsic motivation is not the solution. We do not need to impose each other's motivations on the other. We simply don't know what drives the other person and have a hard time assessing that. Sometimes you work purely for the money. Fine, maybe there's a touch of intrinsic motivation in there too, let's hope so. Sometimes something seems extrinsic but turns out to be intrinsic. For example, it may be a sense of progress, a big motivation may be that you would like to give your children a better future and money is that means. Maybe you want to experience more freedom and be more independent (autonomy). If the extrinsic motivation becomes more prominent there is a chance that the intrinsic motivation will be pushed away. Consider, for example, donating blood. You do that to help your fellow man. If we attach a price tag to it, you may be the one who drops out, but people who find the extrinsic incentive attractive sign up. You might wonder what that will do to the quality of blood donors.

Osterloh & Fry call this the crowding out effect. Moreover, you might feel insulted that 1 x blood donation earns 10 euros. The book *The Measuring Society* by Berend van der Kolk talks about the price tag of a price tag. Turning something into extrinsic and measurable elements can affect your motivation. Vosselman writes about public service motivation, the motivation to engage in public service. The motivation to work in a government, for example, is different than within the private sector, where profit plays a bigger role.

Therefore, the fact that salaries are higher in some sectors is partly because people are "bought off. The premium (raise) paid to work at a Shell or Tatasteel, for example, buys off some of that motivation or guilt, so to speak. However, people are much more relational than instrumental in nature. I will illustrate this with an example from my own experience.

"When my niece was just born, my mother was eager to visit my brother, sister-in-law and the little world wonder. She was recovering from breast cancer and she couldn't drive herself. It was an eventful time with this as a bright spot. I was at work, but had indicated in the morning that I might leave in the afternoon to take my mother that way (and of course to welcome the new sprout to the earth myself and congratulate my brother and sister-in-law). The call comes and it's 2 p.m. I finish what I am working on and leave the office. At 16:00 I call that I am not coming back, that I am not going to make it. My employer was not too happy about this. With pain and effort it was possible. Really it was not from the heart. By the way, it cost me the "hours" so the employer didn't pay a euro extra for it.

The years before, I had gone along to fairs on Saturdays and Sundays without "writing hours. I had expected at least some empathy. Let's just say a certain reciprocity and flexibility. The same flexibility that I showed when they were tight for once. For me, that was the moment my motivation went down the drain. Motivation has nothing to do with money, but with room for things in your life that are more important than work. I will drop everything next time when it comes to family. Whatever assignment or amount of money is in return. I knew then that if I ever became an employer, I would never act this way. Moral of the story: if you as an organization do not give the space to be able to experience such life events then you will only get the physical presence but no longer the heart and soul. Above all, let us not invent forms of leave for this, but show a piece of humanity. You will see that people will then go through fire for each other and the organization."

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/louisgoulmywerkvierentwintig_toen-mijn-nichtje-net-geboren-was-wilde-mijn-activity-6924385673604931584-MCj3?utm_source=linkedin_share&utm_medium=member_desktop_web