The Return of the Work-Life Blend

A successful man continues to look for work even after he has found a job.

— Unknown
Pay to Play in the NBA

You don’t have to be a fan of the National Basketball Association (NBA) to appreciate this story about compensation and motivation. . . .

It’s a March evening in Dallas, Texas, and the Denver Nuggets have traveled in to play an important basketball game against the Mavericks. The late season NBA game had all the excitement of two big teams fighting for playoff spots, but this game would have special significance for Earl “J.R.” Smith, a young Nuggets’ player with a knack for landing three-point shots. You see, he knew that on that single night, during that single game, he would earn more money than any other NBA player—a lot more.1

It all started when Smith signed a new three-year contract with the Nuggets, which contained a unique clause specifying a performance bonus. If Smith played 2,000 or more minutes in the season, and the Nuggets won 42 or more games, the Nuggets had to pay Smith a very big bonus. At the time of the negotiations, the Nuggets probably thought it was a safe bet. After all, Smith had played less than 1,500 minutes in each of the previous two seasons. But they structured the deal carefully so that he would be both motivated to consistently contribute throughout the year and to value team success as much as his own play time.

Going into this game, Smith had played for a total of 1,991 minutes in the season. Certainly the fans had no idea
of the importance of that number and his teammates were probably oblivious to it, too. But there is no doubt that Smith smiled to himself as each minute of the game clock ticked ever closer—1,998 minutes of total game play, 1,999 minutes, 2,000! J.R. Smith, just 23 years old, earned a $600,000 bonus, the highest game-triggered payout ever.

The Return of Variable Pay

Many people hear about professional sports players’ multimillion dollar contracts, but few realize that most contracts are built on performance clauses very similar to what the Nuggets owners crafted for J.R. Smith. In baseball, fielders are paid bonuses on the number of putout assists and pitchers on the total number of innings pitched. The compensation for an NFL football quarterback is tied to the quarterback rating, which is a formula measuring completions, touchdowns, interceptions, and yards gained. In fact, while this “pay for performance” structure may seem odd to today’s workers who are used to just being paid for their time, it’s actually been the norm in all societies for a long time.

For most of human existence, pay has been tied directly to output. We consumed only what we hunted successfully, later we bartered the crops we harvested and livestock we raised, and still later we would swap the skills we were good at for lodging or meals we needed. Even after the adoption of standardized currencies, we only received it for the goods we made or for specific services (e.g., shoeing a horse). But the industrial revolution and the nature of basic task work inside factories quickly broadened the practice of paying for time rather than performance. Unskilled factory workers were paid wages by the week or by the day, with many people working as many as 16 hours in a 24-hour period. Factory managers were paid by the week. In the 1800s,
the English labor movement rallied around a pay-for-time slogan: “A Fair Day’s Wages for a Fair Day’s Work.” In the 1900s, a new army of white-collar office workers began receiving salaries based on annual estimates of time worked.

This two-century long experiment in fixed-payment-for-fixed-time peaked in the 1930s. Then slowly but surely, more and more corporations began to introduce variable pay programs for at least part of their workforce. Variable pay refers to compensation systems where a large part of total compensation is performance based, and must be re-earned each year. It is typically tied to the performance of the individual, that person’s team, the employer, or some combination of the three. Payment can be made in cash or sometimes in stock options or stock grants in the company.

Funding for variable pay programs is now dramatically rising. Figure 1.1 shows how the portion of compensation tied to variable pay has tripled in the last 20 years, increasing from 4.2 percent in 1990 to 12 percent in 2009.

By the year 2030, we project that fully one-quarter of white-collar pay will be tied to performance and output. This data reflects nonsales compensation; if you were to include sales
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**Figure 1.1** Actual and Projected Variable Pay as Percent of Total Compensation
commissions, these numbers would be in the 35 percent of total pay range.

This dramatic shift to variable pay is an example of We principles at work (see Figure 1.2). Employers benefit from variable pay as it better enables them to manage base costs, reduce risks from unforeseen events, and reward employees whose efforts directly drive business outcomes. Workers benefit from variable pay programs because it can increase their compensation each year far beyond cost-of-living increases and better reward their individual efforts.

**Case Study: The Kenexa Z-Index**

So how do you actually implement an effective variable pay plan? How do you balance the organization’s goals with the performance of the individual?

At Kenexa, more than 2,000 employees track something called the “Z-Index.” It’s a single number that boils down the organization’s top goals into a single score.
Z-Index = (Sales Backlog + Priority Partner Program Revenue + Enterprise Sales) × Income Percentage × Renewal Rate

This internally is simplified as:

\[ Z = (B + P^3 + E) \times I \times R \]

The factors that comprise the Z-Index reflect the strategic priorities of the company. Sales backlog represents what's been sold and committed to, but not yet delivered or earned. Enterprise Sales is a measure of total revenue, \( P^3 \) is the revenue from the Priority Partner Program, which represents top clients, the contract renewal rate reflects client satisfaction, and income percentage reflects the value of profit. From Rudy in his office near Philadelphia, PA, to the office workers in Vizag, India, and everybody in between, the Z-Index makes crystal clear that Kenexa values profitable growth and client service.

The Z-Index offers a precise answer to the question, “How are we doing as a company?” The Z-Index formula is taught to all new hires, and is reinforced with prominent placement in internal newsletters, posters, and the company’s Intranet, and leaders frequently speak to the score in their team meetings.

Targets are set at the beginning of the year with the Gold Z-Score representing the most ambitious goal, a Silver Z-Score is equal to 90 percent of the gold level, and a Bronze Z-Score reflects 80 percent of the gold level goal (i.e., the bronze goal is 20 percent less than the highest gold-level target). Kenexa senior leadership receives a base pay compensation that is only a fraction of their potential total. The majority of their compensation is variable pay that is tied to both company performance against the Z-Index, and their individual performance against their quarterly and annual objectives. Based on the success of this variable pay plan, compensation plans tied to the Z-Index are being rolled out through the rest of Kenexa.
Managers can use variable pay plans as a powerful tool to attract and retain top talent. For individuals, it offers a higher income potential based on one’s unique talents. Variable pay plans must be designed to balance synergistic interests, just as the contracts of professional athletes reward for both team and individual performance. If a basketball player was only rewarded for three-point shots, he may choose to shoot when he should really pass. If a quarterback was rewarded only for the number of games played, he might choose to avoid hard tackles with a slide instead of diving for the first down. J.R. Smith earned his bonus only if he played a certain number of minutes (the individual goal) and the Denver Nuggets won at least 42 games (the team goal). We-compensation balances the goals of the organization with the goals of the individual.

So Many Jobs

What is most striking about this simple word is that despite 100,000 years of human social evolution, the word job has only been around for the last 400 years. For most of human history, people had one job; they were hunter-gatherers. They moved about from place to place to forage edible plants and hunt game. Eventually, about 12,000 years ago, they learned to domesticate edible plants and animals, thus enabling simple settlements and eventually, they became farmers. Even as settlements flourished and grew in population, most people either tended their crops or were considered herdsmen, moving their cows and sheep across different fields to graze.

With the Bronze and Iron Ages (approximately 3000 to 500 B.C.) came only a few more job types. Most people were still farmers, but smiths and smelters spent their time turning copper into bronze, traders traveled great distances to barter metals and gemstones, craftsmen built chariots and boats, and professional
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warriors protected the traders. By the time of Ancient Rome job choice expanded slightly and included priests, scribes, and with an intentional misuse of the word *job*, you also had slaves. About 1,000 years ago, in the Middle Ages, you could find more service jobs like doctor, bookkeeper, butler, maid, cook, groundskeeper, page, and even minstrel entertainers.

But a historic shift in what we did to make a living occurred when the first steam engine was unveiled in 1769 and the Industrial Revolution ushered in the word *job* as we know it today. Power generation increasingly came from coal engines rather than animals and rapid wealth generation came from owning factories, not land. People living in the country flocked to cities as factory owners hired unskilled commoditized workers to run the machines. A salary report from an 1860 silk mill in England shows just a sample of the brand new industrial job types including loom cleaners, winders, twisters, weavers, and gauze examiners. The explosion in jobs and new job types was unprecedented, and the burst in factory workers, of course, ushered in a new class of managers as well.

There was another shift in the 1930s, which was reflected by the American writer Upton Sinclair when he coined the term *white-collar worker* to describe the proliferation of a new

---

**Definition of Job**

Job  
Function: Noun  
Data: circa 1627  
Definition: a small, miscellaneous piece of work undertaken on order at a stated rate  
Or, a specific duty, role, or function  
—Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary
We class of office workers. These service jobs included sales, marketing, finance, customer service, civil service, teaching, and other nonmanual labor positions. The number of white-collar workers outstripped blue-collar workers and farmers by the mid-1950s, and in turn, has been supplanted by knowledge workers in the new information age.

This short traipse through occupational history shows how for thousands of years we’ve only had a handful of job possibilities, but in very recent times, we’ve seen an explosion in job types. In fact, the 1950 U.S. Census listed 287 job categories and a mere 50 years later, it lists 543 job types—a net increase of 83 percent\(^7\) (see Figure 1.3).

### Disappearing Jobs

In the 1967 film *The Graduate*, Benjamin Braddock (played by a young Dustin Hoffman) is anxious and confused about his future. In a classic film scene, an older family friend named Mr. McGuire offers some unsolicited career advice.

**Mr. McGuire:** I just want to say one word to you—just one word.

**Ben:** Yes sir.
Mr. McGuire: Are you listening?
Ben: Yes I am.
Mr. McGuire: Plastics.
Ben: Exactly how do you mean?
Mr. McGuire: There's a great future in plastics. Think about it. Will you think about it?

The single word plastics is viewed by many as the most famous line ever delivered in an American movie.

Previous generations marched with confidence into their careers. Often people chose to pursue the same careers their parents pursued. They assumed that a good job in a good company would guarantee their future. One worried about climbing the ladder, not whether the ladder would tip over. We have long since left the days when career advice could be summed up in a single word (e.g., plastics), no matter how bright the prospects for a specific industry may seem. No longer can we assume that we will have to learn just one trade, or choose just one employer, or even just one industry. A job for life is the very rare exception, not the rule.

Case Study: Typesetting Industry
Before the mid-1980s, everything from business cards to display ads were designed by special typesetting companies with employees whose skills ranged from typography to photography and film, as well as working the press itself. With the advent of affordable personal computers and desktop publishing software, in less than a decade the typesetting industry almost disappeared. Professional printers who thought they

(continued)
The visual artist Raymon Elozua created a powerful chronicle of jobs that no longer exist in his self-published book, *Lost Labor*. You can view over 100 photographs of jobs that no longer exist on his Web site, www.lostlabor.com, including rubber reclaimers, hat makers, poultry pluckers, ice haulers, and many more.

Being engaged at work doesn’t mean being blissfully ignorant of today’s business realities. Rapid change means true security comes from actively managing your career, not assuming you made the one right job choice. It is not the employer’s role alone to ease your anxieties; it is dangerous to ever cede control over your future to someone else. If industries change, you must change with them. Some skills are more transferable than others. We explore later in the book the importance of being a continual learner. But paramount to being a continual learner is to constantly look at your career path, your industry, and the possible options in the future.

If you are a manager, it should be part of your job to assist your team members in their career path planning as well. You of course are already grooming your own replacement and have a succession plan in place (right?). But all your team members will benefit
in their current job if they see a future in the company through job promotions and variety (see Figure 1.4).

**From Job, to Jobs**

Michael, age 55, packs up his laptop, grabs his car keys, and nods to his boss as he leaves the office just after five. With an advanced degree in biostatistics, Michael earns a handsome six-figure salary writing clinical trial reports for his employer, a leading biotech company in California. But Michael doesn’t drive straight home. He stops at 16-year-old Jenna’s house. You see, Jenna is struggling with advanced algebra and the big SAT exam is coming up. Michael greets Jenna’s parents before pulling out his calculator, asking Jenna to do the same, and sitting down for his “second shift.”

Tutoring could never replace his day job of course, but Michael found that the science-oriented parents in the valley paid well for an hour of his time. And while he wouldn’t do it for free, it feels good helping kids get better at math and several of their parents have become new
friends. You’d think Michael would be too burned out from his day job to want to spend an hour teaching math—but to his own surprise, it actually invigorates him. He feels refreshed by the time he gets home.

Another strong workforce trend is the shift to holding more than just one job. The predictions made by many a decade ago are becoming reality. Irish business guru Charles Handy, in his 2001 book The Elephant and the Flea, coined the term the portfolio life to describe those who juggle multiple roles and occupations. Similar to how one builds an investment portfolio, Handy predicted that more people would assemble multiple jobs to reduce risk, maximize interest, and allow for more flexible schedules and work-life balance. The very same year, Daniel Pink suggested we would become a “Free Agent Nation” in the book of the same name, in order to become more fulfilled with our work, and to take back more of our time.

And it’s not just people in lower income brackets who are juggling multiple jobs. CEOs and senior executives of large companies frequently also hold paid director positions with other companies, not to mention unpaid roles with nonprofit organizations. For example, in 2009 IBM CEO Samuel Palmisano earned $1.8 million in salary from IBM, but also earned about $100,000 as a director for ExxonMobil. Zachary Carter is a partner at the law firm Dorsey & Whitney, but also earns $425,000 as a director for Cablevision and another $90,000 as a director for March & McLennan.

Today’s professional athletes don’t just get paid to play the game; the most successful ones sign endorsement deals, some give speeches, and others sell autographs. In fact, the world’s highest paid athletes earned much more from “moonlighting” than from their day jobs. In 2009, golfer Tiger Woods made $7.7 million in salary and winnings, but made $92 million in endorsements. LeBron James made $14 million for playing basketball, but another $28 million in endorsements. Dale Earnhardt Jr. was paid $4.6 million for racing, and another $22 million in endorsements.
The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics actually measures the number of multiple jobholders in its monthly census, which stood at 5.2 percent of all workers in 2009. But we think this number is vastly underreported. Their measurement is based on this question: “Last week, did you have more than one job (or business), including part-time, evening, or weekend work?” Many multiple jobholders might not think to answer yes to this category, if their second job is not one considered to be conventional. They include the executives who work on corporate boards perhaps only one day a month and get paid on a quarterly basis; moonlighting-entrepreneurs who will take their income in the form of profits at the end of the year; members of multilevel marketing companies who are paid only when they hold parties or reach certain milestones; consultants who typically work for several different employers on multiple projects, but may consider being a consultant “one job.” And of course, there are many, many others who work on a cash basis, and would never dream of telling the government that indeed, they held more than one job in the prior week.

We actually wonder who doesn’t hold more than one job these days. Just considering our own positions, Rudy’s multiple jobs include duties as the CEO of Kenexa along with being a director at other companies, while Kevin is President of Krū Research, is on the board of a bank, and is a professional speaker. Among our friends and family alone we know:

- A pharmaceutical purchasing director who also owns and oversees 20 rental properties.
- A real estate broker who owns a restaurant.
- A sheriff’s officer who also works as a personal trainer.
- A lawyer who is a partner in a medical device startup.
- A teacher who runs a summer tutoring camp.
- A commercial property manager who also runs a cleaning service.
Several primary care doctors who also deliver paid lectures and serve as paid expert witnesses in malpractice cases.

A high-end private security guard who is occasionally called again for duty as a U.S. Navy SEAL.

An accountant who runs an ice cream store.

An office manager who does accounting for a print shop.

A sales manager who is also a successful day trader.

Why are so many people holding more than one job?

- Income—Perhaps the biggest benefit, of course, is that it can increase your income.
- Variety—Second jobs often don’t pay much, but they enable the worker to learn new skills, meet new people, and do interesting work.
- Diversification—Having more than one employer or source of income can reduce the financial and emotional impact of losing your primary job, and may enable you to more quickly recover by growing the secondary job.
- Flexibility—For some, having two part-time jobs offers the same income as one full-time job, but enables them to fulfill other role duties like picking up their kids from the bus stop or caring for an elderly parent.
- Risk Elimination—Many entrepreneurs began building their business while they still maintained their day job. Knowing that the first couple years of a startup can be very lean, maintaining the primary job until things are more stable reduces the risk of entrepreneurship.

Of course, along with these many benefits comes an increase in work-related time commitments and great responsibility, too.

Having more than one job is neither better nor worse—but it is a rapidly growing trend. As an individual, you should consider
whether or not becoming a multiple jobholder would enable you to develop new skills, supplement income, or reduce career risk. As a manager or employer, you need to acknowledge that you can win the fight for the best talent by focusing on their productivity and less on being their only source of income.

How to Negotiate a Multi-Job Career

You might be thinking, “I’d love to have multiple jobs but my employer would never let me do it.”

Indeed, the most important thing is to be completely transparent and open about your situation. You’d never want to be in the situation where you bump into your boss when you’re working your second job. If you’re employed full-time, what your boss should care most about is that your primary attention is with your primary job and that your other activities won’t interfere in any way.

Go to www.WeTheBook.com to watch “Negotiate a Multi-Job Career: An Interview with Rudy Karsan” to see how to address the multiple job issue during a job interview, or with your existing employer.

From 9-to-5 to Get-It-Done

As we’ve shifted to a knowledge-based economy, with business being conducted around the world, the notion of a 9 AM to 5 PM standard workday has become antiquated. Perhaps a better description is short lived. After all, historically people just worked whatever hours it took to get the job done. Hunt and gather when your family or tribe needed food. Get up early to milk the cows and do the heavy work before the hot afternoon sun rose. Shoe the horse when the traveler stops by and pays you to.
Many are surprised to learn that the standard 40-hour workweek only came into existence in the United States recently, in 1938, with the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Although many had fought for a shorter, defined workweek throughout the 1800s, it was actually the Great Depression that enabled passage of the act; with fewer hours per worker, companies would be forced to keep more workers employed. Today, according to one recent survey, 63 percent of Americans are working more than 40 hours per week and 40 percent are working more than 50 hours per week.\textsuperscript{13}

More relevant, it’s not the total number of hours worked (there has always been the notion of overtime) but it’s the set time and location of work that is noticeably disappearing. Work is increasingly bleeding into and blending into the rest of our lives. With e-mail, laptops, and smart phones, we are increasingly blending work activities with leisure activities. Who hasn’t checked in with the office while standing at their child’s bus stop? Who hasn’t sent an e-mail or two out while standing on the sidelines of their kids’ sports practice or game? Left a little early to take their spouse to the theater and made up the time Sunday night when the kids went to bed?

This return to a work-life blend is a natural result of dual-income families benefiting from more flexible work hours, and from companies that benefit from higher service levels and the ability to conduct business across multiple time zones. It has also been enabled by advances in communication technology; smart phones let us text, talk, e-mail, and run applications from anywhere while broadband connections and Wi-Fi keep us connected to work from our home offices.

There’s even a management movement known as Results Only Work Environment (ROWE), which emerged from Best Buy’s experiment in extreme work flexibility. The idea is that employees can work when they want and where they want, as
long as the work gets done. What Best Buy, and others who are emulating them, have found, is that productivity goes up and turnover goes down.

Retirement (In)Security

On January 31, 1940, Ida Mae Fuller became an unlikely character for American history books. “Aunt Ida,” as her friends called her, was born on a Vermont farm in 1874. She never married, and worked for many years as a schoolteacher and later as a legal secretary. She retired in 1939 and while running errands in the town of Rutland, Vermont, decided to stop by one of the government offices. As she tells it, “It wasn’t that I expected anything, mind you, but I knew I’d been paying for something called Social Security and I wanted to ask the people in Rutland about it.”

Three months after putting in her request, Ida Fuller would become the first person to receive a Social Security check, number 00-000-001. It was in the amount of $22.54. Although she only ever paid in $24.75 into the Social Security system, she would go on to live until the age of 100 and collect $22,888.92 in retirement payments.¹⁴

Throughout history, humans have always faced difficult times related to illness, disability, and the inability to work in old age. In the earliest times, we depended on our families for economic security. We cared for our elderly parents just as they cared for us when we were children. Farms were passed down among the generations; whoever owned land would never go hungry. As farms gave way to villages in the Middle Ages, craftsmen banded together to form guilds and guild members collectively replaced the security that was previously provided by family and assets.

About 400 years ago, for the first time in the Western world, people began to turn over these kinds of responsibilities to the
state. The “Poor Laws” were passed in England, which instituted new taxes to fund welfare for the poor and English settlers brought their notions of state-guaranteed welfare with them to America. But through the 1800s, relief was made as unpleasant as possible in order to discourage dependency. Those who received welfare from the state lost their personal property, lost the right to vote, and in some cases were marked with a “P” on their clothing so all could see that they received welfare for the poor.

But the 1930s brought the Great Depression with huge corporate losses, the collapse of the stock market, and massive unemployment. The impact on the elderly was especially harsh. These extreme circumstances led to widespread pleas for government help, and President Roosevelt called for the formation of the program of Social Security. The original program was quite basic: only people who paid into the system received benefits, the retirement age was 65, and the payouts were modest.15

When Should You Receive Social Security?

In 1935, a 20-year-old worker could expect to live to age 67. This means he could expect that Social Security would provide modest support for the last two years of his life. If we applied the original standards to our life expectancy today, we wouldn’t be eligible for Social Security until age 75.16

Over time, the Social Security program has grown considerably:

- Benefits were granted to the spouse and children of deceased workers
- The value of benefits doubled in the 1950s as Congress made inflation-related adjustments
Disability benefits were added in the 1950s
Early retirement features enabled workers to retire at 62

Today, one in seven Americans receives Social Security benefits and by 2037, the money will run out—one century after it was started. It’s impossible to predict exactly what changes will be made to save the program, but it is likely that the retirement age will be extended, we will have to pay higher taxes into the system, and benefits will only be paid to those who pass some form of means testing (i.e., those who have accumulated a certain level of assets will not be able to draw back Social Security).

In addition to government-run retirement security, a parallel phenomenon occurred with the rapid growth of employer-sponsored pensions. Private pension plans were very rare until after World War II. But then they grew quickly to the point where by 1999, fully 44 percent of all workers in the United States were part of employer pension plans. These were predominantly defined benefit plans, whereby the employer alone pays into the system and guarantees retirement payments to the worker for life. The problem with these plans, of course, is that while the payout is a promised and fixed amount, the contribution the company puts into the program and what happens to their investment over time is variable.

Indeed many companies made promises they couldn’t keep, and many companies and their pension programs have gone bust. In 1964, carmaker Studebaker closed down after 60 years in business, and 4,500 workers lost 85 percent of their promised pension. In response to the Studebaker crisis and others like it, the U.S. Congress passed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) of 1974 and established the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation (PBGC) to regulate and insure pension plans. But the looming pension crisis—with unfunded benefits in the trillions of
dollars—is far bigger than the PBGC can handle. Experts talk not if the PBGC will need a government bailout but when it will need a bailout.

When it comes to retirement security, in as little as 100 years, we’ve shifted responsibility from ourselves and our families to governments and employers. This turned out to be risky as neither companies nor governments can fund the promises that have now been made. For many, sadly, there will be no pension at all and for others, they’ll receive a fraction of what was to be expected.

Defined benefit plans—plans supported by and controlled by employers—are risky, underfunded, and are now seen by most as an ill-conceived experiment. The We approach to retirement security is one in which there is shared responsibility and control (see Figure 1.5). These defined contribution plans, most commonly in the form of 401(k) plans, shift the model whereby employees must pay in a percentage of their pay, employers match the contribution, and government gives up potential tax revenues
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on the investment income. Additionally, 401(k)s empower the participant to take the plan with them when they leave the company—no longer do you need to work for 10, 20, or 30 years for your pension to kick in. While critics of defined contribution plans often say that this shifts too much risk to the employee, we would suggest that trusting that your employer is going to fully fund your plan and still be around to pay it out is the riskiest option of all. Just ask the workers at Studebaker.

From Work-Life Balance to the Work-Life Blend

As our history has shown, we’ve existed for more than 100,000 years living a certain way. We knew everybody in our community, job choices were limited, we perfected our chosen craft throughout our lives, we consumed what we produced, our home and workplace were often one and the same, and when we got too old to work we would be supported by family or charity.

Then, very recently, the steam engine was invented and things dramatically changed. We left our families and moved to work in big factories in bigger cities where we became anonymous. We began to sell our time instead of our output. We expected a job for life and let our retirement become somebody else’s responsibility. We separated work from life. The thrill of the hunt was replaced with the malaise of entitlement. However, we painfully discovered in the last 50 years that both our job and our retirement are always at risk, and we are foolish to cede responsibility for them to anybody but ourselves.

The Industrial Revolution brought us great societal wealth, but it may have come at the price of individual happiness. The Surgeon General estimates that 16 percent of the U.S. adult population suffers from some form of anxiety, and one in 10 American adults is now taking antidepressant drugs.
If you take just one message away from this book, make it this: the idea that work and life are separate entities is an illusion. Everything is your life. And you spend far too much time “at work” for it not to be an enjoyable, fulfilling, and yes, an engaging experience. But the We approach is one that says stop striving for a work-life balance, and begin to craft a work-life blend.

The We mind-set is about recognizing and accepting the world as it really is, and assuming shared responsibility for your career and financial success. We are living longer than ever before, with more job churn and job choices, and much less financial security. It is just as foolish to believe happiness comes from the dichotomy of the work-life balance as it is to think we can all return to a hunter-gatherer existence. The answer is to do away with the false duality of work and life, and to embrace a work-life blend. This requires us to reject the false choice between work and life, career and family, and fun and money.

We began this chapter highlighting the performance pay of a professional basketball player, and from pro athletes we can see clues as to how to succeed in this new world of the work-life blend. They receive variable pay based on both individual and team performance. They hold multiple jobs, playing for teams but also working endorsement deals. They know they will retire in their mid-30s or early 40s, depending on the sport, so they plan for multiple careers—planning ahead for a time when they may go into announcing, or opening a restaurant, or real estate development. While our day job may not involve hitting a sinking fastball, we can certainly learn from the career paths and career mind-sets of these athletes. And we must remember to be passionate whatever the game is that we are playing.
Chapter Summary

The Return of the Work-Life Blend

(You can download this summary as a one-page PDF at www.WeTheBook.com.)

The path to career success and full engagement is made easier once you understand the forces in the world of work, and that it’s now a new world of work. As a species, for 100,000 years we made no distinction between our life and our work, and the word job didn’t even exist. The Industrial Revolution brought great societal wealth but introduced the idea that work and life were separate from one another, and our pay was tied to time rather than our production. But the pendulum is now swinging back in the other direction, and we can see a shift:

- From pay-for-time to pay-for-performance
- From limited job choices to complex and numerous job choices
- From holding one job to being a multiple jobholder
- From false guarantees to shared responsibility for economic security

Key Takeaways for Individuals

- You will be working longer, and in more jobs, than ever before.
- Therefore, it’s critical that you find a career and job that fully engages you.
- You must cast off any entitlement thinking you may have and become mindful of your career and long-term success.

(continued)
Key Takeaways for Managers

- Developing your skills as a manager is a way to reduce career risk, as leadership skills are in demand across all industries.
- Selling the flexibility that comes with a work-life blend model will enable you to recruit and retain top talent.
- Offering a variable-pay structure can both reduce your budget risk while motivating your top performers.

Chapter Bonus Material

Video Interview with Rudy Karsan

You have special access to material only available to readers of this book. Watch this exclusive and provocative interview with Rudy Karsan as he goes into more detail about the dangers of entitlement thinking.

2. Click the “Bonus Material” button/link.
3. Click the link that says “Entitlement Thinking.”
4. Enter the password “security” (without the quotation marks).

Enjoy your bonus material!