

Technology Needs an Operating Model

Part 6 of Golf's Reinvestment Era

Technology has become one of the clearest signals of golf's reinvestment era.

Tee-time systems. CRM platforms. Simulator bays. Range technology. Dynamic pricing tools. Customer communication platforms. Reporting dashboards. AI-supported workflows. Online booking. Loyalty programs. League management. Event inquiry systems. Data capture.

For many facilities, technology is no longer sitting on the edge of the business. It is moving into the center of how the facility understands demand, manages capacity, communicates with customers, supports staff, and measures performance. The 2025 Spring Tee Sheet & Booking Engine Market Share Report from smbGOLF analyzed technology adoption trends across more than 17,500 North American golf courses, a reminder that booking and tee-sheet systems are now foundational operating infrastructure for the industry. (Source: smbGOLF, *2025 Spring Tee Sheet & Booking Engine Market Share Report*)

That shift matters.

But it also raises the standard.

Technology does not fix a weak operating model. It reveals it faster.

If the facility does not know who owns the customer journey, a platform will not solve that. If the team does not have a clear follow-up process, better data will only show where the handoff failed. If the simulator bay has no programming plan, the software will not create one. If pricing decisions are disconnected from utilization, reporting may expose the gap, but it will not automatically close it.

A platform is not a strategy.

The best operators understand this. They are not using technology to look modern. They are using it to operate with more clarity.

That is the real opportunity.

Technology should help a golf facility answer better questions. Where is demand strongest? Where is capacity being wasted? Which customers are returning? Which programs are creating repeat use? Where are staff workflows breaking down? Which spaces are active, and which ones are underperforming? Which investments are improving the guest experience, and which ones are adding complexity without enough value?

Those questions are not about software alone. They are about operating discipline.

That is where this next phase of golf reinvestment is taking shape.

The opportunity is not simply to add more technology, more construction, or more amenities. It is to make better capital decisions while the cycle is still forming. Facilities have a chance to connect investment decisions to operating outcomes from the beginning: stronger utilization, clearer workflows, better customer communication, more resilient revenue, and a guest experience that fits how people use golf facilities today.

Other industries have already learned this lesson.

Retail, hospitality, health care, banking, fitness, and entertainment have all gone through versions of the same shift: technology becomes useful only when it is connected to the customer journey, staff workflow, decision rights, data discipline, and the operating model underneath it. Deloitte's research on digital operating models, based on a benchmarking survey across eight sectors, emphasizes that transformation becomes durable when decisions are integrated into daily activity rather than treated as a one-time technology effort. (Source: Deloitte, *Digital Operating Models*)

That gives golf a blueprint.

Not a script to copy exactly, because golf has its own rhythms, relationships, land, labor, seasonality, and community role. But a blueprint for how to think.

The facilities that benefit most from this cycle will not be the ones that buy technology first and figure out the operating model later. They will be the ones that bring the right people into the conversation early: operators, staff, finance leaders, technology partners, builders, consultants, community stakeholders, and outside advisors who can help pressure-test the decision before capital is committed.

Golf does not need to guess its way through modernization.

There are lessons to borrow.

There are mistakes to avoid.

And there is a better way to build facilities that are easier to operate, easier to understand, and easier for people to come back to.

Technology can help make that possible.

But only when it has an operating model.

A Platform Is Not a Strategy

Technology usually enters the conversation with a promise.

More bookings. Better communication. Cleaner reporting. Easier scheduling. Smarter pricing. Stronger marketing. More efficient staff workflows. Better visibility into the customer.

Those are all valid goals.

But they are not automatic outcomes.

A facility can buy a strong tee-time platform and still have a weak booking strategy. It can add a CRM and still fail to follow up with new customers. It can install range technology and still leave the range disconnected from instruction, leagues, fittings, food and beverage, and guest retention. It can introduce dynamic pricing and still create customer confusion if the communication strategy is not clear.

The platform matters.

But the operating model matters more.

That is especially important now because the golf technology landscape is expanding quickly. Operators are looking at tee sheets, point-of-sale systems, online booking engines, CRM tools, range technology, simulator systems, AI booking agents, pace-of-play platforms, dynamic pricing tools, loyalty platforms, food-and-beverage ordering, league management, reporting dashboards, and integrated operating systems.

Some tools are built around the tee sheet. Some are built around revenue management. Some are built around communication. Some are built around on-course flow. Some are built around the indoor or off-course experience. Some, like Mully AI, are positioning AI around functions such as tee-time booking, dynamic pricing, pace management, and inventory optimization. (Source: Mully AI, *Platform*) Others, like Tagmarshal, focus on course optimization and pace management technology. (Source: Tagmarshal, *Golf Cart GPS - Pace of Play Golf Management Software*) Club Caddie describes its platform as a cloud suite for public, semi-private, private, resort, range, and simulator operations. (Source: Club Caddie, *Premier Golf Course Management Software*)

That range of options can be healthy for the industry. It can create better tools, better integrations, better pricing, and more ways for operators to solve real problems.

But more options also create more responsibility.

Before a facility chooses a system, it has to know what decision it is trying to improve.

Are we trying to improve tee-sheet utilization?

Are we trying to reduce no-shows?

Are we trying to capture more first-time guests?

Are we trying to convert league players into year-round customers?

Are we trying to understand which customer segments are most profitable?

Are we trying to simplify staff workflow?

Are we trying to make pricing more responsive to demand?

Are we trying to communicate more consistently before and after the visit?

Those questions should come before the platform demo.

Because if the goal is unclear, every platform starts to sound impressive. Dashboards look useful. Automation sounds efficient. Integrations feel modern. AI feels inevitable. But the real test is not whether the technology can do more.

The real test is whether it helps the facility do the right things better.

That is why technology decisions should not live only with one department or one champion. They should include the people who actually touch the operating model: ownership, management, golf operations, instruction, food and beverage, marketing, finance, maintenance, and front-line staff.

Each group sees a different part of the truth.

The pro shop sees booking friction.

The food and beverage team sees timing and service pressure.

The instructor sees unused practice demand.

The finance team sees margin and reporting gaps.

The superintendent sees traffic patterns and property stress.

The customer sees whether the whole experience feels simple or disconnected.

A platform cannot reconcile those perspectives unless the facility does the work first.

That work is not glamorous. It is mapping the customer journey. Clarifying who owns follow-up. Defining what gets measured. Setting pricing rules. Building staff workflows. Connecting programming to capacity. Deciding what success looks like before the tool goes live.

Golf does not need more technology for technology's sake.

It needs technology that is attached to a clear operating job.

The Bay Needs a Job Before It Needs a Budget

Simulators, indoor performance spaces, putting studios, and technology-enhanced practice areas are some of the clearest examples of why technology needs an operating model.

On paper, the appeal is obvious.

They can extend the season. They can create indoor revenue. They can support lessons, fittings, leagues, entertainment, corporate events, junior programming, member practice, and social golf. They can make a facility more useful when weather, daylight, or course conditions limit outdoor play.

And the technology itself has become highly capable.

Trackman's simulator and launch-monitor ecosystem combines indoor golf, virtual courses, performance software, and club-and-ball data that can support practice, coaching, fitting, entertainment, and commercial simulator use. (Source: Trackman, *Golf Simulator*) PuttView's indoor putting technology uses projection and ball tracking to help players visualize read, line, and speed directly on the putting surface. (Source: PuttView, *Indoor Features*) Toptracer Range uses range technology and game modes to create practice, skill-building, and entertainment experiences across ability levels. (Source: Toptracer, *Toptracer Range*) Foresight Sports positions its launch monitor technology around accurate data, detailed analysis, and immersive simulation for player improvement. (Source: Foresight Sports, *Launch Monitors*)

That is good for golf.

It means facilities have real options. They can build serious coaching environments, more engaging practice spaces, indoor league products, fitting studios, social entertainment experiences, corporate event offerings, junior-development pathways, and year-round customer touchpoints.

The opportunity is not limited.

That is exactly why the planning has to be disciplined.

This is the same discipline we have been building toward throughout this series. Demand does not make a strategy. Projects need sequence. Public value needs a story. Infrastructure protects revenue. Amenities have to earn their square footage. Technology belongs in that same conversation because it is not just a feature anymore. It is part of how the facility creates, captures, and protects value.

The bay needs a job before it needs a budget.

That job has to be defined clearly. Is the space primarily an instruction asset? A winter league engine? A fitting studio? A social entertainment area? A member practice benefit? A corporate event product? A feeder into outdoor golf? A retention tool? A way to introduce new golfers in a lower-pressure environment?

Those are not questions that undermine the technology.

They are questions that help the facility get more value from it.

Because each use case asks something different from the operation.

An instruction-first space needs scheduling discipline, instructor availability, lesson packaging, player-development pathways, and a clear connection between indoor feedback and outdoor improvement.

A league-first space needs a calendar, formats, standings, communication, food-and-beverage alignment, prize structure, and repeatable weekly rhythm.

A corporate-event space needs hospitality coordination, group pricing, service expectations, staffing plans, and a sales process.

A practice-first space needs access rules, booking windows, utilization tracking, member communication, and technology support.

A social-entertainment space needs atmosphere, pace, onboarding, games, food and beverage, and staff who can help guests feel comfortable quickly.

Same technology category.

Completely different operating model.

That is why the simulator conversation should not start and stop with the equipment quote. It should include the operating role, the programming plan, the customer journey, the staffing model, the pricing logic, and the facility's broader goals.

This is where utilization consultation and operational understanding matter. Not because outside advisors should replace the operator's knowledge, but because a good planning process helps connect strong technology to the right business case before capital gets committed.

The stronger the technology gets, the more important that planning becomes.

A high-performing simulator bay, putting studio, range system, or indoor training space can become more than a feature. It can become a coaching platform, a league product, a winter revenue channel, a fitting environment, a member engagement tool, a social experience, or a more complete player-development pathway.

That is the larger lesson for technology across the facility. Whether the tool is a simulator, CRM, booking engine, pricing platform, range system, putting studio, or AI-supported workflow, the same rule applies.

The technology may create the capability.

The operating model turns that capability into value.

Connected Operations

Technology becomes more valuable when it connects the parts of the facility that guests experience as one journey.

A guest does not think in departments.

They do not separate the tee sheet from the pro shop, the lesson program from the range, the simulator bay from food and beverage, or the event inquiry from the follow-up email. They experience the facility as one connected relationship.

That is why technology decisions should be evaluated across the full operating journey.

How does a customer discover the facility?

How do they book?

What happens before they arrive?

What does the staff know when they check in?

How are they guided toward the right experience?

How does the facility communicate after the visit?

How does the operation know whether that customer came back?

Those questions matter because modern golf facilities are no longer serving one simple customer path. A player may first engage through an online tee time, a junior clinic, a simulator league, a fitting, a corporate event, a range visit, a restaurant reservation, or a community program. Each entry point is different, but the facility still has to build a relationship from there.

That is where disconnected systems create friction.

The booking platform may know one part of the customer.

The point-of-sale system may know another.

The instructor may know another.

The event team may know another.

The marketing platform may know another.

The staff may know the most important context of all, but only because they remember it.

When those pieces do not connect, the facility loses visibility. It may still be busy, but it becomes harder to understand what is actually driving repeat use, what programming is working, where capacity is being wasted, and which customers are ready for a deeper relationship with the facility.

Connected operations are not about collecting data for its own sake.

They are about making the facility easier to run and easier to return to.

That can be simple. A beginner who attends a clinic should be invited into the next step of the player-development pathway. A simulator league participant should know about spring outdoor leagues or instruction opportunities. A corporate event guest should have a clear path back to outings, group lessons, or private events. A range user should understand what else the facility offers beyond a bucket of balls.

The technology should help make those connections easier.

But the facility has to decide what the connections should be.

This is where staff workflow matters as much as guest experience. A system that improves the customer journey but burdens the staff will eventually break down. A reporting tool that produces data nobody reviews will not improve decisions. A CRM that captures leads without ownership will become a

digital junk drawer. A pricing tool that is not connected to communication will create confusion instead of confidence.

It is also where bandwidth becomes part of the technology conversation.

Most facilities are not short on ideas. In many cases, each part of the operation already sees an opportunity. Golf operations may want a smoother booking experience. Instruction may want a better player-development pathway. Food and beverage may want stronger event coordination. Marketing may want cleaner customer communication. Finance may want better reporting. Ownership may want clearer utilization and return on capital.

Those are not bad ideas.

They are usually the right signals coming from people who understand their part of the facility.

The challenge is that those ideas often stay siloed. Each team is trying to improve its own area while the facility still needs all of those micro-initiatives to ladder up to one macro goal: a better operating facility.

That is hard to do while everyone is also running the day-to-day business.

That is where an outside source can make sense.

The key is alignment. Outside perspective is only useful when it is grounded in the facility's actual goals, constraints, people, and operating reality. The right partner should make the decision clearer, not louder. They should help connect the micro-initiatives to the macro goal, not simply introduce another product, preference, or promise into the conversation.

Not as a replacement for the operator's judgment. Not as someone coming in with a one-size-fits-all answer. The value is in helping the facility create enough structure for those internal ideas to come together: ownership, management, staff, vendors, and stakeholders working toward the same common goal.

The right outside perspective should help organize the conversation. It should clarify priorities, reduce blind spots, translate between technology and operations, and keep the decision tied to utilization, staffing, guest experience, and long-term value.

The goal is not to make the operation more complicated.

The goal is to make the operation more coherent.

A strong technology model should help the facility see demand more clearly, communicate more consistently, manage capacity more intelligently, and turn more first-time or occasional users into repeat customers. It should give leadership better visibility without asking staff to carry unnecessary complexity. It should support the way the facility actually works while also helping the facility work better.

That is the difference between adding tools and building an operating system.

Tools solve tasks.

An operating model connects decisions.

And in this next phase of golf reinvestment, that connection is where a lot of the value will be created.

Data Is Only Useful If It Improves a Decision

Data has become one of the most common promises in golf technology.

More reporting.

More dashboards.

More customer information.

More performance tracking.

More visibility into what is happening across the facility.

That can be valuable. But data alone does not create discipline. In some cases, it creates more noise.

The better question is not, “Can we collect more information?”

The better question is, “What decision are we trying to improve?”

That question should sit at the center of the technology conversation.

If the decision is pricing, the facility needs data that helps it understand demand patterns, booking windows, utilization by time of day, weather sensitivity, customer behavior, and perceived value.

If the decision is programming, the facility needs data that helps it understand participation, repeat attendance, conversion from one program to the next, staffing requirements, and the relationship between programming and revenue.

If the decision is staffing, the facility needs visibility into service patterns, peak pressure points, event load, simulator bookings, food-and-beverage timing, and where workflow breaks down.

If the decision is capital planning, the facility needs to understand which parts of the property are creating use, which spaces are underperforming, and where investment would actually improve the operating model.

If the decision is retention, the facility needs to know who is coming back, who is fading away, what brought them in, and what next step would make sense.

That is the difference between data collection and decision support.

A dashboard can show activity.

An operating model determines what that activity means.

This is where technology has to be tied to management rhythm. Who reviews the data? How often? What action can be taken from it? What decisions does it inform? What does the staff need to know? What does leadership need to see? What should be ignored because it looks interesting but does not change the work?

Without that rhythm, reporting becomes performative. It may look sophisticated, but it does not improve the facility.

With the right rhythm, data can become one of the strongest tools in the business.

It can help a facility see where demand is real and where it is assumed. It can help clarify whether a program is building repeat engagement or just filling a calendar. It can show whether a technology investment is expanding utilization or simply shifting existing users into a new channel. It can help leadership make capital decisions with more confidence and less guesswork.

That matters because the next phase of reinvestment is going to require sharper choices.

This is where sequencing comes back into the conversation. Data should not just help a facility decide whether an idea is good. It should help the facility understand when that idea should happen, what has to be ready first, and whether the operation can absorb the change. A strong project can still create strain if the staffing model, customer journey, communication plan, or infrastructure is not ready for it.

Not every project will be equally valuable.

Not every amenity will earn its square footage.

Not every technology will fit the facility.

Not every idea should move at the same time.

Data should help create that discipline.

But only if the facility knows what it is trying to decide.

The best operators will not use technology to admire their own dashboards. They will use it to make better calls: what to build, what to fix, what to program, what to price, what to measure, what to stop doing, and where to put the next dollar.

Data is only useful if it improves a decision.

And in a smarter reinvestment cycle, better decisions are the whole point.

The Discipline Test

The technology conversation should eventually come back to a few practical questions.

Not because facilities need to slow everything down.

Because they need to know what they are actually building toward.

What operating problem are we trying to solve?

What customer behavior are we trying to improve?

What staff workflow are we trying to make easier?

What revenue opportunity are we trying to unlock?

What data do we need to make better decisions?

What has to be true operationally for this investment to work?

Those questions help separate useful technology from attractive technology.

Useful technology has a role. It fits the facility's strategy. It supports the staff. It improves the customer journey. It creates visibility leadership can act on. It connects to programming, pricing, capacity, communication, and retention.

Attractive technology may still be impressive. It may demo well. It may look good in a board packet. It may feel like the right signal to send to the market.

But if the operating role is unclear, the investment is exposed.

That does not mean every technology decision has to be overcomplicated. Some decisions are straightforward. Some tools solve obvious problems. Some upgrades are overdue. Some systems need to be replaced because the old way is clearly holding the facility back.

But even then, the discipline matters.

Other industries have already felt the cost of poorly connected work. Asana's Anatomy of Work Index found that knowledge workers spend 60% of their time on "work about work": chasing updates, switching between tools, sitting in unnecessary meetings, and coordinating work rather than doing the skilled work they were hired to do. (Source: Asana, *Anatomy of Work Index*)

Golf facilities should pay attention to that warning.

A disconnected technology stack can create its own version of the same drag: more manual follow-up, more duplicate entry, more staff confusion, more reporting without action, and more time spent reconciling systems instead of serving guests.

The strongest technology plans are usually not the ones with the most tools.

They are the ones with the clearest operating logic.

This is where the facility has to decide what kind of modernization it is pursuing.

Is the goal to look more current?

Or is the goal to operate with more clarity?

Is the goal to add features?

Or is the goal to improve utilization?

Is the goal to collect more data?

Or is the goal to make better decisions?

Is the goal to follow what other facilities are doing?

Or is the goal to build the right model for this facility, this market, this staff, this customer base, and this capital plan?

That distinction matters because technology can create momentum quickly. Once a facility starts evaluating platforms, vendors, integrations, dashboards, hardware, software, and implementation timelines, the conversation can become technical fast.

But the most important questions are still operational.

Who owns the outcome?

Who uses the system?

Who trains the staff?

Who communicates the change to customers?

Who reviews the data?

Who adjusts the programming?

Who decides whether the investment is working?

If nobody owns those answers, the facility may have bought a tool without building the operating model around it.

That is the discipline test.

Technology should make the facility more useful, not just more complicated. It should help staff do their jobs better, not force them to carry another disconnected process. It should help leadership see the business more clearly, not bury the team in reports that never become action.

Golf does not need to become another industry.

But it can learn from industries that have already gone through this shift.

The lesson is simple: the technology is only as strong as the operating system around it.

And in golf's reinvestment era, that operating system has to be intentional.

Golf's Reinvestment Era Is About Facilities That Work Better

Technology brings us back to the larger point of this series.

Golf's reinvestment era is not about chasing every trend, adding every amenity, or buying every new tool that enters the market.

It is about building facilities that work better.

That means demand has to become strategy.

Projects have to be sequenced.

Public value has to be explained.

Infrastructure has to be protected.

Amenities have to earn their square footage.

Technology has to support an operating model.

Each of those ideas points to the same conclusion: reinvestment is not just a capital exercise. It is an operating decision.

A new building can improve the property, but only if the facility knows how that space will be used.

A new irrigation system can protect the course, but only if leadership understands what reliability means to revenue, labor, water, and guest experience.

A new amenity can broaden the facility's role, but only if it creates repeat use and fits the staffing model.

A new technology platform can create visibility, but only if the operation knows what decisions that visibility is supposed to improve.

That is why this moment matters.

Golf has strong participation, cultural momentum, and renewed investment attention. But the facilities that benefit most will not be the ones that simply move first. They will be the ones that move with clarity.

Clarity about the market they serve.

Clarity about the customer they want to retain.

Clarity about the staff experience they need to protect.

Clarity about the infrastructure risk they cannot ignore.

Clarity about the capital decisions that should happen now, later, or not at all.

Clarity about what the facility is supposed to become easier to do.

That is the standard we believe this next phase of modernization requires.

Not more for the sake of more.

Better for the sake of the operation.

Because the real measure of reinvestment is not whether the project photographs well when it opens. It is whether the facility becomes more useful after the excitement fades.

More useful to the golfer who wants a better practice path.

More useful to the family looking for a place to spend time.

More useful to the league player who wants consistency.

More useful to the beginner who needs a lower-friction entry point.

More useful to the municipality trying to explain public value.

More useful to the operator trying to manage labor, capacity, pricing, programming, and capital.

More useful to the community that needs the property to remain relevant, accessible, and financially resilient.

That is the opportunity in front of golf.

A smarter reinvestment cycle.

One that respects the relationship people have with these places, while also recognizing that nostalgia alone will not fund the future.

Technology is part of that future. So are amenities, irrigation, public storytelling, sequencing, and demand strategy. But none of them should stand alone.

They work best when they are connected.

That is where the next generation of stronger golf facilities will be built: at the intersection of strategy, development, and operations.

As we close this series, our point of view is simple.

Golf does not need to become something else.

It needs to become a clearer, more resilient, more useful version of what it already can be.

That matters because golf's history is not a weakness to work around. It is one of the game's greatest strengths. The architecture, traditions, relationships, competitions, rituals, landscapes, and memories attached to golf facilities are exactly why these places matter so much to the people who defend them.

But respecting that history cannot mean refusing to prepare for the future.

The most loyal stewards of the game should not see reinvestment, technology, amenities, infrastructure, and operational change as threats to golf's identity. Done well, they are tools that help protect it. They can make the game easier to access, easier to learn, easier to enjoy, and easier to sustain. They can help facilities serve today's loyal golfers while also creating a better path for juniors, families, beginners, communities, and the next generation of players who will carry the game forward.

That is the real responsibility of this reinvestment era.

Not to replace what made golf meaningful.

To strengthen it.

To make sure the facilities that hold the game's history are also capable of supporting its future.

And that work is only beginning.

In the coming months, we will keep using this lens as we work through the next phase of golf reinvestment with courses, clubs, municipalities, operators, developers, and decision-makers.

Not as a pulpit.

As a working perspective.

One that we expect to sharpen as we listen more, learn more, see more facilities, and understand more of the real constraints leaders are managing every day. The best ideas in golf do not come from standing outside the operation and declaring what should happen. They come from getting closer to the work, respecting the people already carrying it, and helping connect good ideas to practical execution.

That is what we hope this series has done.

And that is what we plan to keep doing.

— Tech2Turf Owners: Adam, Matt, and Matt

Source List

smbGOLF, *2025 Spring Tee Sheet & Booking Engine Market Share Report*

Used for tee-sheet and booking-engine technology adoption context across more than 17,500 North American golf courses.

<https://web.smbgolf.com/spring-2025-market-share-report-tee-sheets-and-booking-engines>

Deloitte, *Digital Operating Models*

Used for the broader operating-model point that digital transformation becomes more durable when decisions are integrated into daily activity rather than treated as a one-time technology effort.

<https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/business-strategy-growth/digital-operating-models.html>

Mully AI, *Platform*

Used as an example of golf-specific AI technology positioned around tee-time booking, dynamic pricing, pace management, and inventory optimization.

<https://www.mully.ai/>

Tagmarshal, *Golf Cart GPS - Pace of Play Golf Management Software*

Used as an example of technology focused on course optimization and pace management.

<https://www.tagmarshal.com/>

Club Caddie, *Premier Golf Course Management Software*

Used as an example of a cloud-based golf course management platform serving multiple facility types.

<https://clubcaddie.com/>

Trackman, *Golf Simulator*

Used for simulator and launch-monitor technology context, including indoor golf, virtual courses, and launch-monitor data.

<https://www.trackman.com/golf/simulator>

PuttView, *Indoor Features*

Used for indoor putting technology context, including projection, ball tracking, and visualization of read, line, and speed.

<https://www.puttview.com/products/indoor/p7/>

Toptracer, *Toptracer Range*

Used for range technology context, including game modes for practice, skill-building, and entertainment across ability levels.

<https://toptracer.com/range/>

Foresight Sports, *Launch Monitors*

Used for launch-monitor context, including accurate data, detailed analysis, and immersive simulation for player improvement.

<https://www.foresightsports.com/collections/gc-launch-monitors>

Asana, *Anatomy of Work Index*

Used for the operational-drag point that knowledge workers spend 60% of their time on “work about work,” including chasing updates, switching tools, attending unnecessary meetings, and coordinating work.

<https://asana.com/resources/why-work-about-work-is-bad>