Historical Price Evolvement - 2027

┌> mark up #4 >┐

Year	Inflation	Triple Skill Audit	Training	Total, *excl.*:	TOTAL 2026, *including:*
V3 01oct26	NL %/year	= pricing previous year +inflation previous year ! #5 #8	per participant in **group** training for 6 particip. of 5 dayparts with 1 role player **GROUP-TRAINING** #2	• video, location, catering. • half amount of needed raters #3	video, 5x location, 5x catering, 5 raters • **LEFT:** total • **MIDDLE:** quick payment rebate (QPR) from deposit invoice deducted. • **RIGHT :** QPR *also* from final invoice. **INDIVIDUAL TRAINING** ! #4
2001	4,50	*IN NLG* : 3.980 *#1*	n/a	n/a	
2002	3,29	1.895	2.995		
2003	2,11	1.957 (= 1.895 x 1,0329)	3.093		
2004	1,24	1.998	3.158		
2005	1,67	2.023	3.197		
2006	1,17	2.057	3.251		
2007	1,61	2.081	3.289		
2008	2,49	2.114	3.342		
2009	1,19	2.167	3.425		
2010	1,28	2.193	3.466		
2011	2,34	2.221	3.510		
2012	2,47	2.273	3.592		
2013	2,53	2.329	3.681		
2014	0,98	2.388	3.774		
2015	0,64	2.411	3.811		
2016	0,32	2.427	3.836		
2017	1,39	2.435	3.848		
2018	2,10	2.468	3.901		
2019	2,60	2.520	3.983		
2020	1,30	2.586	4.087		
2021	2,70	2.619	4.140		
2022	10,03	2.690	4.252		
2023	3,90	2.960	4.678		
2024	3,33	3.075	4.861		
2025	3,30	3.178	5.023		
2026	?? #9	3.283	5.189		
2027		**3.398**	**5.370**	**8768** #9	**9.920 – 9.620 – 9.320** #8 #9

Notes with: Historical Price Evolvement

#1

Why do we even have historical pricing data? It is a coincidence.

Old invoices were archived as proof for scientific research (a PhD-project).

• Fiscally, invoices have to be archived seven years. We were behind with archive deletion around 2010, but then the biggest Dutch scientific fraud came to light. It is the Diederik Stapel affair (see here in wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diederik_Stapel). Central in this fraud was making up data, without actually observing "subjects". The fraude began at the faculty in Groningen where Gert Keen's pdh was to be defended.

• Out of intuition, we didn't delete the invoices, and kept them on paper, and scanned them too. Why? Because one could expect that after this fraud, all phd-candidates would be invited to provide proof that they had veritably observed "subjects". Side effect: we can still trace back our pricing untill 01jan2002, the date of the EURO-conversion. Without the fraud, we would have deleted the invoices.

#2

Compare group training *with* 1-to-1-training → compare "net individual practice time"

1-to-1-training offers four times more net practice with a roleplayer. And: offers discretion.

• The group training from the pricing table offers 5 x 3 = 15 hours training time with role player, for six participants, which comes down to 2,5 hours per participant.

• The 1-to-1-training offers 3 x 4 hours = 12 hours net individual practice time. That is nearly five times as much, but rounded down we'd rather say it is four times as much.

• And **what about learning-by-observation**? In individual training there are obviously no fellow participants one can observe while they practise. Practising in 1-to-1-training is far more effective, but for those who still want to learn by observing: be reassured, the skill audit is recorded. Moreover, on every day part we make a recording of a crucial aspect in the participant's social style that needs to be improved, and also of some suggested alternatives he/she tries out with the roleplayer under direction of the trainer. These alternatives have to be trained-till-routine in the next daypart. participants can observe the recordings between dayparts, in order to acquire the procedural knowledge that is later needed to train performance.

• **Practice per hour in money** #:

• classical group training: 5.189/2,5 = **EUR 2.075 per hour individual practice***

• SociaL•Talent training in 2025: 5.189/12 = **EUR 432 per hour individual practice ****

*: still without location, catering, video | **: with location, with catering, and with video | #: all amounts corrected for inflation till 2025

#3 #4

In earlier days, the client organisation booked locations themselves and did half of the rater's work.

In order to include these rater and location costs, we marked up the historical totals.

• In order to get a general idea of "the quality of participants", half of the raters in the skill audit were from SAP-M (the precursor of SociaL•Talent), and half of them were trained raters from the commissioning organisation. In terms of psychometrical quality, these two types of raters appeared to be equal (#3).

• Most clients were big corporations, that negotiated special rates with congress and meeting venues. The clients themselves therefore booked venues, because this was more advantageous (#3).

• The mark-up (#4) between the historical and the actual total comprises these raters and location/catering.

#5

The original skill audit from 1996 is back in a new form. Why?

For two main resaons:

1/ the acceptance is higher,

2/ despite contract, organisations want to view reports, so we'd better make a reliable and valid one.

• We intially shortened the classical skill audit to two simulations with one rater: one audit at the start, and one audit at the end of the training. The two got integrated in an individual training. This integration has an advantage: participants don't have to travel an extra day to do the skill audit in a central place where three roleplayers, six raters, and some fellow participants are present. In this central place raters and roleplayer rotate across participants, in order to make them benefit from multiple rater and multiple simulation reliability.

• We then did some comparison pilots, and it appeared that participants had far more confidence in the classical '*triple-simulation-double-rater'* skill audit because it has multiple simulations, and multiple raters. Multiple raters appeared the most important for participant's trust.
• Furthermore, participants in the pilot preferred one triple-simulation-double-rater skill audit at the start, over a repeated (= one at the start, and one at the end) *'double-simulation-single-rater'* skill audit.
• Finally, we observed that commissioning organisations want to view the skill audit reports quite often, despite the fact that they signed for the participant's confidentiality. We never send reports to the organisation, but we cannot see what happens after the training is completed. When it is known that reports might be used by the organisation, we'd better make sure then, that these reports have the same reliability and validity as the classical skill audit that was used in high stake personnel selection.
• **For all the reasons above we reintegrated the classical skill audit.** We however updated the lay out the classical skill audit to make it more cost efficient and more tailored to developmental need diagnosis, see #8.

#6

Quick payment rebate on the deposit invoice: most organisations need it to make a quick start possible.
We unfortunately cannot begin to staff training without a received deposit amount.
• Once the momentum for training is there, all stakeholders should benefit from that, and not postpone a start. So, we used to begin staffing and booking locations right after a signed contract. Too often though training was cancelled, while staff and locations were already booked. We therefore now demand that the 50% or 75% deposit is received before we staff. (The 50% rate is for clients that have booked over five participants.)
• As an incentive for quick payment we offer a rebate of 6%, that we deduct as a rounded, fix amount. We publish that amount every year in our pricing list. Our experience is that the majority of organisations really need this incentive to get the money out in time an enable a quick start.

#7

Quick payment rebate on the final invoice : we offer it as a courtesy if the deposit was received in time.
there is no real need for quick payment with the final invoice, because it is sent after the training is *entirely* accomplished.
• *All* extras that a participant or the decider book are listed in the final invoice.

#8

We updated the triple-simulations-double-rater skill audit ("the classical one" since 1996). We:
1 • skipped the written report, and saved rater's time, which makes rotation over participants more efficient
2 • increased roleplayer's elicitations, which is more tailored to developmental need diagnosis
3 • focussed on the "chain of incluence" that most urgently needs strengthening: it offers quick prioritisation
4 • also integrated the other main finding of our longitudinal research: consistency

• Before we did our longitudinal research, we did not even know about the chains of influence, and that *all* people have four of these chains in their social style. Let alone that the main reason for disfunctioning in work is either one single, across all audit simulations *low scoring* chain, or one single *inconsistent scoring* one even in the positive realm of a rating scale. Inconsistency is so to speak an new developmental need.
• These longitudinal findings enable quick focus in development: identify the weak or the inconsistent chain, and start the training there.
• The younger generation of trainers/raters has less culture and training in writing, so the reporting time we gave them in the past appeared insufficient. A report generator as alternative was perceived as unpersonal. So, we skipped the written report.
• In stead, we now offer ample, immediate feedback by the trainer that is going to conduct the training later: the chain of influence in most urgent developmental need is discussed by this trainer right after the audit, and a train plan is made on the spot. This saves time during the training dayparts, time we use for extra practicing.

.**#9**

We made an estimation or 3,5% inflation for 2026 (due to climate change) as of 01oct26.