

Exit and Organization Studies

Escaping an Epistemic Trap

by

Eric Fassbender

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science

Approved April 2023 by the  
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Robert Kirsch, Chair  
Marie Wallace  
David Corlett

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2023

## ABSTRACT

In spite of the volume of theoretical attention paid to concepts of leadership, there has been little work investigating how assumptions included in concepts of organization have influenced work in the organizational leadership field. Specifically, the concept of exit from organizations, and individual post-exit relations with former groups, in particular, has seen little theory or empirical investigation. This article employs a critical literature review to show that assumptions inherent in concepts of organization, such as prioritizing efficiency and profit production, preclude organizational leadership theories from expanding upon concepts of exit. These assumptions begin with the Weberian concepts of Bureaucracy and continue today in studies of market exit and employee turnover. This review shows that these assumptions have restricted organizational studies research from expanding into additional fields and organizational types, such as religious, separatist, and political organizations. Additionally, this review points towards fruitful new areas of research, through an analysis of New Religious Movements as they apply to organizational leadership studies, and the development of an improved survey for measuring turnover in organizations.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project has been as efficient and painless as large projects like this can possibly be, thanks entirely to the hard work and dedication of the staff of the Organizational Leadership program at ASU. I thank Robert Kirsch for his excitement about this project from the beginning, and for the time dedicated to weekly meetings throughout a good portion of the last year. This project, and myself as an academic, have benefited immensely from his constant feedback, and willingness to entertain lofty additions and extensions to the paper. Additionally, I would like to thank Marie Wallace, who has also guided this project from its inception, pointing to fruitful areas of exploration to flesh out and refine my arguments. In this work I find myself indebted to many of the staff at the OGL program; Denise Bates, without whom I would have never started this journey and who has always encouraged my development in all facets of life, David Corlett who stepped in to help me complete the project, and Mai Trinh whose suggestions led to the title of the paper.

I would also like to thank my parents, Ray and Nancy Fassbender, who helped me stay focused on this project throughout the major life changes occurring during its duration, and the Metropolitan Library System and its employees, who have provided me with the resources necessary to write this paper. No paper is written in a vacuum, and I give thanks to all of the members of my local and school communities that have helped me develop and document this thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	7
2.0.1 Exit and Autonomy .....	8
2.0.2 Weber and Bureaucracy .....	10
2.0.3 Ontological Preferences of Organizational Leadership Studies	17
2.0.4 New Religious Movements and Organizational Development	20
2.1 Conclusion .....	22
3 METHODOLOGY .....	24
3.0.1 Literature Review .....	24
3.0.2 Critical Discourse Analysis .....	26
3.1 Power Structures .....	28
4 EXIT, VOICE AND LOYALTY .....	32
5 BUREAUCRACY AND EXIT .....	37
6 TURNOVER INTENTION AND EXIT .....	41
7 FUTURE APPLICATIONS .....	47
7.1 Politics, Sociology, and Exit .....	48
7.2 Scientology and Exit .....	50
7.2.1 New Religious Movements (NRM) and Organizational Con-	
straints .....	52
7.2.2 The History of Scientology through an Organizational Lens .	54
7.2.3 Schisms and Scientology .....	57
7.3 Discursive Strategies in the Dror Center Schism .....	61
7.3.0.1 Dietics .....	63

CHAPTER	Page
7.3.0.2 Perspectivization .....	64
7.3.0.3 Argumentation .....	65
7.3.1 Discourse and NRMs .....	68
7.4 Organizational Surveys and Exit .....	71
8 CONCLUSION .....	77
REFERENCES .....	81

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

Beginning in 2020, the United States entered what has been called “The Great Resignation”, where the rate of workers resigning reached a 20-year high. Although these numbers may be in line with a consistently upward trend of workplace departures, the factors driving workplace exit are beginning to change (Fuller and Kerr 2022). A large number of workers fleeing their current occupations cite feelings of disrespect and perceptions of a lack of opportunity as reasons for their departure (Parker and Menasce Horowitz 2022). In addition to the growing number of workers leaving, sentiments around the nature of work are beginning to change. Movements to fundamentally change the relationship between work and the worker are gaining popularity. These groups seek to help workers to organize against their workplaces, to secure better working conditions, and a greater work-life balance (O’Connor 2022). These organizations serve as venues for people to share their personal stories of workplace grievances and violations that led to their decision to leave a dysfunctional organization.

Additionally, public support for changing workplace conditions is driving up popular support for labor unions, with union applications and positive perceptions of unionization both showing sharp increases in recent years (DiNatale and West 2022; “Labor Unions,” n.d.). Even in non-union jobs, many feel that they need to distance themselves from their work and reassess the role that it plays in their lives,

choosing to “quiet quit”<sup>1</sup> their jobs by minimizing their workload while maintaining their position (Ellis and Yang 2022). These trends pose a significant problem to organizational leadership studies; although the field has studied at length ways to retain current members and leadership approaches to improving member experience, there has been little theoretical attention paid to the social and political motivations behind an individual’s decision to leave a group. Even less work exists on individuals’ post-exit relations with their former group.

The variety of exit options that an individual holds poses challenges to operational assumptions surrounding organization. While the field has dealt extensively with turnover, where an individual leaves to seek employment at another company, there are many people who do not follow this pattern. Individuals may choose the path of a performative exit or noisy exit, where they emphasize the act of quitting an organization to inspire others to consider their reasons for doing so. Additionally, there are resistant exits where an individual leaves a group to gain leverage to contest their former organization. In this case, dissenters seek to gain greater autonomy by applying external, rather than internal, pressure on organizational leaders. By engaging with the post-exit situations of these individuals, researchers gain a clearer understanding of individual connections to their organizations as well as the variety of options they hold to lobby for change. As popular sentiment toward organizations changes, organizational leadership studies as a field will be required to expand the boundary of study, fully examining the individual, group, social, and political motivations surrounding the decision to leave a group.

This divide in organizational research is reinforced by current conceptualization

---

<sup>1</sup>While this term has become controversial, it shares a past with “work to rule” protests in organization

around organization within the field. Organization is a concept that is often used without definition, even in studies where it is the main concept under investigation (Beer and Eisenstat 1996; Brass 1984; DeGroot, Kiker, and Cross 2009). While the word itself is used to describe any structured grouping of people, organizational leadership studies as a field tends to rely on profit-generating groups, such as businesses and firms, as the default meaning of organization. In addition, organization can be confused with other concepts, such as structure and hierarchy (Waterman, Peters, and Phillips 1980). Increasingly in leadership and organizational leadership studies, the use of organization in theory is conflated with profit-oriented groups. Without reflective examination, the phrase organization can carry with it its own set of moral and social preferences (Bittner 1965). Researchers begin to impose their ideals of what organizations ought to be while seeming only to describe how they are. Thus, when the concept of organization is conflated with the ideals of profit-generating organizations, the “ideal organization” that researchers strive towards favors efficiency and diminishes the importance of social and administrative factors that do not lend themselves towards achieving stated goals. Since organizational research offers actionable and prescriptive results for business leaders, experts in this field are reinforcing and instilling these values in organizations under the guise of studying organizational foundations. For a field that strives to have a positive impact on the organizations that it engages with, it is necessary to understand the implications behind assumptions held in concepts of organization

Echoing the same call that has been voiced over concepts surrounding the term leadership, organization can no longer be used as a catch-all term, which captures the ideals and biases of the researcher. Rather, self-reflection is required to fully test assumptions on the concept of organization that find their way into leadership and



organizational studies research (Alvesson and Spicer 2012; Wilson 2016; Andersen 2014; Kelly 2008). These assumptions pervade many levels of research, from the selection of research topics to the guidance of research outcomes. Of interest to this paper are the ways these assumptions restrict study to certain organizational actions, organizational structures, and the impacts this restriction has on the study of concepts such as organizational exit.

Investigation into organizational types is not a new concept for leadership and organizational studies researchers; rather the creation of the field is often credited to the works of Max Weber, whose influential work examining the implications of bureaucracy, a specific organizational type, sparked a continued debate on the relationship between organizational structures and lived member experiences (Lounsbury and Carberry 2005; Mills, Weatherbee, and Durepos 2014). Some authors contend that the study of organizational types is no longer fruitful, as Weberian bureaucracy has won out over all other forms of organization; this claim leads to a change in research priority, where variation within bureaucratic organizations becomes the primary topic of study (Lumby 2019; Solomon 2004). However, this view is critiqued as both being centered on western organizations, and feeding into the dominance of current organizational leaders (Rothstein 2015; Acker 1990). From another perspective, as organizational types change due to emerging technology and a shifting economy, the bureaucratic framework may be unable to adapt to changing organizational incentives (Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey 2007).

These debates, however, largely critique the adoption or abandonment of certain organizational types from within the current paradigm of research. While researchers argue the applicability of bureaucracy or any other organizational type, there is widespread agreement as to the boundaries of study. Debates center around current

economic trends and dominant industrial organizational types. Research continues to prioritize the organizational type that is the most effective at attaining its stated goal. The field at large remains interested in questions of efficiency, upholding the achievement of organizational goals as the dominant phenomenon of interest (Bittner 1965). This focus has created unnecessary boundaries on organizational types and dynamics, preventing research into concepts such as organizational fracturing, exit, and organizational decline and death. Rather than viewing these phenomena as the rich structural and social processes that they are, they are often given little acknowledgment, dismissed as problems to solve.

This paper starts a discussion on the impact that assumptions within organizational setting selection have for the organizational leadership studies field. The purpose of this exploratory study is to examine the limitations to organizational studies research that stem from an epistemic preference towards studying businesses and business outcomes and imposing an implicit value towards the achievement of stated organizational goals. First, an examination of the organizational settings and contexts utilized by organizational and leadership scholars is necessary to demonstrate the lack of variety in research published in relevant journals concerning the concept of exit. Through a sample of research in top organizational studies journals, two main theoretical traditions are identified: market exit and employee turnover. Then, a critical lens will be used to examine the connections between academic discourse on organizational types and research outcomes in the organizational leadership field. First, the concept of exit will be analyzed as it has been used in the organizational literature today. Following this will be a discussion of the bureaucratic type, which highlights the importance of acknowledging the emancipatory aspects of exit as a concept. Finally, perspectives from sociology and political science will be introduced,

to provide direction to incorporate knowledge from other fields to expand current research directions in organizational leadership.

The aim of the paper is to show that fruitful areas of research into leadership and organizational dynamics, such as organizational fracturing and failure, cannot be explored under the current paradigm of improving efficiency in obtaining organizational outcomes. Additionally, it aims to demonstrate that the study of exit not only enriches the study of organizational leadership but can serve as a step toward empowering new voices in the discipline.

## Chapter 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

There have been many calls for organizational leadership to take a self-reflective turn, and to truly flesh out concepts that have been used without prior consensus (Alvesson and Spicer 2012; Kelly 2008; Learmonth and Morrell 2017). While this effort has been focused on concepts of leadership, concepts of organization are equally worthy of investigation from a critical perspective. Inherent in this method of investigation is an explicit consideration of the power dynamics within and surrounding any topic of study. One understudied method of altering power relations within a group is to exit. When an individual leaves a group in protest, they have the option to publicize their departure to highlight their grievances and to take action against their former group in ways unavailable to them from within (Kirkpatrick 2016). Exit as conceptualized in this study is connected to expressions of power and protest within organizations. Exit gives an individual autonomy and influence that they could not obtain in their current role in an organization. Following a discussion of exit, this review will continue with an analysis of debates over structure in the organizational leadership field with respect to their effect on individual freedoms and mechanisms for change, followed by an analysis of the ontological and epistemic issues posed by a simple view of exit. Included in this discussion is a problem concerning organizational settings in research. Out of assumptions regarding the structure of organizations comes a preference for studying profit-generating organizations. It is this preference that has guided research on exit to its current form in organizational studies leadership.

### 2.0.1 Exit and Autonomy

Some may view exit as simply a personal decision to leave a group, however, it is a phenomenon that can emerge in a variety of ways, depending on changing organizational dynamics (Bromley 2021; Coates 2013; Richardson 2021). While complete exits, where an individual severs all ties within an organization, may be common for certain organizational settings, often an individual will often retain financial, social, or influential ties to a group they have disaffiliated with (Lewis and Steinmo 2012). Previously, studies on exit focused on the ways that exit can be damaging to organizational goals, but little research from an organizational leadership standpoint investigates the changing group dynamics that surround exit (Davenport 2015).

Exit is a concept that proves problematic for studies based on an ontological preference toward improving efficient organizations. One of the main tasks for an organization from a bureaucratic standpoint is to limit personal expressions, and elevate the importance of roles rather than individuals (Strong 2012). However, exit is at its core an expression of personal autonomy (Kirkpatrick 2017). The very act of exit itself can give an individual influence over organizational dynamics, giving them a voice that they lacked if they retained their previous role in the organization. This perceived lack of voice can be one of the main drivers for individuals to leave organizations (Sani and Reicher 2000). Organizational changes, mixed with the notion that new ideas will not be considered, can be one of the main drivers for individuals or large groups of members to disaffiliate with an organization (Sani and Todman 2002).

Exit is seen as a way to regain that lost power within an organization. If viewed from a standpoint that prioritizes efficiency, organizations with a high turnover of

members may be seen merely as immature or lacking internal cohesion (Barker 2012). However, studies that focus on organizational development need not fixate only on the achievement of organizational goals when assessing organizations. Study of the experiences of individuals within organizations, the importance of the organization to the development of the self, and changes in organizational identity are some of the variety of perspectives that can shed light on organizational dynamics without necessarily prioritizing the stated goal of the group (Sani and Reicher 2000; Sani and Todman 2002; Coates 2013). Indeed, when it comes to examining exit, a group view becomes necessary, as decisions to exit rarely occur in isolation.

The decision to leave an organization is not often an unconsidered decision of an individual. Separation is the outcome of a complex organizational process. Previously it was believed that the mere existence of conflict could be enough to induce exit; however, conflict exists at some level in all organizations (Contu 2019). All extant organizations have developed, at some level, a method of dealing with deliberation and enticing their members to contribute to the group (Olson 1965). Exits, and schisms in particular, occur when the normal process for reconciling arguments breaks down, and one side feels that the group has changed and that their voice will no longer be heard when considering further changes (Sani and Reicher 2000; Sani and Todman 2002). Thus, failing to investigate this process as a significant change in organizational composure and operation is to ignore a fundamental change in an organization. Additionally, research that seeks to restrict the mechanisms that lead to exit in the name of increasing measures of efficiency may be doing themselves a disservice by curtailing the voice of group members and allowing organizational issues to continue.

A focus on exit allows for increased interdisciplinary research into areas that have

had little theoretical attention under organizational leadership studies. Exit has been a topic of study from political, sociological, economic, and religious perspectives. These diverse intellectual traditions have begun to explore leadership in organizations as it relates to exit through the lenses of interpersonal socialization and changing group circumstances (Bromley 2021; Coates 2013). These works have made their own advances in parallel with organizational leadership studies, eschewing a focus on individual traits for a more complex view of the distribution of power throughout organizations; however, with an increased focus on exit, or disaffiliation (Richardson 2021). While other fields may take different approaches to organizational structure, organizational leadership studies have predominately focused on bureaucracy. In the next section, the historical traditions surrounding structure will be connected to current paradigms on the study of exit.

## 2.0.2 Weber and Bureaucracy

Max Weber is one of the most influential thinkers in the study of organization. Weber's work sparked an ever-increasing discussion on the nature of organizational structure's relation to group outcomes. Specifically, Weber spoke of bureaucratic organizations as highly efficient in achieving organizational goals. In an ideal type bureaucracy, individuals take on certain roles within the organization, and their actions are guided by rules developed rationally by technical experts within the organization (Bittner 1965). While Weber himself was fearful of this form of bureaucracy, for its tendency to diminish personal autonomy and undermine the democratic nature of institutions, he did recognize them as highly efficient organizational structures. Lately, contrasting opinions as to the applicability of Weber's ideal type bureaucracy

to modern organizational study are surfacing. Lounsbury and Carberry (2005) argue that although Weber was an “omnipresent guiding force” for the development of organizational studies, diminishing citation patterns indicate that the influence of Weber’s works is waning in modern organizational study. The authors, however, contend that analytical frameworks such as bureaucracy and the power relations found within are still highly applicable to current study, and thus they stress a return to these founding concepts. Jacky Lumby gives a slightly different perspective; they contend that bureaucracy has evolved significantly since Weber’s time and that although bureaucracy is still an important issue to engage with the criticisms of the organizational type based on Weber’s depictions no longer apply (Lumby 2019). Rather, since bureaucracies have become ingrained in society it is more fruitful to engage with variations within a complex organizational type, rather than eschew the study of bureaucracy in its entirety.

Despite initial misunderstandings and mistranslations, the distribution of power under bureaucratic organizations is clear: power is concentrated with the technocratic leaders of organizations (Wolin 1960). However, there remains debate as to whether or not non-bureaucratic organizations can even exist in the modern world (Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey 2007; Lumby 2019). The debate over organizational type remains central to the continued development of organizational research, as a lack of consideration leads to gaps in research, and knowledge incapable of applying to a variety of observable organizational outcomes (Rothstein 2015). To come to an understanding of the current state of the field, an overview of the development of the dominant organizational type used in research is necessary.

However, the ability of Weberian bureaucracies to influence power relations has been a consideration since the development of the concept. One of Weber’s main



concerns about bureaucracy was its tendency to limit the importance of individual actions, diminishing the importance of democratic processes in favor of efficient rules developed by technocrats (Strong 2012). Thus, if bureaucratic organizations are so pervasive that attempts to eradicate them cannot succeed, it becomes necessary to focus on the influences in the struggle between democratic and individual influences and bureaucratic efficiency. This approach spawned the mechanistic view of organizations (Morgan 2006). In this view, organizations would react in predictable ways to stimuli, if individual actions were limited so as to be consistent. By preventing workers from taking spontaneous actions, organizational managers believed they could control the outputs of organizations predictably by altering the inputs. This required strict control over organizational operation, encouraging members to submit to minute control over all aspects of their work.

Tracy Strong (2012) details the interaction between democratic ideals and bureaucratic goals in a Weberian system; within a bureaucracy, rules are set in a rational and efficient way by experts, in a way that does not change significantly over time. Allowing individual workers to alter these rules added mitigating factors to the calculations set forth by administrative leaders. Additionally, any ability by rank and file members to alter their working routines or to determine their own working conditions was seen as detrimental to the goals of the organization. As democratic elections lend power to the goals of a larger set of individuals, who were not thought to have the same ability to rationally examine what is the most efficient path for the organization, they pose existential issues for technocratic leaders. Therefore, one task for a bureaucratic system is to limit the importance of any democratically elected official so as to minimize any potential disruption to organizational roles. Clearly, under this

conception of bureaucracy the interests of individuals are sublimated to the interests of the organization at large.

Additionally, the violence inherent in bureaucratic systems contributes to the continued need to examine organizational type. While bureaucratic organizations may not rely directly on the use of violence, they are often reliant on a stable economic and political situation, which is itself supported through the use and threat of violence (Swedberg 1998). Organization studies cannot turn a blind eye to the violence underpinning this system, in favor of promoting efficiency within the current status quo (Costas and Grey 2019). Although organizational authority is often decoupled from state authority, obfuscating forms of violence, and expressions of violence in everyday organizational functioning remain to this day. Large bureaucratic organizations obscure poor working conditions through the use of subcontractors and multi-level corporate ownership, further diluting responsibility and accountability for organizational harm (Bartley 2005). Additionally, institutionalized harm is accepted as a part of a larger bureaucratic corporation; for example, restrictive work policies which force workers to urinate in their clothing, leading to urinary and bladder infections (Perelman 2005), suicide attempts due to poor working conditions (Chan 2013), and physical and verbal abuse from customers (Baines and Cunningham 2011), are common occurrences in modern bureaucratic organizations. These offenses are often covered up, both by managers, fellow employees, and the abused employee themselves, for fear of reprisal due to a loss in efficiency (Costas and Grey 2019). In the commonly understood view, this violence needs to be sublimated under the needs of the organization.

While this interpretation paints a bleak view of a world ruled by bureaucracy, a Hegelian interpretation arrives at a different conclusion via the same route. Bu-

reauracies, or Hegel's conception as administrative states, are necessary to quell the alienation, social polarization, and rampant poverty that result in an unrestrained liberal-capitalist way of life (Grey 2020). Thus, although bureaucratic institutions continue to run counter to democratic interests, Hegel finds that they are the only way for communities to develop shared norms and values and that without these institutions, no ethical basis can develop in society.

Although both conceptions share the base tenants of bureaucracy, they make society and an individual's roles and actions within that society consistently legible <sup>2</sup>, the normative implications of the bureaucratic type depend on the author's ontological orientation to the potential of individuals. This diminishes the argument that studying the nature of bureaucratic organizations is no longer worthwhile (Lumby 2019; Dobbin, Schrage, and Kalev 2015), and at the same time lends credence to the idea that an author's implicit acceptance of organizational type implies a normative stance, and warrants investigation in and of itself (Bittner 1965).

A key point, although left unexplained, in Lumby's (2019) analysis of the bureaucratic type is the assertion that organizations have well-defined ethical parameters that their actors do not violate. Lumby claims that this framework "... views leaders as a key factor in establishing effective, efficient and humane systems, and assumes their wish to do so" (Lumby page 13). This take on the study of organizations rests on the assumption that organizations have an ethical basis, and that abuses of power within bureaucracies are a distortion of the normal workings of the organizational type, not a necessary aspect of it. This call has precedent in Robert Solomon's (2004) attempt to inject Aristotelian ethics into business. Solomon sees a way out of the ethical trap

---

<sup>2</sup>This general description may be consistent with any organization that centers around a centralized authority seeking to administer to public life (Scott 1998).

of bureaucratic domination through the development of corporate culture. This view undermines the bureaucratic importance of roles and emphasizes the humanistic view that the connections between the individuals within the roles, outside of merely their functionary duties (Solomon 2004). In this way community roles that cannot merely be filled or exchanged with any other individual surpass the importance of functionary roles. Additionally, Solomon claims that this does not reduce the organization to atomistic tendencies, as the roles only exist in their embeddedness within the culture. In this view, bureaucracies have evolved past their original form under Weber and have adapted to the modern competitive environment, which favors ethical tendencies and a functional working culture.

New theories suggest that Weber's concepts were contingent upon an industrial model of business claim they can not translate well to the modern knowledge-based economy (Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey 2007). These updated theories contend that the centralization of power and limitations placed on bureaucrats do not make competitive organizational forms in an economy that favors organizations that can adapt quickly and rely on information to be shared throughout the organization. This has led to conceptions of organizations as organic entities, with parallels to biology, where organizations must remain competitive relative to their peers and must be able to adapt within markets. This parallel extends to the internal workings of groups and accommodates a more fluid conception of member interactions. It prioritizes the ability of each member to determine their action at some level, to provide the innovation that allows the organization as a whole to adapt to external stimulus (Morgan 2006).

These new organizational models still hold implications for the study of exit as a concept. Even when organizational culture becomes the focus of study, the realization

of organizational goals is implicitly understood as the desirable outcome. It is assumed that decentralized power will allow leaders to pursue more ethical goals, and to provide a more humane working environment, but the mechanisms behind this change are left unexamined. Additionally, exit serves as one of the main drivers for this structural change: individuals in a knowledge-based economy supposedly hold more sway, as their departure may hold far more impact on organizational functioning than a traditional worker under bureaucracy. Explanations of drivers of exit, the impact of exit on organizational change, and individual post-exit relations are all necessary to understand the change that knowledge-based organizations are experiencing. This holds true even if the focus of organizational research remains on profit-generating organizations.

This epistemic change towards organizations is centered around a change in the organizational types of businesses dominant in the current economy. While complexity theory certainly offers exciting avenues for understanding certain organizations, it is billed unfairly as a holistic turn away from the explanatory frameworks developed under bureaucracy (Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey 2007). This framework centers itself around a new economic paradigm in the same manner that it claims bureaucracy has. This new model is contingent upon a knowledge-based economy and will begin to develop similar problems to bureaucratic models as economic forces change. Thus, rather than an epistemological change, a renewed ontological orientation is necessary to free organizational leadership studies from the cyclical nature of reworking theories based on industry changes. The drivers of change behind organizations' structure need to be examined, and any generalizability among organizational types, such as military or religious groups that do not hold profit generation as their main goal, needs to be rigorously examined and tested.

### 2.0.3 Ontological Preferences of Organizational Leadership Studies

Within organizational studies, there remains an ontological preference for improving existing organizations. Researchers seek to improve organizations in the realm that their research pertains to and often apply that knowledge to current organizations with little respect to their history or changes over time (Castillo and Trinh 2018). This view leads the field to a narrow focus. Research primarily centers around the functioning of organizations and their ability to achieve their immediate goals. In this view, exit is seen as antithetical to organizational functioning; turnover is a problem to solve and the maintenance of social and organizational ties is a top priority for the field. By rejecting the importance of exit without fully investigating its implications for the social and moral functioning of organizations, the field at large is sublimating the interests of individuals to the interests of groups. While this orientation may seem benign on its face, exit serves as a practical form of social resistance that provides individuals with a powerful form of social and political resistance (Kirkpatrick 2019). Personal lives become increasingly intertwined with organizational factors, especially in the U.S. where healthcare and retirement savings are tied to employment, where personal activities are increasingly monitored for organizational use, and some employers are tying housing directly to employment (Har 2022). The further integration of personal and organizational life greatly raises the costs of exit for organizational members. Losing one's house, life insurance, or access to personal data stored digitally strengthens the positions of organizations relative to their members. By growing the extant literature on restricting exit and turnover, organizational studies literature contributes to this organizational overreach.

In addition to the moral implications of research on exit and turnover, there are

temporal limitations enforced by this ontological view. Many extant organizations found their beginnings through a group schism, or through the exit of an experienced member. These exits have allowed individuals and groups to remake and reshape organizations in accordance with their beliefs. However, it is expected that as new members join and organizations grow, these same processes will result in more breaks within organizations, spurring additional sets of exits and reformations. Given the tendency of organizational leadership studies to view snapshots of organizations, ignoring longitudinal studies, the lengthy process of organizational development remains understudied. Although work on the formation of social groups and forms of social control have investigated groups that provide public and private goods (Olson 1965; Hechter 1987), the foundations of this research have been called into question. Much of this work starts with the ontological stance that individuals seek their own benefit and cohesion must be enforced by social control. However, there are group and individual actions which cannot be explained by this form of rational cost-benefit analysis (Fassbender 2020). With this critique, however, has not come the same investigation of the basis of organization; if individuals are willing to make great sacrifices for group outcomes, what drives their desires to leave instead?

The outputs of scholarly research follow from the misguided focus on improving efficiency in organization; prescriptions of what organizations ought to be have been concealed within descriptions of what organizations are (Bittner 1965). This preference has rendered organizational studies ill-equipped to deal with organizational contexts which do not fit within a narrow set of conditions. Specifically, organizational studies have typically dealt with organizations that fit within the context of an economic market, and that operate within explicit formal institutions (Bothello, Nason, and Schnyder 2019). The success of organizations that do not follow a standardized

rational-technical structure has historically posed a puzzle to researchers (Rothstein 2015). Additionally, attempts to bridge emerging gaps in the literature continue to develop theories adjusted to changes within market conditions, rather than broadening potential areas of study (Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey 2007). What develops here, from an organizational leadership perspective, is an understanding of leadership solely as it relates to output. As the context for leadership only occurs under market conditions, the measurement for success often relates to the ability of the organization to remain competitive in the economic market. In this way, although complexity theory addresses the inability of Weberian bureaucracy to adapt to a knowledge-based economy, it does not address the goals and strengths of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy emerged as the most efficient way of allocating resources on an organizational level given the current economy. This same label could be applied to complexity research in the new era. Rather than this epistemological shift, an ontological change is necessary.

A new perspective deals with organizational change and leadership emergence as they occur outside of the normal or assumed functioning of an organization. These occurrences, such as strikes, religious schisms, or separatist groups, may seek to harm organizations, or they may form competing or contesting groups of their own. However, the shared history of the groups and their development play a key role in their organization, and it would be a flawed assumption to ignore the organizational changes that spawn new groups or cause existing groups to fail.



## 2.0.4 New Religious Movements and Organizational Development

Many people see New Religious Movements <sup>3</sup> (hereafter NRMs) as cults, where few leaders in the organization hold massive sway over their followers, who would be able to command their followers to perform any action. However, not only do these leaders face direct contestation for prominent roles in their movements, but the average follower also controls the narrative of the movement through their ability to voice dissatisfaction, and to leave the organization (Richardson 2021; Lewis 2017). Due to both contestation for positions of power and the need to appease their follower base, there are direct limits on the actions of those who seek to establish and maintain a New Religious Movement. Thus, similar to the turn away from trait theories of leadership in the organizational leadership fields, religious studies scholars have turned towards examining social interactions between group members, and have expanded their search for expressions of power within these groups (Wilson 2016; Richardson 2021).

The hierarchy of and expressions of power within new religious movements are more dynamic than their popular depiction represents. First, individual movement across new religious movements is quite common. People may try out a movement for a short time without becoming a dedicated member, or may engage with several movements at the same time (Barker 2012). These movements, then, do not immediately serve as traps which ensnare any member who joins their ranks. Additionally, the myth that the heads of these organizations have the charismatic ability to brainwash any follower who joins these ranks is misguided (Richardson 2021). Rather, the heads of

---

<sup>3</sup>The common definition for a New Religious Movement is any movement with a spiritual or religious goal emerging after the second world war

the movements become recognized as charismatic and otherworldly through a process of socialization with the follower, where both come to agree on what is expected in the organization (Barker 1984). In this mutual process, although it may seem that the head of the organization is given tremendous power to lead followers, they must remain within the expectation that has been set through this socialization process.

Despite claims to be the only source of the goal of the organization, those as the head of NRM hierarchies can find their authority challenged when they overreach the bounds of the expectations set forth in the organization. When these expectations are violated, there are many ways that members of the organizations can act against their founders or purported leaders. Some simply ignore the edicts from their founders, others band together to force out the offender, to install a new head, and others still attempt to wrest control away from the current leader, and could end up supplanting them, or breaking off to start their new group (Richardson 2021). Under the religious studies tradition, contestation of authority often comes from one or more of three groups within the organization: Inner circle leadership, administrative functionaries, and grassroots membership. The range of actions is different for these three groups: the development of support for a schism is often seen as the realm of contestation by inner circle leadership, where a mass movement to oust a current leader comes from the grassroots members (Bromley 2021). While the separation of groups into distinct hierarchies makes them eligible for analysis from a bureaucratic perspective, organizational leadership theories which seek to branch from this tradition may provide explanatory power to the religious studies perspective. For example, as the understanding of these groups changes to acknowledge the distribution of power, distributive and complexity leadership models can be applied (Hairon and Goh 2015). While current perspectives focus on using sociological perspectives to understand individual decision-making,

there remains a need to re-examine this separation of the organization into distinct levels that take action irrespective of the others. However, in order to apply these theories to NRMs, the assumptions that organizations should remain in-tact, and should be able to achieve their goals must be removed from theory.

Not all organizations are able to successfully overcome deliberations and remain combined as a single entity. However, perhaps distinct from business organizations as a concept, religious affiliations need not be defined by membership to a particular group or sect. There are many people who leave these organizations and sever all ties with them, however some new religious movements are interesting in that a majority of the members who leave the organizations maintain some tie to previous members or to the ideology (Tuxen Rubin 2017). Group members may maintain their religious practices and beliefs, while merely separating themselves from the legal entity that they were previously a member of; in this way they seek to influence members of the religion at large, while only maintaining codified membership in a small part of the overall organizational ecosystem (Cusack 2017). Thus, the desire to further to goals of an organization is not necessarily tied to formalized membership within an organization. Restricting organizational leadership study to formalized group members, while it provides for a far more manageable concept to study, may be limiting understanding of what it means to meaningfully engage with an organization.

## 2.1 Conclusion

Although there is debate as to the applicability of bureaucratic notions of organization to modern society, the presence of bureaucratic theory remains in current organizational leadership work. It continues to influence the topic selection and

ontological standing of scholars. While some may contest that bureaucracy no longer holds the dominant position among organizational types, the ideals of efficiency and legibility that formed the bureaucratic administration remain ingrained in researchers' conceptions of organization. As this debate is one inherently dealing with the construction, maintenance, and expression of power within organizations, a critical perspective is necessary to understand how the assumptions of researchers affect their study, and how this perception translates to and has been influenced by society at large. In the following sections, key works in the organizational field are analyzed for their influence in forming the prior assumptions that researchers carry to this day. Then, perspectives from other fields are introduced, to provide a starting point for the expansion of exit into organizational leadership studies.

## Chapter 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### 3.0.1 Literature Review

An overview of organizational setting selection is necessary to provide an understanding of the scope of organizational setting selection within organizational leadership studies. As such, a semi-structured literature review was utilized to determine trends in academic publishing in relation to the concept of exit. A sample of 2247 articles was collected from the *Organization Studies*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, and *Leadership Quarterly* journals, from the period 2005 to 2020. This represents the bulk of the full-length journal articles published in these journals for the time period, limited by browzine availability, with access provided by the Arizona State University library. The articles were keyword searched for terms related to exit. The first 500 articles were searched for the terms: exit, resign, resignation, leave, flight, and quit. Based on the results from these articles, turnover and attrition were added for the remainder of the sample. Articles with keywords were read to understand the context surrounding the use of the key term, and to identify trends in the treatment of the context of exit in the discipline. Departing from the traditional meta-analytic trend of identifying and analyzing effect sizes, this review will focus only on broad trends in organizational setting selection (DeGroot, Kiker, and Cross 2009), as a way of providing context for the content analysis to follow. While this data set is not comprehensive enough to draw causal connections between any trends in organizational settings, it is meant to identify broad areas of interest, and gaps in

the existing literature. Through this targeted reading, two main areas of interest were identified.

The first major trend is a market-oriented perspective. This perspective focuses on insights from an economic tradition, and analyses groups at the organizational level. Research questions in this perspective center around groups exiting markets or industries, and how internal leadership makeup or decision-making style affects organizational exit decisions. While this was the most common keyword hit for the term “exit”, it centers around a fundamentally different level of analysis. The progenitor of this viewpoint is A.O. Hirschman’s *Exit, Voice and Loyalty*. In this work, Hirschman details a trade-off between exit and voice, where actors make a rational choice to either attempt to have their opinions heard within an organization or to exit and seek the group good in another group. Loyalty serves as a mediating factor in this work, limiting the exit option and increasing the voice option in certain organizations. While this work begins with an acknowledgment of its economic bases and gives a call for this research to be expanded into the sociological and political realms, this call has gone largely unheeded.

The second area of research centers around “turnover intentions”. While this research does take place at the individual level of analysis, it retains the prioritization of organizational perspectives. In this tradition, organizational members are measured as capital, where the goal of research has been to assess what causes turnover intentions, and what steps organizational leaders can take to minimize them. While this research comes much closer to the trend proposed in this paper, there are fundamental differences in the treatment of organizational members, including the implicit understanding that turnover intentions are malicious to an organization, and need to be diminished. While this viewpoint succeeds in analyzing certain psychological and social

occurrences surrounding exit decisions, it continues to be focused on profit-generating organizations. This mirrors Bittner 1965's accusation that organizational leadership studies takes an unknowing proscriptive stance in its research. In this discussion, a key focus will be on the selection of the organizational type when measuring turnover, and the ensuing recommendations that researchers pose based on their work.

Lastly, a discussion of the implications that exit has on the bureaucratic organizational type pioneered by Max Weber in *Economy and Society* will highlight the dangers of ignoring organizational type. The discussion will center around the tendencies that bureaucratic organizations have toward limiting the personal freedoms of their members. In the pursuit of maintaining a concentrated power with technical leaders, bureaucratic organizations often seek to limit personal expressions of voice, and democratic processes within the organization (Strong 2012). Accordingly, technical leaders should seek to restrict exit as well, as resistant exits allow individuals an elevated voice, and removed them largely from the influence of the technocratic leaders. In this endeavor, organizational studies as a field have served as the apparatus that provides the necessary technical expertise to leaders; much of the focus on organizational exit has been to limit its occurrence. This discussion will center around the applicability of the bureaucratic organizational type to conversations surrounding exit, and the implications that an expanded concept of exit posed for work premised within bureaucracy.

### 3.0.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

In order to assess the current state of philosophies of exit, the foundations of the current research paradigms require investigation. Critical methodologies have been

employed in the organizational leadership fields to highlight the ways that research alters and reinforces its own ideas of the subject under study (Wilson, 2016). However, many of these works highlight only how the concept of leadership requires further critical study, without applying the same methods to our concepts of organization, and their theoretical development (Alvesson and Spicer 2012; Andersen 2014; Kelly 2008; Learmonth and Morrell 2017). Concepts of organization are worthy of the same process of dialectic investigation to reveal untested assumptions which get injected into research. The critical form of investigation takes its roots from the dialectic logic of Hegel and Marx, where the objective is to highlight the shortcomings of the current system of thought or action and thus reveal a new path for development (Antonio 1981). In doing so, the researcher must consider the development of the current system, and the route to the current contradictions of logic (Carr 2000). In addition to highlighting weaknesses in the current trajectory of research, critical methods are useful for proposing future research questions and guiding the development of the field, making them ideal for exploratory studies that seek to correct entrenched issues in current research.

Following the theme of exit as a topic that demonstrates gaps in organizational theory development, a critical analysis will be employed to understand how individuals change their identity and group relations following their decision to leave a group and form a competitor. This paper will feature an analysis of the writings emerging from the Dror Center, a former Scientology mission that split from the organization to develop one of the larger Independent Scientology groups. Following the discursive strategies laid out by Wodak 2011, this analysis will focus on the following rhetorical strategies: References/Nomination, Perspectivization, and Argumentation.

Interwoven with these readings will be insights on the concept of exit from political,



sociological, and religious perspectives. Each of these academic disciplines has dealt with aspects of exit that relate to their own areas of interest; however, as organizational leadership studies is a highly interdisciplinary field, extant theories should be able to adapt and incorporate perspectives from a variety of fields.

### 3.1 Power Structures

The goal of critical analysis is to uncover power structures that lay unknown in the current operations of any system. The goal of this discovery is to reveal the ways that systems prioritize the goals of some over others. Currently, organizational leadership studies prioritizes business interests, and the interests of pre-existing organizations, under the guise of organizational study.

The readings of these works will be undertaken with an eye towards a preference to the improvement of current organizations, and a diminishment of factors that plague them. This does not mean a malicious intent in those who have engaged in the study of organizational leadership; however, the current paradigm puts value in extant organizations, while largely ignoring the historical development of said organizations. In this paper, I seek to show that although organizational improvement is a tenet of organizational studies leadership, this tenet implicitly restricts the freedoms of members within the organizations, by damaging their ability to express their voice through exit.

While at face value it may appear that diminished rates of exit mean that member concerns are being met, the two are not directly related. There are many organizational types, such as participation in a local or national government, in which people are restricted from exiting. In these cases, an individual is more likely to opt to operate

through other channels, not due to their best interests, but because all other options have been made prohibitively costly (Hirschman 1978). When considering the impact of restricting exit, organizational studies researchers should consider the likelihood that a member can leave their organization without significant repercussions. For example, many individuals are dependent on their employers for life-saving access to medical care, disability coverage, and other fringe benefits, and many do not have the savings to leave an organization without undertaking significant financial risk. Individuals who are already well off financially enjoy the benefits of less stable, but potentially more emotionally rewarding, employment. This allows them to take advantage of a wider range of employment opportunities, and then to leave them as culture and stability change (Ravenelle 2017). Unfortunately, as organizational culture changes, and the benefits of on-demand but less stable work begin to wane, workers who cannot afford to exit the situations become entrenched in less desirable working conditions (Ravenelle 2019). As the cost to exit is higher for disadvantaged groups, policies that restrict exit will affect these groups more heavily. Social stratification, then, is likely to grow as exit continues to be restricted; only the most economically advantaged members will be able to exit working situations that no longer fit their morals and lifestyles. Additionally, given the importance of switching employment to avoid wage stagnation, employees who are not able to exercise exit rights will continue to see their financial status diminish over time (Kochhar, Parker, and Igielnik 2022). While organizations may be able to structure themselves so that the costs to exit overcome the benefits, this is not an accurate measure of organizational satisfaction for the individual members. Rather, a drop in exit rates may signal only that members who hold the means to exit an organization have done so.

Rather, organizational leadership studies should incorporate political, psychological,

and theoretical perspectives to better understand the dynamics behind individual and group decisions to exit a system. Simple turnover rates do not adequately capture a complex phenomenon. Additionally, greater attention should be paid to the normative implications of extant research. By encouraging the view of exit as simple turnover, organizational studies research runs the risk of encouraging the social stratification that exit can drive. This paper does not claim that all exit is positive for an individual or for a group, but rather that organizational leadership studies as a field has suppressed organizational exit without fully acknowledging the phenomenon. A focus on resistant exit as a particular type demonstrates the extreme cases of exit; often individuals who practice a resistant exit do not consider costs in their actions. They are more concerned with the moral and political implications of their organization's work, rather than a personal cost-benefit analysis. In particular, sacrificial exits, where an individual may take their own life in an act of protest, are ill-suited to be analyzed through a rational cost-benefit framework (Fassbender 2020).

In addition to a critical review of extant literature, two paper proposals are provided as examples of advancements to the concept of exit in organizational leadership studies. First, a case study of Scientology represents a limit case to the concept of exit. Scientology has experienced many schisms throughout its storied history, that provide insights into the leadership dynamics of New Religious Movements. The development of Scientology as an organization is traced, highlighting several schisms the group has experienced as it grows. The goal of this case study is to outline how organizational practices influence religious organizations.

Second, given the flawed nature of turnover intention as an analytical tool, a potential amendment to the surveys employed for this measure is proposed to increase predictive power. The surveys employed in turnover intention research are analyzed

for their inability to predict actual turnover, and A study is proposed to include social measures of exit. This proposal highlights the ways the existing research can be modified to include the insights that the inclusion of exit provides, rather than the need to fully eschew current research.

## Chapter 4

### EXIT, VOICE AND LOYALTY

Albert Hirschman's *Exit, Voice and Loyalty* has been extremely influential in the development of exit as a concept in organizational studies leadership. It developed the connection between market forces and exit that continues to be used today. However, this work predominately focuses on an economic perspective when detailing expectations for exit. The work is not limited to an economic perspective; rather, it encourages readers to take up the concepts introduced in the book to develop them for non-market groups. Unfortunately, this call has fallen by the wayside while economic developments have flourished in the current literature. This section will proceed with an analysis of the development of Hirschman's concepts, with a focus on their prioritization of market forces and organizational goals over individual interests.

One clear departure between Hirschman's concept of exit and that developed here is the distinction between exit and voice. Although it is made clear that one action does not take priority over another, exit and voice remain separate concepts in which an individual has the opportunity to voice their concerns to their organization right up until the moment they choose to exit. However, that individual's involvement with the organization ends when the exit option is chosen. Although they may choose to reenter later, they still are seen as unable to voice their concerns while in the exited position. In this case, there is a trade-off between voice and exit that can be expressed as a function of the quality of the received benefit from an organization and its interchangeability. This sets up a rational calculation from group members in which they balance several factors to determine their optimal solution. This analysis

heavily favors the market-based approach, mirroring the ideas surrounding supply and demand. While this simplification may be useful for economic forces, which are more heavily swayed by cost-benefit analysis, it has limited applicability to many organizational types.

Hirschman's discussion of groups in which the exit option is increasingly unlikely focuses on public goods groups. These are groups where merely attempting to exit the group does not preclude an individual from experiencing group outcomes. The example provided in the text centers on political organizations: although someone may find the policies of a political party objectionable, they will still be subject to those policies if that party wins. In this example, exit is not a feasible way to achieve a desired outcome and so the voice option is more likely to be prominent. However, this perspective highlights the importance of viewing exit as a form of voice. A sensational or publicized form of exit gives an individual a platform from which to engage their former group. The importance of bridging this distinction is made clear when analyzing the work of Thoreau, who sparked debate on the value of walking away from political institutions. While many see Thoreau's work as simply a desire to leave a society he found distasteful, he maintained ties through his writings and continued support of the abolitionist movement (Kirkpatrick 2016). Had his intention merely been to separate from society at large, it is unlikely he would have continued to sensationalize his views through publication. Through exit, he was able to engage with the dominant political forces of his time, and lend credibility to his arguments.

There is a myriad of cases where the distinctions between exit and voice begin to fade. For example, in the case of sacrificial exits where an individual dies in protest, the act of exit itself becomes an expression of voice against a particular group. Hirschman states of sacrificial exits, "The remarkable influence wielded by martyrs

throughout history can be understood in those terms, for the martyr's death is exit at its most irreversible and argument at its most irrefutable" (126), demonstrating the recognition that, at times, exit is a particularly strong form of voice. Just before this statement, Hirschman claims that exit is not undertaken as a way of garnering more influence than one could have while remaining within the organization. In sharp contrast, resistant exits are often meticulously planned to elicit the largest reaction from the public. When planning a sacrificial exit, individuals may alert media and government agents to ensure that there is substantial coverage of the event (Fassbender 2020). Often, this planning occurs at the group level, with the volunteer allowing their personal exit to raise the voice of the group as a whole. Thus, the individual rational calculations upon which Hirschman bases his expectations do not translate well to certain kinds of exits or types of organizations.

The locus of this disagreement is caused by a market-based perspective on the act of exit. In Hirschman's work, exit is seen as a way to affect the bottom line of organizations, to signal that changes in the structure of the group are needed. However, this activity ignores the post-exit behavior of the individual and assumes that they are leaving to seek a similar good, albeit in another location. This approach assumes that organizations can adapt to exit to improve their chances of retaining members. This perspective continues unabated within organizational studies literature, as exit serves merely as an indicator of underlying issues within an organization. While conflict is required for resistant exit to occur, one cannot assume that by fixing these issues the organization will improve substantially.

Some individuals seek to irreparably harm the original organization through their exit. In the case of separatist groups, they do not exit the polity to have their policy changes heard and amended, but to destroy and supplant their original

group. Hirschman's work assumes that the views of the dissenters could be taken into consideration and that the group could eventually rejoin the "market" if conditions were favorable to them again. However, political resources are often not as fluid as economic resources. Issues can become defined in terms that make them indivisible between two groups, even if they could have been negotiated on earlier terms (Hensel and Mitchell 2005; Goddard 2006). Often, this leaves the original organization little leeway to amend itself to the desires of the exiting individuals. Additionally, it emphasizes the importance of the motivations behind the exit; viewing exit as voice is critical in understanding the dynamics that cause these phenomena.

One mediator between exit and voice is the concept of loyalty. Hirschman sets up loyalty as a factor that skews individuals towards voice over exit; it gives them the desire to improve groups from within, rather than abandoning them to seek their benefits somewhere else. One complication to this concept is when groups change but individuals claim loyalty to a previous group identity. For example, when the Church of England amended its regulations to allow women to become ordained as ministers, many church leaders left for other religious sects or formed their own churches. In the eyes of these leaders, the identity of the church was fundamentally altered, and they were remaining loyal to the original doctrines (Sani and Reicher 2000). The same can be seen in independent Scientologists; members who leave the Church of Scientology often see the organization as straying from the guidelines of the faith and seek to maintain their practice of the religion (Cusack 2017; Tuxen Rubin 2017). In these cases, loyalty to the individual's perception of group identity caused exit from the organizational-operational side of their group. While this effect may be more pronounced for religious organizations, exit may occur from political and business organizations over the same issues. While these considerations complicate the



study of exit, it further solidifies the importance of social perspectives when engaging organizational exit as a concept.

In the introduction to this piece, Hirshman is explicit in his assumption from a rational economic stance. While he calls for this work to be expanded to apply to non-market-based organizations, this call has gone largely unheeded in the organizational studies literature. Rather, exit continues to be viewed as a mere indicator of organizational issues, to be corrected to limit turnover; or, on the organizational end, as a byproduct of organizations changing their strategies to adjust to economic markets.

## Chapter 5

### BUREAUCRACY AND EXIT

Within the study of organizations in a social science context, Max Weber is one of the most prolific and influential authors (Greenwood and Lawrence 2005; Lounsbury and Carberry 2005). In a review of citations, Lounsbury and Carberry (2005) show that Weber's work has been massively influential, being cited in up to 50 percent of articles in a publication in any given year. However, these authors make the claim that diminishing citation numbers, with some citations being "ceremonial", means that Weber's influence is dwindling in social science research. However, it seems that the need to distinguish ceremonial citations from substantive citations signals not a decline in influence, but an acceptance of Weber's ideas as part and parcel with concepts of organization. Thus, when tracing the development of concepts of organization, and the untested assumptions within, beginning with Weber's works is a necessary jumping-off point to trace their development in subsequent research.

Specifically, Weber's focus on bureaucracy imposes upon the field of organizational studies a focus on organizations as a "rule of conduct" (Bittner 1965). In this conception, researchers view an organization as the clear relationship between rules and behaviors, which favor behaviors that act in compliance with rules in order to produce the stated goal of the organization. This is what Weber refers to as a Legal Rule, where impersonal rules are developed in line with the rational goals of the organization (Weber 2019). In this case, members of a bureaucratic organization owe loyalty to the rules that direct their actions, not to any specific technocratic leaders themselves. Under the ideal working bureaucracy, as described by Weber, technocratic

leaders rule through the knowledge that has been gained through specialized education and experience. Under a bureaucratic organization, technocratic leaders are seen as holding superior knowledge and organizational skills to average members. In order for the smooth functioning of an organization of this style, individual members must limit their discretion and perform the roles that have been assigned to them in the way that they have been designated. Therefore, rules and behaviors should be in line with one another. Additionally, personal style and preferences are purposefully distanced from one's role within an organization; those outside of technocratic positions become easily replaceable as all of their functions should be transferable to another member. Approaching organization as a concept from this mentality restricts exit in several key ways.

One function that allows exit to serve as a form of voice for an individual is its ability to hinder organizational functioning until the departed member has been replaced. Under bureaucratic rule, members in non-technocratic roles are unlikely to pose a significant hindrance to the organization through exit. In fact, the right of any individual member to resign from their position at any time is one of the facets that Weber describes as defining a bureaucratic organization. However, a number of legal complications have developed that hinder the ability of organizational members to resign from positions without unduly harming their chances elsewhere

Developments such as non-compete clauses and the expansion of copyright law can create legal ramifications for an individual when they leave an organization. On occasion, their prior organization will attempt to leverage the threat of legal action to prevent the member from continuing in their activities with another group. This prevents non-technocratic leaders from applying their gained experience and leveraging it for better conditions or improved status in another organizational setting. This

serves to further impose the gap between technocratic leaders and the members of their organizations and acts as a way to punish individuals for their choice to exit. Additionally, it may act as a deterrent to prevent more exit from the organization. However, this diminished rate of exit does not signal an improvement in organizational standards or a superior rational basis of authority. Rather, the organization sees an improvement in its conditions, in the form of a reduced turnover rate, through the manipulation of the legal basis of rule.

Concentrated power in bureaucratic organizations hinders the effectiveness of exit. While a prior member may be able to easily sway an organization if they are able to convince one of the technocratic leaders, they would need to convince a significant portion of the rank-and-file members of an organization to join them in order to change organizational culture. Since individual members do not have autonomy in their actions within an organization, it is likely that they would also need to engage in exit to put increased pressure on change. This point emphasizes the importance of an expanded meaning of exit past turnover. While turnover alone is unlikely to affect organizations that can absorb the costs of replacing workers <sup>4</sup>, drawing visibility to poor organizational practices provides social pressure that can force technocratic leaders to implement changes. Exit understood as turnover does not fully explore the “performative, aesthetic, and moral dimensions of the phenomenon” (Kirkpatrick 2017).

Currently, the study of organizations mirrors the bureaucratic drive to ensure efficiency and compliance with understood standards for organizational effectiveness.

---

<sup>4</sup>Using tech giant Amazon as an example of an organization that can sustain turnover, the company preferred massive turnover rates until analysis showed that their current turnover rate would deplete their entire United States labor pool within a three-year window. Despite committing to fixing some of these issues, turnover rates remain over double the average rate for comparable positions. (Del Rey 2022; Nieto-Munoz 2022)

As Bittner (1965) points out, this leads researchers to measure organizational “success” based on the factors resulting from compliance. Exit as a theoretical concept cannot be compatible with studies that measure success by compliance and dedication to assigned roles. By necessity, resistant and performative exit requires an individual to act against the stated rules of their organization or social group (Kirkpatrick 2019). However, since exit acts as an expression of autonomy for individuals, providing them opportunities to voice their views in ways they could not before, research that unintentionally increases compliance, and thus restricts an individual’s ability to voice their concerns with an organization, unduly affects the members of organizations under study. While this assumption is problematic for organizational studies, it is the most concerning for studies already employing a critical methodology.

One of the main tenants of critical research is the emancipatory effects of the research (Carr 2000). Exit when taken in resistance to an unresponsive organization is often a self-emancipatory step for an individual; however, it can be undertaken as a form of collective good as well. Often, when an individual campaigns against their previous organization for the mistreatment they have the desire to stop that same mistreatment for other organizational members. As Jennet Kirkpatrick states, “Exit looks to what is common or shared and makes a negative judgment about it. Thus, unlike withdrawals, which can be confined to the self, exit starts with attention to something that is public and external to the individual” (Kirkpatrick 2017). Research that aids the ability of individuals to engage in exits and to do so without fear of excessive repercussion improves the ability of individual organizational members to take steps to improve entire organizational cultures, not just the areas of an organization that their role engages with.

## Chapter 6

### TURNOVER INTENTION AND EXIT

Turnover intention is a measure individual of desire to leave a position of employment utilized by researchers to stand as a proxy for measuring turnover rates in organizations. Researchers believe turnover intention to be closely correlated with actual rates of turnover; turnover intention then serves as a much easier and more cost-effective way of measuring expected turnover rates than collecting longitudinal data on actual employment levels. It is often implemented through a survey of current employees, measuring factors such as satisfaction with pay, advancement opportunities, and workload.

This measure is used by human resources practitioners to decrease the turnover rates in their organizations, and thus increase organizational effectiveness (Cohen, Blake, and Goodman 2016). Intention is often seen as a preferable measure to realized turnover in organizations, due to the difficulty of performing longitudinal studies. Intention to turnover is expected to correlate closely to actualized turnover rates, and to serve as a proxy to inform human resource managers. While turnover intention research does take into account psychological factors in employee satisfaction, through surveys on organizational members' self-perceptions of their relation to the organization and their role, the goal of the research is inherently a reduction in turnover rate. However, when accounting for other demographic factors related to turnover, it appears that turnover intention alone is not a significant predictor of turnover rate. Rather, it appears to provide no additional explanatory power when considered along with other factors which influence turnover rates (Cohen, Blake, and

Goodman 2016). Thus, although these studies seek to improve the effectiveness of human resource practitioners, through a decrease in turnover rate, it is unlikely that recommendations coming from the turnover intention research will significantly affect actualized turnover within organizations. Indeed, as previously mentioned, although research on turnover intention is gaining traction, quit rates in general have been rising for several years.

However, the focus of this review is not on the usefulness of turnover intention to solve its stated goal, but on the motivation behind the establishment of turnover intention as an academic subject. Turnover intention is founded in the field of human resource management, which seeks to aid organizations in managing the labor and productivity of their members. These theories largely apply only to profit-making organizations, as productivity and profitability are often the driving factors behind the desire to study the working conditions of organizational members. In fact, in many studies in this field organization becomes almost synonymous with business and member synonymous with employee.

Although turnover intention is measured on the individual level, often through surveys of members' perceptions towards their organization, the research remains firmly rooted in an organizational perspective. When engaging in research on turnover, members only remain under study so long as they remain with the organization. In fact, turnover intention is seen as preferable to longitudinal studies following changes experienced by group members (Ngo-Henha 2017). Once members leave, their connections to the group, or the actual reasoning behind their desire to leave, are no longer factored into the research. Additionally, turnover research often does not account for individuals, but rather counts the number of permanent positions at an organization versus the hiring rates (Cohen, Blake, and Goodman 2016). Although

this perspective draws its measurement from the individual level, it does not take into account individual perspectives on exit.

This is not to say that turnover research has no potential to benefit organizational members. The identification of common areas of discontent among workers, and their amelioration, certainly does benefit workers in some way. Where this research falls short is in its lack of acknowledgment of the variety of forms that exit can take and the longitudinal development of exit intentions. As it stands, the current research tends to provide a snapshot of organizational contentment that human resource managers can use to assess its impact on actual turnover rates.

It is unlikely that turnover intention alone will allow organizations to curtail their rates of resistant exit. The field at large largely assumes the reasons for exit are tied to the working conditions of organizations centered around the generation of profit. This mirrors the level of attachment expected from workers in a true bureaucratic organization: personal attachments to jobs are not expected beyond the desire for wages. However, resistant exit occurs in many organizations which are not centered around profit, at least not at the local level, and whose members may prioritize factors other than remuneration in their exit decisions. For example, members of non-profit, military, political, and religious organizations may be more driven by ideology and personal moral convictions than by the desire to seek better working conditions. The personal attachments that keep them anchored to jobs through poor working conditions and wages also drive the desire to protest against an organization when they leave. Without an understanding of individual perspectives of organizational attachment, the complex aspects of exit cannot be investigated from a turnover perspective. In addition, this subfield cannot be applied outside of a narrow band of organizational



types. Even if the issues of predictability can be solved, current research can only explain exit for a narrow range of reasons.

However, it is likely that the turnover intentions subject area is highly adaptable to incorporating the social and moral implications of exit. Already, there is the practice of surveying organizational members to discover areas of discontent. One step forward would be to incorporate members' perceptions of the identity of the organization, and whether they align with that identity. Fabio and Sani (2000) show that schisms in groups often result from a perceived change in group identity. These changes are social, as the organizational member is gauging their experience with changes in the organization and the reactions of others in the group. Additionally, although they may be highlighted at pivotal moments, perceptions of organizational identity and the way that the member fits within that identity will change over time. Surveys currently explore members' satisfaction only within their current role in the organization; it includes their satisfaction with their workload and pay rates. However, it does not touch on any personal connections, be they positive or negative, with the organization. With an expanded view of exit, decisions could still be made pertaining to human resource management issues; a more complete image of member attitudes towards the groups could alert managers to reactions to upcoming challenges or changes within organizational structure. Additionally, understanding member perceptions of group identity could enhance a feeling of voice, reducing the likelihood of schisms and resistant exits from an organization (Sani and Reicher 2000).

Additionally, the inclusion of the moral dimensions of exit will force researchers to examine organizational types, as well as member-organization dynamics; human resource managers will also need to confront perceptions of the organizations they operate within. Current research assumes an employee-employer relationship, and that

one of the main steps in an individual leaving an organization is seeking employment elsewhere (Cho and Lewis 2012). However, an individual is much more likely to exit an organization in a resistant way if they are leaving on moral grounds. As previously stated, distancing ones-self from an organization is a key part of resistance for some, and allows them to examine their previous organization, and continue to speak out against it. Individuals who exit for moral reasons are not necessarily seeking employment immediately after their departure, and are certainly not leaving an organization merely to explore more profitable opportunities elsewhere.

Another group that stands to benefit from an improved measure of turnover intention is precarious workers (Ravenelle, Janko, and Cai Kowalski 2022). These workers cannot practice exit due to practical limitations of wage insecurity, dependence on employment-related benefits, or social pressures tied to receiving unemployment benefits. By gauging the desire of these workers to leave an organization, human resource managers can respond to their needs without relying on realized turnover numbers, which may not be representative of discontent within an organization. Additionally, investigating precarious workers could illuminate gaps between the measure of turnover intention and actual turnover rate: these workers represent a group who certainly intend to leave their organizations were they able, but cannot practice exit. As their options diminish, they may also be more inclined to practice resistant exits, as the costs of their exit will be much higher.

This is a key point even from an organizational perspective, as the organization needs to focus on its continued relationship with individuals who practice resistant exit. Unlike the current subject of turnover research, whose job can simply be filled with another worker at some cost to the organization, resistant exits require responses from current organizational members, lest they risk damage to their ability to operate

effectively, due to decreased perceptions of legitimacy and worth (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011). Additionally, the form of response matters as well; organizations that seek to retaliate against resistant prior members run the risk of further damaging their reputation, turning public support further against themselves (Peckham 1998). This opens the study of turnover to include post-exit organizational dynamics, studying how people relate to prior organizations, and how that relationship can change over time. From an organizational perspective, this information will allow them to remain in good standing with prior members, and potentially still decrease turnover costs due to increased positive recommendations from former employees.

## FUTURE APPLICATIONS

This section compiles the recommendations found throughout the paper to underscore the future applications that an expanded view of exit provides for the organizational leadership field as a whole. In addition to providing overarching advice that demonstrates the ability of exit to change organizational research, two specific paper ideas will be proposed to provide concrete models for the elaboration of the concept of exit as it applies to organizational theory development. The application/advancement distinction is important for the concept of exit; exit is a form of voice, and as such will change over time and location. Salient forms of exit and protest change over time, as will predictors and causes. The field of organizational leadership cannot rely on prior assessments of exit, as voice can be expressed through many different avenues.

The section starts with recommendations from social and political theories of exit, with a focus on methods for assessing exit. Next, the first paper example will be a review of resistant exit as it applies to the Church of Scientology, to demonstrate the application of exit with respect to religious organizations. The next paper idea will be a proposal for a survey of profit-generating organizations, to demonstrate a measure that will capture member perspectives on resistant exit in a way usable to organizational leaders. The paper will conclude with a summary of the benefits of pursuing both the application and advancement of exit as a theoretical topic.

## 7.1 Politics, Sociology, and Exit

Political science as a discipline, and political theory in particular, is disposed to studying the meaning and intention behind actions, in addition to their ramifications. The study of exit from a political standpoint has focused on the meaning behind an intent to remove one's self from a polity, and the difficulty of sharing one's experience with members who have remained. Exit is often associated with hardship and loss, which often serve to provide legitimacy behind the argument of the protester. In some of the more radical cases of exit, being protest suicides such as self-immolation or hunger strikes, the very act of exit signals a determination that can inspire many people, and have a unique effect in spreading a political message <sup>5</sup>.

These benefits of exit are not new within political thought; similar to leadership theories, theories of exit were seen in the Greek philosophy of Plato and Aristotle (Kirkpatrick 2017, 2015). However, the potential for expressions of exit have changed significantly over time; additionally, given changing communication technology, exiters retain the ability to connect with a group that a protester has left and to spread one's message while remaining physically absent. These methods and forms of communication play a key role in political theories of exit and have garnered increased attention with the advent of social media and mass communication over the internet.

When considering exit, organizational leadership studies should incorporate both the intended meaning of the act and the method of continued communication as explored in political science. Not all studies will involve exit where an individual protests or remains connected, however, this cannot be the base assumption. Given the

---

<sup>5</sup>This is not to say that exit is capable of spreading this message alone. A political apparatus surrounding exit is often necessary for the full benefit of exit to be realized (Fassbender 2020)

frequency of organizational change, researchers should always investigate the meaning behind individuals' decisions to leave, to ensure that research is not developed under false assumptions. Additionally, if prior members do continue their relationship in some form, it is important to understand the ways that this relationship continues to influence current organizational members and leadership.

Sociological approaches to exit focus more on changing group dynamics, which may result in larger schisms of groups, and in diasporas forming into new organizations. In these explanations, organizational identity plays a key role in members' decisions to leave a group. Each member holds their own idea as to the meaning behind an organization, but general agreement among these ideas keeps an organization codified. While these ideas may change over time, certain issues can threaten a member's perception of the group and lead them to seek the group good elsewhere. In these theories, members who choose to leave an organization often see themselves as upholding the original intention of the group. This perspective lends itself well to explaining schisms, where a group of members who are able to retain their agreement on what the organizational identity should be band together to form their own organization.

Incorporating this perspective gives the organizational leadership field greater explanatory power when assessing both exit and organizational failure. Following a trend from studying the effects of select individuals to investigating interaction among groups, changing group relations both before and after exit will allow scholars to investigate changing perceptions of leadership under an exit event. Specifically, in the case of a schism, scholars will need to investigate how current leadership ceases to be acknowledged as such, and how members develop their own organizational rules and goals.

Additionally, the combination of these factors, along with organizational leadership theory, expands the field to allow for the study of many organizational types. For example, separatist and militant organizations fall under the paradigm mix of political, sociological, and organizational interests. Without incorporating views from a variety of fields, insights into the leadership and organizational structures will lack depth and explanatory power, missing either the reason for the existence of the organization, the way it maintains social cohesion or the method by which it decides upon goals and actions. Developing theories of organizational leadership requires a mixture of disciplines.

## 7.2 Scientology and Exit

The moral dimensions of exit are highlighted when the concept is applied to religious organizations. These organizations often deal with goods that are deemed indivisible, namely access or admittance to an ultimate good, and thus find it difficult to change over time. Additionally, members who find issues with the doctrines of their religion are often known to start their own competing organizations, with similar but slightly different doctrines. According to a study from the Center for the Study of Global Christianity, there are now more than 45,000 Christian denominations alone around the world. Each of these new denominations involves an instance of exit; an individual or group in each case found issue with either organizational or doctrinal functions within an existing sect and gathered a following to create their own organization.

These schisms are not restricted to long-standing religions, but continue to emerge as new religions are developed. New Religious Movements, the label applied to

religions developing after world war two, continue to arise, and then fracture, creating a complex web of interrelated organizations. Due to their younger nature, research involving these organizations can trace their inception and development, and more easily tack split-off organizations, making them a perfect candidate for a longitudinal study of exit within organizations. Additionally, their members are rarely focused on profit, but rather hold a moral or social connection to the organization. Thus, complications which result in a resistant exit are likely to arise from the moral and social underpinnings of the organization, allowing research to take a step away from profit generation to further flesh out exit as it relates to organizational leadership theory. One final benefit of New Religious Movements as a subject of inquiry is the complex dynamics between organizational leadership and general members; contrary to the prevailing belief these organizations are cults that brainwash their members, there is social feedback between members and leadership which develops alongside doctrines (Richardson 2021).

In this section, following a brief survey of the ways New Religious Movements relate to both exit and organizational leadership theory, a short history of the Church of Scientology is provided as an example of the social and moral dimensions of exit. After this summary, a critical discourse analysis of the Dror schism is presented to demonstrate the fruitfulness of observing exit in religious organizations. This is not a complete study of Scientology as an organization, but it points towards fruitful areas of research; namely, in separating doctrines from organizations. Many Scientologists leave the Church for purely organizational reasons, but continue to practice the religion on their own. These independent Scientologists even become fervent opponents of the Church, while continuing their practice. While these members ostensibly continue to work towards the goal of the organization, to “clear” the planet, they have given



up their codified membership within that organization. Without an account of their post-exit relationship with the organization, there remains an unclear picture of practicing Scientologists, and of the pushback towards the Church as an organization.

### 7.2.1 New Religious Movements (NRM) and Organizational Constraints

New Religious Movements are complex organizational types that have seen little study outside of the Religious Studies field. Many people see New Religious Movements as cults, where few leaders in the organization hold massive sway over their followers, with the ability to command their followers to perform any action. However, these leaders not only face direct contestation for prominent roles in their movements, but the average follower also controls the narrative of the movement through their ability to voice dissatisfaction and leave the organization. Due to both contestation for positions of power and the need to appease their follower base, there are direct limits on the actions of those establishing and learning NRMs.

The hierarchy of new religious movements are more dynamic than their popular depiction represents. First, individual movement across new religious movements is quite common. People may try out a movement for a short time without becoming a dedicated member or may engage with several movements at the same time (Barker 2012). These movements, then, do not immediately serve as traps that ensnare any member who joins their ranks. Additionally, the myth that the heads of these organizations have the charismatic ability to brainwash any follower who joins these ranks is misguided (Richardson 2021). Rather, the heads of the movements become recognized as charismatic and otherworldly through a process of socialization with the follower, where both come to agree on what is expected in the organization (Barker

1984). In this mutual process, although it may seem that the head of the organization is given tremendous power to lead followers, they must remain within the expectation that has been set through this socialization process. When these expectations are violated, there are many ways that members of the organizations can act against their founders or purported leaders. Some simply ignore the edicts from their founders, others band together to force out the offender, to install a new head, and others still attempt to wrest control away from the current leader, and could end up supplanting them, or breaking off to start their new group.

Bromley 2021 divides the sources of these challenges down into three groups within the organization: Inner circle leadership, administrative functionaries, and grassroots membership. In this conception, contestation for authority is a normal process of movement development, and each group has a different set of actions available to them. Contestation does in fact appear to play a central role in the development of many movements; however, it is unlikely that any of these groups are able to take action irrespective of the other levels. Since leadership is socialized alongside administrative functionaries and grassroots members, any change among these levels will require corresponding socialization among the different groups for the group to remain united.

Not all organizations are able to successfully surmount this process of socialization and remain combined as a single entity. There are many people who leave these organizations and sever all ties with them, however, some new religious movements are interesting in that a majority of the members who leave the organizations maintain some tie to previous members or to the ideology (Tuxen Rubin 2017). Additionally, NRMs are a form of organization that is particularly prone to schisms, where a portion of the organization splits off to form a similar, yet distinct group. These political exits will be our focus. These fractures in the organization are caused by a breakdown

in the normal deliberative process in an organization. It is a misconception that organizations, especially religious ones, are able to make decisions with unanimous support among their members. Rather, there is a process of deliberation in which members, even if they do not agree with the outcome of the matter of contestation, retain their faith in the organization, and their ability to express their concerns. Schisms happen when this process fails, and members perceive that there has been a change in the essence of their organization and that they no longer have the ability to voice their concerns against it (Sani and Todman 2002; Sani and Reicher 2000). Stated another way, organizations may change over time without fear of creating major fractures among their members, so long as members continue to identify with the group process, and do not begin to feel disenfranchised. These feelings of a changed essence in the organization are perceived by each individual person. However, when changes are large enough, many people throughout an organization may perceive a similar change, and thus schisms occur when several to many members perceive a change as negative and leave the organization together. Although any change may entice members to express their dissatisfaction by exiting an organization, it only becomes a schism if they collate into their own distinct organization.

### 7.2.2 The History of Scientology through an Organizational Lens

This section begins with a history of Scientology and its major split-off groups with respect to the theories of Organizational Leadership, before analyzing the way that Scientology offers an ideal type to demonstrate the importance of further developing the concept of Exit. Scientology serves as a limit case that highlights a variety of organizational processes that relate to exit. Throughout its history, there have been

many spin-off organizations that borrow its ideology, members who leave and actively contest the organization, and those who leave but maintain the faith. The sensational nature of the organization is a positive feature when examining exit, as members who practice resistant exit have gained platforms to express their motivations and cognitive changes when deciding to leave the group. Additionally, well-documented history, personal narratives, and legal proceedings provide a wealth of information to draw upon. While Scientology is certainly a unique organization, and these results may not be directly generalizable, the insights gained from such a controversial group highlight the nature of resistant exit. This seeks to demonstrate the rich variety of ways that New Religious Movements can inform work in Organizational Leadership by analyzing the interactions of these ideas in a grounded situation.

This analysis will begin with the development of Scientology as an organization, and thus will miss some of the key developments of the ideology and history of its founder, Lafayette Ronald Hubbard (L. Ron Hubbard, LRH). While the psychological concerns surrounding the founder of the organization certainly factor into the development of organizational processes, the purpose of this study is to highlight contestation which occurred further along in the organizational history. The examination of the psychological situation and development of its founder is key for an understanding of Scientology as a religion, for the sake of space this paper will be limited to its key ideologies with respect to organizational development and leadership constraints. As such, it will focus on interactions between the members of the organization, rather than studying them individually. This acknowledges the group development of organizational processes, and goes against the trend and assigning deity-like status to the leaders of New Religious Movements (Richardson 2021). An in-depth case study is needed to investigate the specific psychological and social processes of the

development of organizational procedures which lead to dysfunctional organizations. For the purpose of this paper proposal, the history is limited to the necessary facts to understand the ensuing analysis of the organization.

Scientology dates its history from 1950, when its founder, Lafayette Ron Hubbard, published the first text that would comprise the ideology of the organization: *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* (The Church of Scientology n.d.). This first text detailed some of the key tenants of Scientology, namely that the mind is separated into two parts, the analytical and the reactive, and that the reactive mind is capable of recording painful and destructive emotions physically into the structure of a person's cells. These recordings are called an Engram. The removal of engrams composes one of the core practices of Scientology, in which a member of The Church works with a current or prospective member to relive a memory until there are no longer any negative emotions attached to the event (Wright 2013). This is the beginning of the socialization process in which those who started to follow LHR's teachings began to recognize him as a sort of supernatural figure in their lives and began looking to him for spiritual guidance. As the practice of Dianetics grew, Hubbard sought to create places for his followers to congregate and train new members and develop his burgeoning ideology. It is through the mid-1950s that Hubbard and his followers transformed the practice of Dianetics into the religion of Scientology.

Scientology was seen by members as a practice that they could develop, and that Hubbard was a master of. As members began to see supernatural abilities in Hubbard, they began to see it in themselves as well. Once Hubbard advanced the idea that human bodies are a vessel for a spiritual being, a Thetan, who is only anchored in space and time (MEST) by a lack of perception, individual members began experiencing past life and out-of-body moments themselves. In an early auditing session, the method by

which one investigates their past to free themselves from space and time, one follower described seeing a past life where a nineteenth-century British soldier killed her young son, and she murdered him in turn. She worked through the grief of this past life, and in turn felt a spiritual awakening in this life. In recalling her feelings after the event, she states, “When I walked downstairs . . . the electric lights dazzled me. The clean modern lines of the house interior, and the furniture, were elegant and strange to me beyond all description. I was freshly there from another age. For the first time in this lifetime, I knew I was beyond the laws of space and time” (Wright 2013). In this way, LRH was not able to single-handedly declare his enhanced ability to followers but developed them alongside followers, who validated his claims and enhanced his practices. One of the key technologies in Scientology, the E-Meter, was developed by one of his followers to advance the organization as a whole.

It is important that Scientology as a religion during the time of LRH was seen as developing. There was a hierarchy, the Bridge to Total Freedom, that a person could work towards. New steps on the bridge, called Operating Thetan, or OT, levels were being developed by LRH. This was seen as an assumption of great personal risk, and Hubbard was the only member of The Church deemed capable of discovering new levels. For this reason, Hubbard maintained strict control over the ability to develop the Ideology of Scientology, although he did not lay exclusive claim to its supernatural benefits.

### 7.2.3 Schisms and Scientology

Scientology is well known for its contention with its members, and its history reflects this perception. As Scientology made its way across the globe (sometimes literally

in the form of a few ships making up a makeshift navy), there were contestations over L. Ron Hubbard's supremacy as the sole member able to develop the ideas put forth by Dianetics and Scientology. One interesting facet of Scientology is that there is the perception that the teachings are "technology" more so than they are religion. Several organizations split off from Scientology, claiming no religious basis, but rather to develop and improve upon this "technology" outside of the Church. For example, Werner Erhard founded Erhard Seminars Training, which evolved into Landmark Education, and now exists as The Landmark Forum, continuing to teach an auditing style personal improvement course. Additional notable organizations include Kenja and Re-evaluation Counselling (or RC), both of which borrow heavily from the idea that prior lives can impact a person's emotional well-being, and that reliving distressing life experiences is the only way to remove their hold on a person (Cusack 2017). In these cases, the individual creators of the groups were Scientology adherents (although some claimed they had never practiced the religion) but were unwilling to follow the doctrine in its entirety. Rather than abandon the facets of the "technology" that they believed worked, they founded groups to gain the ability to change and alter their practices, a freedom that was strictly forbidden within the Church.

While these organizations enjoyed portions of the teachings of Scientology, the founders sought to develop their own organizations, where they would not be subject to the rules and regulations under Hubbard.

Some organizational leaders, however, fully believed the doctrine but felt that the organizational side of the Church was beginning to stray from their teachings. One of the first major schisms in Scientology was the so-called Mission Holders' Conference in 1982. Originally, individual groups could hold what was called a "mission", in which a group operated an arm of the Church, and sent a portion of their earnings back to

the main office. However, when Church leadership realized that mission holders were out earning and out recruiting main offices, they decided to eliminate the mission system, and to bring all arms under the control of the central branch of The Church (Hellesoy 2017). Under this new structure, prior mission holders would lose much of their autonomy and income, in addition to losing the ability to independently instruct their own members. Past the introductory levels, members were required to travel to the main Scientology branch to complete their instruction. This radical change led many mission holders to decry the organization as profit and power-hungry, fueled by what was seen as a hostile takeover of the church by David Miscavige, and to attempt to practice the religion on their own. A “free zone” for Scientology was established throughout Europe by a former regional director, Bill Robertson.

Robertson went on to create Ron’s Org, one of the few independent Scientologist organizations to publicize their recruitment of former members of the Church. Although the early years of the organization were hampered by lawsuits from the Church, after the fall of the Soviet Union they were able to establish a foothold in Russia, from which they spread back into several European countries. They continue to host retreats where they teach auditing and train members on the principles of dianetics, two of the core tenets of Scientology.

One more notable schism was the departure of the Dror center, originally a Scientology mission ins Israel. The restructuring of the mission system worried the leadership of the Dror center, causing them to draft several letters to David Miscavige to raise their concerns; according to the center, power was too centralized with the main office, and local leaders could not effectively lead their members.

Their concerns came to a head in 2011, when top Scientologist leaders began disappearing from public view; most of the officials with the power to challenge



Miscavige were being systematically removed from their positions, and being put on “Ethics”, where they suffered abuse and were not allowed to communicate with other members of the Church (Wright 2013). Dani Cook, one of the head members of the Dror center wrote an open letter to Scientologists, decrying Miscavige’s command structure. Additionally, he pointed out that the fundraising strategies the Church was using to build new “ideal orgs” goes against Hubbard’s teachings. In response, Dani was officially censured by the Church, without any response to the substance of the letter.

Without any significant response from the Church, the members of the Dror center began to research negative information about Church practices, an action vehemently banned for Scientologists. Influenced by others who have broken away from the Church, but maintained their practices, the Dror center held an internal vote to become an independent organization. In 2012, they distributed an Independence letter to many Scientologists, notifying Church leadership of their decision to leave, and urging members to follow suit and to research offenses committed by the Church. Indeed the letter goes so far as to claim that Miscavige has committed treason against the teachings of Scientology.

In both of these cases, organizational change led members to question the applicability of the current operational apparatus to uphold their stated beliefs. in this case to follow the doctrines of Scientology to “clear” the planet. In the case of the mission holders, their ability to lead their members was constrained, and their role within the organization was largely removed. Even former mission holders who remained in the organization, such as the leaders of the Dror center, relied on the central branch for the majority of their operational directions.

Many believe that the religious views of Scientologists are what drives them to

leave their faith. However, many individuals keep their faith and merely choose to leave the Church. From this, we can conclude that organized religion develops both an organizational and religious identity with members, which are required to be internally consistent. Conflicts between doctrinal commands and organizational operations can lead members to leave in droves. While Scientology is a highly specific case, these lessons may port over to corporate and non-profit organizations as well. Many of these groups take on mission statements and statements of organizational goals and values. Individuals hold organizations to these goals and will protest groups that violate them (Bartley and Child 2014). Organizational practices are expected to align with the moral and social persona that organizations present. In this way, both religious and non-religious organizations must understand the moral, social, and operational expectations of their members. The following section proposed an applied study to build on the findings from this case study.

### 7.3 Discursive Strategies in the Dror Center Schism

It should be no surprise that the Church of Scientology as an organization holds fast to a strict bureaucratic hierarchy, adhering to policies and procedures when dealing with dissent within the organization. One of the more famous of these policies is a “declare”, in which the organization lists an individual or group as subversive to the goals of The Church and recommends that members in good standing cease contact with the declared person. This declaration serves as a notice of the shortcomings of the individual and lays out the reasoning to remove them from the organization. While someone who has been declared as “suppressive” is technically able to rejoin the organization through a lengthy reconciliation process, this is quite rare. For the

majority of members, being declared as suppressive means a severing of ties from their community, and potential legal and financial repercussions.

This is the context surrounding the contestation between the Lembergers, leaders of the Dror Center, and The Church, in particular its leader, David Miscavige. Discursive strategies employed by official statements are quite important for several reasons; first, in the case of declarations, the reasoning behind the decision is included, with specific tenets and laws specified, including the methods by which they were violated. By addressing these specific laws, and by observing differences in their interpretation, we are able to glean the ideological differences that separate the Lembergers from Scientology as prescribed by David Miscavige. Secondly, official messages are the only method the Lembergers had to communicate with the remaining members of The Church. Officially, meeting with suppressive persons is considered dangerous, and generally prohibited for most members of The Church. Thus, the Lembergers would have little recourse to argue their points against the declare. Their works are geared towards Church officials, and members who may already be questioning the organization by reading works that are technically banned. Thus, included in these messages are not only refutations of accusations, but also explanations of differences in ideology and organizational functioning. These messages are documented on the Dror Center website: <http://scnil.org/english/dror-center-independence/>

Through these works, the Lembergers seek to reinforce their ideal of Scientology as an organization. In their view, Scientology as a practice can be separated from the administrative structure and fundraising activities that have arisen during their tenure in the organization. In the following edict, the Lembergers seek to separate out the portions of Scientology that they see as integral to the religion, and those that are unacceptable as organizational practices. In this effort, they urge a return to

the missions system, in which the practices of Scientology are shared freely with the general public, and members are not charged for services. However, to new adherents of Scientology, what the Lembergers claim constitutes a radical change Scientology. From their perspective, fundraising and membership are key components of daily organizational life, and may be nearly inseparable from the religion itself. While the Lembergers employ several discursive strategies that may ameliorate this disconnect in a recent convert, this work demonstrates the complex meshing of organizational and religious practices, and the change in these relationships as religious organizations develop.

#### 7.3.0.1 Dietics

##### Excerpt 1

Miscavige refuses to be in comm, refuses to be accountable, refuses to tell us truthfully what is going on. Those writing previous letters were subjected to stiff 'Ethics' and accused of spreading 'entheta' and creating ARC breaks within the group. We were told by OSA and Ethics Officers that Miscavige is 'our leader,' cannot be questioned and that we must not read the internet. Also, that the IAS is, "COB's financial arm for financing Scientology" and thus must be supported.

This totalitarian 'logic' is unacceptable to us, hence our action in putting ethics in on Miscavige. We ask that you read the attached letter and decide for yourself what is true.

If you, fellow Scientologist, agree with what we say, please put it in writing. If we all unite in putting ethics in, we will win. We will save Scientology and we will see renewed expansion and rapid progress towards a Cleared Planet.

The use and emphasis of pronouns in this section set the leaders of the Dror center as true friends of Scientologists and sets Miscavige apart. First, the appearance of 'our leader' in quotations could be read with an emphasis '**our** leader', extending the

“our” to cover both the recipient of the letter and the members of the Dror center. This form of discursive extension occurs again in the final paragraph. The initial ‘we’ clearly pertains to just the writers of the letter, however, the next four occurrences extend to cover all practicing members of Scientology. In this extension, any reader who does agree with the statements within is rhetorically included in the struggle to save the religion from its current misguided practices.

As previously discussed, one of the challenges that the Lembergers may face is that recent converts to Scientology will not recognize the version of Scientology that is argued throughout this message. It is unclear if these discursive strategies were undertaken with this difficulty in mind. However, the discursive extension of the Lemberger’s version of the organization extending to all current practitioners of Scientology shows that they do see the negative aspects of the organization as resting solely with Miscavige and his organizational edicts.

### 7.3.0.2 Perspectivization

#### Excerpt 2

We have always pushed our public to move on to higher orgs, working closely with Tel Aviv Org, AOSH EU and Flag. We have won many awards for being Top FSM’s and for our contribution to the expansion of Scientology. Many of our public have joined staff at TAV Org and the Sea Org.

Our auditors have won numerous awards as Top International Auditors and as Top Auditors for Europe and Israel. We are proud of our achievements and intend to continue working to achieve Ron’s vision of a New Civilization and a Cleared Planet.

We believe that Dror comes close to a Scientology activity as described by Ron in “The Ideal Org” and in many other policies. Our public enjoys coming here for totally Standard Tech, friendly service and a distraction-

free environment. We have never demanded they pay ‘memberships’ or join staff. Our staff is professional, well-paid and we do not allow moon-lighting. Our premises are well-kept and just the size necessary for the volume of public and delivery. In the HGC, we have installed an advanced look-in system that guarantees Standard Tech.

Our observation, over the past few years, is that the Church has now become an obstacle to achieving the goals of Ron rather than a safe route to travel up the Bridge. This is clearly the doing of one man, David Miscavige. Thus we demand his immediate resignation. We have communicated our concerns many times, yet never got a response.

This portion of the text represents two discursive strategies that lie under the umbrella of perspectivation: Positive self-representation and Negative other-presentation. In this passage, the Dror center presents its track record of stellar performance, to combat any rumors that they are being declared for lack of performance, and paints the Church as misguided in its direction. Importantly, the Lembergers claim that the organization follows closer to the prescriptions of L Ron Hubbard than the current Church administration: under Scientology, all rules and regulations were set forth by L Ron Hubbard, and upon his demise, the Church was left without an apparatus to grow and change along with society at large. This underscores the importance of organizational practices as they relate to decisions to exit: this schism results directly from mundane organizational practices, rather than disagreements over doctrine.

### 7.3.0.3 Argumentation

#### Excerpt 3

Dror Center has been paying for the past 20 years 10% of its income to Management. We have received nothing in return – no advertising, no promotion, no support. Same goes for all field auditors, Missions, WISE consultants, Applied Scholastics activities. Field auditors and missions are viewed as “competition” to the orgs and are not encouraged or assisted in any way. Very few young auditors are joining our ranks. Our academies

are empty and there are very few new auditors being trained or opening new practices.

Through the argumentation in the letter, the Dror center lays out the mundane reasons for their split with the Church. Although schisms are often painted in the light of major ideological discrepancies, this reasoning clearly points to grievances with daily organizational life as the main driver for their conflict with Miscavige. In this section they depict Management as a source of extraction, siphoning off funds without providing any of the organizational benefits that have been promised. Importantly, this passage, unlike many of the other portions of the letter, does not mention any specific ideological facet of Scientology, nor name any individual member. Previous sections have been aimed primarily at David Miscavige, leveling the blame on his shoulders and leaving the rest of the Church untouched. However, this change in the use of anthroponyms signals that the Lembergers do have issues with the Church at large, and may not believe that Miscavige alone is to blame for every issue in Scientology Wodak 2011. This underscores their willingness to split from the organization, rather than attempt a protracted campaign against Miscavige.

#### Excerpt 4

##### 6.1 High Crimes, as listed in the Scientology Ethics Book

##### A. “Organizing Splinter Groups . . .” and “Organizing a splinter group . . .”

—

YES! Sounds strange but when so many are forced out of the Church and into the “independent” field, Miscavige is in fact pushing power to the splinter groups and systematically dismembering the Scientology organization. If and when the undersigned get declared, and thus splintered away, it will be more destruction to the Church and a joyous celebration for the “independents.”

In this section, the Lembergers seek to alter the grounds of discussion. They realize that they will be cast out of the church, and recognize that their ideology condemns splinter groups as a high form of treason. However, they seek to push the blame

for this separation onto Miscavige, placing their role in the situation as inevitable. The use of the passive tense in “splintered away” is an attempt to shift the burden of action onto Miscavige and The Church. This passage also concerns the flow of power away from the organized Church and towards independent organizations. Here, the Lemberger’s explicitly create the sense that the Church is losing influence over Scientology practices, with the Dror center acting as a significant boon for independent practitioners. Once more, this language serves to influence potential new converts to the organization, who may not even be aware of independent Scientologist groups. These groups tend to appeal to members who are enamored with the technology of Scientology, but who suffer under their practices; thus, seeking and absorbing information on these groups is prohibited for practicing members of the Church.

#### Excerpt 5

##### Assignment of Treason Condition – David Miscavige

We, the undersigned, staff of Dror Center, Scientology Mission of Haifa, Israel, have convened and after thorough review, have determined that David Miscavige, who currently holds the post of COB RTC, is in the Condition of Treason.

We have been staff and active Scientologists for many years. Our goal is a cleared planet and broad dissemination of Standard Tech. This has not been happening over the past years. In fact, management actions under Miscavige have caused the Church to stray away from its goals.

Near the end of their letter, the Dror center makes clear the differences between their perceptions of power within the organization, and the expressions of power that they have seen. Just after this quote, they cite specific passages in edicts from L. Ron Hubbard that detail the ability of any organizational member to assign a condition of treason, even against executive members of the Church. However, it remains clear from the previous sections in the letter that they have little faith that their declaration will garner widespread support among executive members of Scientology. Thus, as



they remain within the umbrella of The Church, they lack access to power that they believe is afforded to them through the teachings of Scientology. This reveals that, for the members of the Dror Center, a split from the organizational arm of Scientology does not engender an illicit act, but rather corrects an abuse of power, and brings them closer to following the teachings of the religion.

### 7.3.1 Discourse and NRMs

The discursive strategies employed by the Dror Center emphasize the importance of organizational functions in decisions to exit an organization. The Lembergers seem to implicitly understand that their ability to remain within The Church of Scientology is coming to an end, however, they are clear that their beliefs in the edicts of Scientology and the teachings of Hubbard remain unshaken. They lay the problems of the organization at the feet of its leader, David Miscavige, consistently naming him as the root cause. When they discuss widespread issues, their language becomes amorphous and less accusatory. This underscores their personal grievances with the decisions of management, not with the religion itself. Additionally, they make several calls to action extolling current members to take action against Miscavige, claiming that the only way to return to the teachings of the religion is to oust him from leadership. Through these claims, the Lembergers reverse the accusations leveled at them, painting Miscavige as responsible for a rise in independent groups, while inviting members to join them to remain within the church. This language engenders a return to a prior position of power; they believe that current leadership has unfairly stripped rank and file members of the authority invested in them by the teachings of

L. Ron Hubbard, and by becoming “independent” they are returning to a state of balance.

An understanding of the discursive strategies employed by the Lembergers provides an understanding of their perspective on the nature of the interaction between organization and faith. In their statements, they clearly separate organizational functions from religious edicts. Scientology remains a constant, and the value of religious practices does not come into question. Rather, their grievances stem from organizational activities outside of those prescribed by L. Ron Hubbard. Many of these activities, including more aggressive canvassing for members, the increased real estate activities that generate profit for the church, and the “ideal org” system to systematize teachings, are the facets that allow Scientology to survive and grow as an organization. The legal and financial activities of the Church, although they generate much negative attention for the organization, have allowed it to retain influence. Although the Lembergers argue for seemingly minor changes to operations within the Church, to bring it back in line with Scientology regulations, their prescriptions would change the public-facing nature of the organization, and radically alter its day-to-day activities.

This opens discussions on the link between religious edicts and daily organizational life. The Lembergers were early Scientology followers, experiencing radical changes in organizational activity during the transition of power from L. Ron Hubbard to David Miscavige. However, more recent Scientology converts may not be able to easily separate the daily organizational practices from the practice of the religion. What is a minor change to the Lembergers, merely a restoration of normal organizational power, may represent a fundamental change for recent members. This underscores the importance of a critical perspective when viewing issues that navigate the boundary between simple organizational function and religious reformation. In these letters,

the Lembergers seek to impose their reality of organizational life within Scientology, positioning themselves as the arbiters of organizational life, and challenging Miscavige's role as arbiter of truth (Mills 2004). This text operates to reestablish the Lemberger's notion of Scientology, and to challenge the construction of Scientology as a centrally dominated organization. It reinstates an earlier notion of Scientology, with the teachings as "technology" that can be mastered and shared more freely by adherents.

In this paper, a focus on traditional analysis of the units of language employed by the authors is eschewed for a wider analysis of organizational change, and the altered notions of power found within. However, although the organizational context that houses this debate is the primary analytical point, this paper continues to understand the ways that discourse is employed linguistically to alter its current context (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2010). Rather than a focus on the construction of the language, organizational context is used to understand the position of the author and intended audience, and to delineate the struggle for power and identity within a changing organization.

Further work is necessary to understand how organizational practices become intertwined with the requirements of the faith. In this limited review, individual images of Scientology as an organization were treated as set. However, this document was clearly issued to alter perceptions of the Church for members outside of the Dror center. For future studies, an in depth study of changing perceptions of an organizations, culminating in individual or group exit events would generate insights into individual attachments to religious edicts and organizational practices. Sociological studies of network effects and points of influence, when combined with the study of discourse, can be employed to trace the impact of decisions to exit. This allows researchers

to understand how different organizational realities are formed, and investigate the factors that make organizations separate around these rifts.

The following section proposes an amendment to current studies of organizational fracturing outside of religious organizations, to correct current measures of exit, and to provide a greater understanding of the motivations driving exit. This section addresses the ways that lessons from studies of identity and exit can be integrated into existing work that focuses on more traditional organizations.

#### 7.4 Organizational Surveys and Exit

While the development of exit requires researchers to expand their view outside of profit-generating organizations, it does not require us to abandon them completely. Currently, measures of turnover intention are ineffectual and offer no predictive power above demographic factors (Cohen, Blake, and Goodman 2016; Ngo-Henha 2017). These measures assume that within a profit-generating organization money, working conditions, and work satisfaction are the driving factors in the likelihood to exit. However, this view imposes the same profit focus on individuals that it does on organizations. On the contrary, exit is a social and moral process over a rational calculation. The current measure of turnover intention assumes a stereotypical attitude toward work. It cannot capture individual satisfaction in their role in their community, or in the world at large.

An expanded view of exit is necessary to compensate for the current lack of explanatory power within the turnover intention subfield. Although their goals are often not as far-reaching as religious organizations, modern organizations often have a mission statement, set of goals, and set of values that they claim to uphold. Workers

and the public at large hold organizations to these values, to the extent that they often view groups as legally obligated to uphold them (Bartley 2005). Similar to religious organizations, when individuals see operational practices that appear to violate these values, they are likely to become disenchanted with the group, and begin to leave.

By incorporating these social and moral processes into surveys pertaining to turnover intention, researchers can gain greater insight into organizational members' affinity for their organizations. Additionally, these surveys should be administered to organizational leadership as well as general members. Since mass exit is often caused by a perceived change in the essence of an organization, differing views on organizational identity between management and general members signal the potential for organizational change that members may find undesirable.

This research remains highly applicable to human resource managers and expands their ability to interact with organizational members. Human resource managers would be alerted to disconnects between management and general organizational members and could gain insight into the impact that planned organizational changes may have on members. Additionally, addressing member concerns about the cultural and social identity within their organization could provide the avenues of expression needed to prevent organizational members from the need to exit in protest. It can also help prevent social stratification, as precarious workers who take the exit option often faced the increased burden of job scams that pervade sites that provide immediate and available work (Ravenelle, Janko, and Cai Kowalski 2022).

One benefit to this approach is that organizational concerns can be addressed before resistant exits occur. This proactive stance may hold the most benefit to “precarious workers” or workers who are unable to go without wages for any period of time (Ravenelle, Cai Kowalski, and Janko 2021). These workers are unable to practice

exit due to a lack of available funds, stable living conditions, or a reliance on the benefits ties to work, such as medical and retirement benefits. However, given an accurate measure of turnover intention, it is possible for Human Resource managers to gauge their desire to leave organizations. With an accurate measure, it will be able for managers to respond to the concerns of these workers, preventing them from being trapped in working conditions that they cannot leave.

Currently, turnover research follows the following guidelines: performance culture perception, workload satisfaction, opportunity satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and work schedule satisfaction (Cohen, Blake, and Goodman 2016). These items are usually graded on a Likert scale, expecting lower scores on each of the items to correlate with higher turnover. While these indicators cover the workplace well as it applies to monetary and some social areas, it performs poorly in measuring the way that members see themselves within an organization, and how they see that organization in society. This lack of context may explain why the measures perform poorly compared to simple demographic factors; many of the questions on the survey correlate with age and tenure in an organization. While the measure is labeled turnover intention, it fails to account for many factors that individuals use to develop their intentions and goals. In order to develop measures that correlate to actual intentions, survey questions must gauge the moral and social factors that lead to decisions to exit.

Existing measures of turnover intention concern a comprehensive view of conditions as it relates to work. Currently, the following subject areas comprise the scope of these surveys:

- Collective Member Perceptions
  - telework
  - performance culture

- pay satisfaction
- advancement opportunities
- workload
- flexible work schedule
- Performance management practices
  - Continuous Feedback
  - Ongoing evaluation
- Collective member characteristics
  - Age
  - Job tenure
  - Workforce diversity
  - Gender

Survey questions relating to these items are most often graded on a Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. While these questions appear to be comprehensive, they only connect intention to quit to specific work-related conditions. given this survey, positive working conditions comprise the only factors related to individual decisions to quit. However, as personal fulfillment and the desire to work in an ethical organization factor into individual decisions to leave, the survey must be amended to include a wider range of topics. This study proposes that adding the following issue areas into the survey will improve its predictive power in relation to actual turnover rate.

- Voice
  - Inclusion in decision-making processes
  - Satisfaction with deliberation procedures

- Acceptance of deliberation outcomes
- Moral Standing
  - Agreement with organizational values
  - Contributions of the organization to the community
  - Agreement with organizational growth
- Affinity with organization
  - Willingness to refer friends and family
  - Willingness to personally engage

These items can match the same 1-5 Likert scale as the existing surveys for consistency. Additionally, the specific questions that measure these topic areas can easily follow the structure of the existing survey questions, diminishing impact on the rest of the survey, and allowing seamless integration to existing measures. Additionally, the analysis and application of these measures can match up with the existing measures, while allowing human resource managers to gain further insight into the moral and social standing of their organization with members.

This proposed future study would develop specific survey questions related to these issue areas, and combine these questions with existing turnover intention surveys to compare their use as a predictor of actual turnover. Additionally, if applied to an organization that is experiencing resistant exits, a longitudinal study tracking former employees would measure their ability to predict with former members become resistant exiters. By comparing resistant individuals' scores, a prediction measure could be developed from this survey.

Currently, there are several restrictions to implementing this study. Both longitudinal studies and studies that follow actual turnover rates have a higher cost in



both money and time, hence the development of turnover intention as a correlate. Additionally, in the case of individuals who practice resistant exit, issues of accessibility and willingness to engage with research arise. However, it is necessary to improve current measurements. The combination of poor investigation of assumptions and the need to circumvent a longer research process has led human resource managers to work with flawed empirical tools. This comes at a cost to organizations, and to organizational members, who should reap the benefits of an organization that listens and responds to their needs. A better measure of turnover intention would serve to improve conditions for human resource managers and organizational members through an open dialog on issues of culture and moral disconnect within a group. In addition, the time and profit saved on organizational ends offset the increased costs of reevaluating this empirical tool.

## Chapter 8

### CONCLUSION

In this paper, by applying the concept of exit to extant organizational studies frameworks several large gaps have emerged. First and foremost is the membership boundary. The wide-held, although scarcely acknowledged, view that members cease to affect organizations after their exit guides organizational studies down narrow and misguided paths. Individuals have been contesting organizations over labor concerns for centuries, and their efforts can create widespread changes that alter entire industries. Additionally, public perceptions around individual relationships change over time; specifically, norms around bashing, badmouthing, and smearing former employees may be beginning to change. When observing interactions across this boundary, concerns of individual autonomy, working conditions, and overarching approaches to work emerge. These concerns affect organizational cultures, operations, as well as legal and social standings.

There exists many approaches to span this boundary, however, resistant exit provides one of the clearest examples of post-exit attempts to alter organizational operations. By highlighting individuals who exit specifically to gain the autonomy to protest their former group, the inadequacies of current models of exit become clear. Under the dominant paradigm, individuals leave solely to withdraw income or support for an organization or to seek employment in other areas. While this view may represent many people, it has resulted in a misguided view of individual motivations. Profit, workload, and working hours are seen as the dominating factors

in individual decision-making. Unfortunately, this lack of depth in models of exit has resulted in inefficient and ineffectual predictors of exit.

Extant theory on exit within organizational leadership rests on the assumption that exit engenders a complete and total separation from an organization. In this scenario, organizations can solve their issues by stemming the expression, exit, even if the underlying factors are not addressed. Under this assumption, repressive strategies to deal with exit, such as non-disclosure and non-compete agreements, are theoretically identical to supportive strategies which understand and respond to underlying drivers of exit. By judging exit solely by the implications of the outcome for organizational effectiveness, organizational leadership has effectively created a black box surrounding the phenomenon.

By acknowledging the importance of exit decisions, and the ramifications of the actions of former members, organizational leadership studies is able to expand the boundaries of study, and collaborate more effectively across disciplinary borders. This paper outlines social and political motives for members to exit, shining a light on the importance of individual autonomy when analyzing organizational outcomes.

These lessons necessitate several changes in the organizational leadership studies field. First, organizations must be placed in a greater operational context. As the field trends towards approaching organizations from a complexity view, focusing on the relationships between individuals and acknowledging the importance of situations to organizational functioning, it must also begin to understand the social and political contexts that drive organizational members to support group efforts. This involves an understanding of individual emotional, social, and moral connections with the organization. While further work is necessary to systematically and empirically test the likelihood of a resistant exit, it is expected that group members with a higher social and

moral connection to an organizational goal or outcome may be more likely to protest and organization if they leave or are removed based on operational changes. The need for a moral and emotional connection points towards fruitful areas of investigation, such as the study of New Religious Movements forwarded earlier in the paper, and encourages researchers to study groups outside of an employer/employee dynamic. For example, interactions between end users and tech platforms show many examples of exit. End users generate the context for social media platforms, and thus enter into a tacit form of production with the media company, even if they are not a formal member of the organization and do not derive monetary benefit from the group. As social media platforms benefit from network effects, where their active users determine the attractiveness of the platform for new users, they should be especially sensitive to resistant exits from well connected users. Understanding the importance of resistance when exiting an organization opens the field of study to a broader understanding of organizations within their social contexts.

By understanding organizations within a social web of former members, current members and beneficiaries, and potential members, researchers can address their own conceptions of what an organization is, what its goals should be, and how prescriptions derived from their research will impact organizational and extra-organizational life. By engaging critically with the value of stated organizational goals, researchers can identify any predilections toward measuring the success of organizations through the achievement of their stated goal by default. Rather, the analysis of organizational life need not engage substantially with organizational goals. In the treatment of Scientology in this paper, it is not necessary to center organizational goals when discussing organizational life and conflict. Rather, by focusing on individual interpretations of organizational action, centering the perceptions and experiences of individual members,

it becomes possible to engage with the organizational life of a Scientologist without proscribing value, positive or negative, to the goals of the organization.

Finally, this change in perspective offers more useful advice for organizational leaders. By engaging with the social and moral needs of organizational members, an organization can be more responsive to their needs, and aware of the impact that potential changes could cause. Rather than relying on faulty measures of turnover, or actualized turnover rates once members have left, organizations can better map member's perspectives of the important aspects of their goals and operations. Additionally, organizations gain perspective on their standing among former members, and can address perpetuated images of the group that may have lasting harmful effects on recruitment and operations.

## REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 1990. "HIERARCHIES, JOBS, BODIES:: A Theory of Gendered Organizations" [in en]. *Gender & Society* 4, no. 2 (June): 139–158. Accessed March 31, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002>.
- Alvesson, Mats, and Andre Spicer. 2012. "Critical leadership studies: The case for critical performativity." *Human Relations* 65 (3): 367–390.
- Andersen, Jon Aarum. 2014. "Ladies and gentlemen: leadership has left the building" [in en]. *Leadership and the Humanities* 2, no. 2 (September): 94–107. Accessed November 22, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.4337/lath.2014.02.01>.
- Antonio, Robert J. 1981. "Immanent Critique as the Core of Critical Theory: Its Origins and Developments in Hegel, Marx and Contemporary Thought" [in en]. *The British Journal of Sociology* 32, no. 3 (September): 330. Accessed November 28, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/589281>.
- Baines, Donna, and Ian Cunningham. 2011. "'White knuckle care work': violence, gender and new public management in the voluntary sector." *Work, employment and society* 25 (4): 760–776.
- Barker, Eileen. 1984. *The Making of a Moonie: Choice or Brainwashing?* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- . 2012. "New Religious Movements: Their incidence and significance" [in en]. In *New Religious Movements*, 0th ed., 33–50. Routledge, December. Accessed November 6, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203129166-9>.
- Bartley, Tim. 2005. "Corporate Accountability and the Privatization of Labor Standards: Struggles over codes of conduct in the apparel industry." *Politics and the Corporation* 14:211–244.
- Bartley, Tim, and Curtis Child. 2014. "Shaming the Corporation: The Social Production of Targets and the Anti-Sweatshop Movement." *American Sociological Review* 79 (4): 653–679.
- Beer, Michael, and Russell A. Eisenstat. 1996. "Developing an Organization Capable of Implementing Strategy and Learning" [in en]. *Human Relations* 49, no. 5 (May): 597–619. Accessed January 10, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679604900504>.

- Bittner, Egon. 1965. "THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATION" [in en]. *Social Research* 32 (3): 239–255.
- Bothello, Joel, Robert S. Nason, and Gerhard Schnyder. 2019. "Institutional Voids and Organization Studies: Towards an epistemological rupture" [in en]. *Organization Studies* 40, no. 10 (October): 1499–1512. Accessed May 15, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618819037>.
- Brass, Daniel J. 1984. "Being in the Right Place: A Structural Analysis of Individual Influence in an Organization" [in en]. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 29, no. 4 (December): 518. Accessed January 10, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392937>.
- Bromley, David G. 2021. "Sources of Challenge to Charismatic Authority in Newly Emerging Religious Movements" [in en]. *Nova Religio* 24, no. 4 (May): 26–40. Accessed November 6, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1525/nr.2021.24.4.26>.
- Carr, Adrian. 2000. "Critical theory and the management of change in organizations" [in en]. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 13, no. 3 (June): 208–220. Accessed November 22, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810010330869>.
- Castillo, Elizabeth A., and Mai P. Trinh. 2018. "In search of missing time: A review of the study of time in leadership research" [in en]. *The Leadership Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (February): 165–178. Accessed July 12, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.001>.
- Chan, Jenny. 2013. "A suicide survivor: the life of a Chinese worker." *New technology, work, and employment* 28 (2): 84–99.
- Chenoweth, Erica, and Maria J. Stephan. 2011. *Why civil resistance works: the strategic logic of nonviolent conflict* [in eng]. Columbia studies in terrorism and irregular warfare. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cho, Yoon Jik, and Gregory Lewis. 2012. "Turnover Intention and Turnover Behavior: Implications for Retaining Federal Employees." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 32 (1): 4–23.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie, and Norman Fairclough. 2010. "Critical Discourse Analysis in Organizational Studies: Towards an Integrationist Methodology: Critical Discourse Analysis in Organizational Studies" [in en]. *Journal of Management Studies* 47, no. 6 (September): 1213–1218. Accessed February 2, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00883.x>.

- Coates, Dominiek D. 2013. “Disaffiliation from a New Religious Movement: The Importance of Self and Others in Exit: Disaffiliation from NRM” [in en]. *Symbolic Interaction* 36, no. 3 (August): 314–334. Accessed November 21, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.60>.
- Cohen, Galia, Robert S. Blake, and Doug Goodman. 2016. “Does Turnover Intention Matter? Evaluating the Usefulness of Turnover Intention Rate as a Predictor of Actual Turnover Rate” [in en]. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 36, no. 3 (September): 240–263. Accessed July 15, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X15581850>.
- Contu, Alessia. 2019. “Conflict and Organization Studies” [in en]. *Organization Studies* 40, no. 10 (October): 1445–1462. Accessed May 15, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617747916>.
- Costas, Jana, and Chris Grey. 2019. “Violence and Organization Studies” [in en]. *Organization Studies* 40, no. 10 (October): 1573–1586. Accessed May 15, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618782282>.
- Cusack, Carole. 2017. ““Squirrels” and Unauthorized Uses of Scientology: Werner Erhard and est, Ken Dyers and Kenja, and Harvey Jackins and Re-Evaluation Counselling” [in en]. In *Handbook of Scientology*, edited by James R. Lewis, 485–506. BRILL, January. Accessed August 17, 2021. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004330542\\_023](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004330542_023).
- Davenport, Christian. 2015. *How Social Movements Die: Repression and Demobilization of the Republic of New Africa*. New York, United States: Cambridge University Press.
- DeGroot, Timothy, D. Scott Kiker, and Thomas C. Cross. 2009. “A Meta-Analysis to Review Organizational Outcomes Related to Charismatic Leadership” [in en]. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration* 17, no. 4 (April): 356–372. Accessed September 13, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.2000.tb00234.x>.
- Del Rey, Jason. 2022. “Leaked Amazon memo warns the company is running out of people to hire.” *Vox* (June). Accessed July 10, 2022. <https://www.vox.com/recode/23170900/leaked-amazon-memo-warehouses-hiring-shortage>.
- DiNatale, Natale, and Kayla West. 2022. “Union Representation Petitions Are Up 57 Percent, but That’s Not All!” *The National Law Review* (May). [https://www.natlawreview.com/article/union-representation-petitions-are-57-percent-s-not-all#google\\_vignette](https://www.natlawreview.com/article/union-representation-petitions-are-57-percent-s-not-all#google_vignette).



- Dobbin, Frank, Daniel Schrage, and Alexandra Kalev. 2015. "Rage against the Iron Cage: The Varied Effects of Bureaucratic Personnel Reforms on Diversity" [in en]. *American Sociological Review* 80, no. 5 (October): 1014–1044. Accessed March 13, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122415596416>.
- Ellis, Lindsay, and Angela Yang. 2022. "If Your Co-Workers Are 'Quiet Quitting,' Here's What That Means." *Wall Street Journal* (August). Accessed August 15, 2022. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/if-your-gen-z-co-workers-are-quiet-quitting-heres-what-that-means-11660260608>.
- Fassbender, Eric. 2020. "Variations in the Effectiveness of Politically Motivated Suicide: Exploring Symbolism and Group Access." Master's thesis, Arizona State University.
- Fuller, Joseph, and William Kerr. 2022. "The Great Resignation Didn't Start with the Pandemic." *Harvard Business Review* (March). <https://hbr.org/2022/03/the-great-resignation-didnt-start-with-the-pandemic>.
- "Labor Unions." n.d. *Gallup*, accessed June 20, 2022. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/12751/labor-unions.aspx>.
- Goddard, Stacie E. 2006. "Uncommon Ground: Indivisible Territory and the Politics of Legitimacy" [in en]. *International Organization* 60, no. 01 (January). Accessed July 4, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818306060024>.
- Greenwood, Royston, and Thomas B. Lawrence. 2005. "The Iron Cage in the Information Age: The Legacy and Relevance of Max Weber for Organization Studies. Editorial" [in en]. *Organization Studies* 26, no. 4 (April): 493–499. Accessed May 6, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605051465>.
- Grey, Colin. 2020. "Bureaucracy without alienation" [in en]. *University of Toronto Law Journal* 71, no. 1 (November): 126–143. Accessed March 13, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.3138/utlj-2020-0060>.
- Hairon, Salleh, and Jonathan WP Goh. 2015. "Pursuing the elusive construct of distributed leadership: Is the search over?" [In en]. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 43, no. 5 (September): 693–718. Accessed March 31, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214535745>.
- Har, Janie. 2022. "Some schools build affordable housing to retain teachers." *AP News* (July). <https://apnews.com/article/teacher-shortage-housing-california-cb46ae358d85a55ecfc852603f07db23>.

- Hechter, Michael. 1987. *Principles of Group Solidarity*. University of California Press.
- Hellesoy, Kjersti. 2017. “Scientology Schismatics” [in en]. In *Handbook of Scientology*, edited by James R. Lewis, 448–461. BRILL, January. Accessed August 18, 2021. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004330542\\_021](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004330542_021).
- Hensel, Paul R., and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2005. “Issue indivisibility and territorial claims\*” [in en]. *GeoJournal* 64, no. 4 (December): 275–285. Accessed July 4, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-005-5803-3>.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1978. “Exit, Voice, and the State.” *World Politics* 31 (1): 90–107. Accessed September 11, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009968>.
- Kelly, Simon. 2008. “Leadership: A categorical mistake?” [In en]. *Human Relations* 61, no. 6 (June): 763–782. Accessed November 22, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708092403>.
- Kirkpatrick, Jennet. 2015. “Exit out of Athens? Migration and Obligation in Plato’s Crito.” *Political Theory* 43 (3): 356–379.
- . 2016. “Walking Away with Thoreau: The Pleasures and Risks of Exit.” *American Political Thought* 5:446–466.
- . 2017. *The Virtues of Exit: on Resistance and Quitting Politics* [in en-US]. The University of North Carolina Press. Accessed March 4, 2019. <https://www.uncpress.org/book/9781469635392/the-virtues-of-exit>.
- . 2019. “Resistant exit.” *Contemporary Political Theory* 18 (2): 135–157. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41296-018-0252-1>.
- Kochhar, Rakesh, Kim Parker, and Ruth Igielnik. 2022. “Majority of U.S. Workers Changing Jobs Are Seeing Real Wage Gains.” *Pew Research Center* (July). Accessed August 18, 2022. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2022/07/28/majority-of-u-s-workers-changing-jobs-are-seeing-real-wage-gains/>.
- Learmonth, Mark, and Kevin Morrell. 2017. “Is critical leadership studies ‘critical’?” [In en]. *Leadership* 13, no. 3 (July): 257–271. Accessed November 22, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715016649722>.
- Lewis, James R., ed. 2017. “The Dror Center Schism, The Cook Letter and Scientology’s Legitimation Crisis” [in en]. In *Handbook of Scientology*, 462–484. BRILL, January. Accessed August 17, 2021. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004330542\\_022](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004330542_022).

- Lewis, Orion A., and Sven Steinmo. 2012. "How Institutions Evolve: Evolutionary Theory and Institutional Change" [in en]. *Polity* 44, no. 3 (July): 314–339. Accessed October 17, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1057/pol.2012.10>.
- Lounsbury, Michael, and Edward J. Carberry. 2005. "From King to Court Jester? Weber's Fall from Grace in Organizational Theory" [in en]. *Organization Studies* 26, no. 4 (April): 501–525. Accessed May 6, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605051486>.
- Lumby, Jacky. 2019. "Distributed Leadership and bureaucracy" [in en]. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 47, no. 1 (January): 5–19. Accessed March 13, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217711190>.
- Mills, Albert J., Terrance G. Weatherbee, and Gabrielle Durepos. 2014. "Reassembling Weber to reveal the-past-as-history in management and organization studies" [in en]. *Organization* 21, no. 2 (March): 225–243. Accessed March 13, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508413475495>.
- Mills, Sarah. 2004. *Discourse*. 2nd ed. The New Critical Idiom. New York, United States: Routledge.
- Morgan, Gareth. 2006. *Images of Organization*. Vol. Updated Edition. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Ngo-Henha, Pauline. 2017. "A Review of Existing Turnover Intention Theories." *International Journal of Economics and Management Engineering* 11 (11).
- Nieto-Munoz, Sophie. 2022. "Excessive injuries, low pay at Amazon warehouses cause high turnover, report claims." *New Jersey Monitor* (June). Accessed July 10, 2022. <https://newjerseymonitor.com/2022/06/23/excessive-injuries-low-pay-at-amazon-warehouses-cause-high-turnover-report-claims/>.
- O'Connor, Brian. 2022. "The rise of the anti-work movement." *British Broadcasting Channel* (January). <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220126-the-rise-of-the-anti-work-movement>.
- Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The logic of collective action; public goods and the theory of groups*. [in eng]. Harvard economic studies ; v. 124. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Parker, Kim, and Juliana Menasce Horowitz. 2022. "Majority of workers who quit a job in 2021 cite low pay, no opportunities for advancement, feeling disrespected." *Pew Research Center* (March). Accessed April 26, 2022. <https://www.pewresearch.com>.

org/fact-tank/2022/03/09/majority-of-workers-who-quit-a-job-in-2021-cite-low-pay-no-opportunities-for-advancement-feeling-disrespected/.

Peckham, Michael. 1998. “New Dimensions of Social Movement/Countermovement Interaction: The Case of Scientology and Its Internet Critics” [in en]. *Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie* 23 (4): 317. Accessed August 26, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3341804>.

Perelman, Michael. 2005. *Manufacturing Discontent: The Trap of Individualism in Corporate Society*. London: Pluto Press.

Ravenelle, Alexandra J. 2017. “Sharing economy workers: selling, not sharing.” *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 10:281–295.

———. 2019. ““We’re not uber:” control, autonomy, and entrepreneurship in the gig economy” [in en]. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 34, no. 4 (May): 269–285. Accessed August 19, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2018-0256>.

Ravenelle, Alexandra J., Ken Cai Kowalski, and Erica Janko. 2021. “The Side Hustle Safety Net: Precarious Workers and Gig Work during COVID-19.” *Sociological Perspectives, Coronavirus (COVID-19) and Society*, 64 (5): 898–919.

Ravenelle, Alexandra J., Erica Janko, and Ken Cai Kowalski. 2022. “Good jobs, scam jobs: Detecting, normalizing, and internalizing online job scams during the COVID-19 pandemic.” *New Media & Society* 24 (7): 1591–1610.

Richardson, James T. 2021. “The Myth of the Omnipotent Leader” [in en]. *Nova Religio* 24, no. 4 (May): 11–25. Accessed November 6, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1525/nr.2021.24.4.11>.

Rothstein, Bo. 2015. “The Chinese Paradox of High Growth and Low Quality of Government: The Cadre Organization Meets Max Weber: The Chinese Paradox” [in en]. *Governance* 28, no. 4 (October): 533–548. Accessed March 13, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12128>.

Sani, Fabio, and Steve Reicher. 2000. “Contested identities and schisms in groups: Opposing the ordination of women as priests in the Church of England.” *British Journal of Social Psychology* 39:95–112.

Sani, Fabio, and John Todman. 2002. “Should We Stay or Should We Go? A Social Psychological Model of Schisms in Groups.” Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28, no. 12 (December): 1647–1655. Accessed June 2, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014616702237646>.

- Scott, James. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. Yale University Press.
- Solomon, Robert C. 2004. "Aristotle, Ethics and Business Organizations" [in en]. *Organization Studies* 25, no. 6 (July): 1021–1043. Accessed December 2, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840604042409>.
- Strong, Tracy. 2012. *Politics Without Vision: Thinking without a Banister in the Twentieth Century*. University of Chicago Press.
- Swedberg, Richard. 1998. *Max Weber and the idea of economic sociology*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Tuxen Rubin, Elisabeth. 2017. "Affiliation, Disaffiliation and Its Significance for the Individual's Post-Movement Faith: A Sociological Study of Disaffiliated Scientologists with Emphasis on Their Post-Apostatic Religious Behavior and Attitudes" [in en]. In *Handbook of Scientology*, edited by James R. Lewis, 421–447. BRILL, January. Accessed August 18, 2021. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004330542\\_020](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004330542_020).
- Uhl-Bien, Mary, Russ Marion, and Bill McKelvey. 2007. "Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era" [in en]. *The Leadership Quarterly* 18, no. 4 (August): 298–318. Accessed May 18, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002>.
- Waterman, Robert, Thomas Peters, and Julien Phillips. 1980. "Structure is not Organization." *Business Horizons* 23 (3): 14–26.
- Weber, Max. 2019. *Economy and Society*. Third Printing. Edited and translated by Keith Tribe. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, Suze. 2016. *Thinking Differently About Leadership*. Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2011. "Complex texts: Analysing, understanding, explaining and interpreting meanings" [in en]. *Discourse Studies* 13, no. 5 (October): 623–633. Accessed January 3, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445611412745>.
- Wolin, Sheldon. 1960. *Politics and Vision*. Princeton University Press.
- Wright, Lawrence. 2013. *Going Clear: Scientology, Hollywood & the Prison of Belief*. New York: Vintage Books.