The Cost of *Disengagement*

CHRISTINE KAHANE | SEPTEMBER 2026

The work can look stable while people quietly compensate for conditions the organization has not addressed.

1. THE STABILITY THAT ISN'T

The work is getting done.

Customers are being served. Deadlines are met often enough. Problems get solved before they become visible outside the function that created them. The numbers may be holding. From several levels above the work, there may be little reason to think the organization is in trouble.

Look more closely at how the work actually gets done and another system begins to appear.

Someone knows the formal handoff will fail, so she calls the person who can move it through. Someone keeps a spreadsheet alongside the approved system because the information there cannot quite be trusted. A manager carries a decision between two functions that rarely speak directly. An experienced employee catches an error because he remembers what happened the last time. Someone takes responsibility for a problem she does not have the authority to solve because leaving it alone would make the eventual failure worse.

This is rarely dramatic. Often, it looks like competence.

The people doing this work may be among the most trusted people in the organization. They know the history and the exceptions. They know which process works as designed and which one needs help. They know who will answer the phone.

You can sometimes hear this knowledge in the shorthand that develops around recurring problems.

“We knew that was coming.”

“It's just another day in paradise.”

“Where’s the cheat sheet Shirley keeps?”

“Time to open the Ancient Spreadsheet.”

The language is casual because the condition is no longer surprising. These phrases become part of the operating vernacular, small cultural artifacts produced by repeated encounters with the real system. They carry information.

A joke can tell you that a failure is predictable. A nickname can reveal that a workaround has been around long enough to acquire a history. The existence of the cheat sheet tells you something the process documentation does not. People have learned the distance between what is supposed to happen and what actually happens.

That knowledge helps the organization function. It can also make it harder to see where the organization itself is no longer functioning very well.

A weak handoff reinforced every day by a conscientious manager can continue to look like a working handoff. Information carried informally across a structural gap still reaches its destination. A process dependent on memory can produce an acceptable result for years. Nobody necessarily records the intervention. The result arrives.

Over time, these accommodations stop feeling temporary. People work around them so routinely that the workaround becomes part of the work. New employees learn whom to ask. Experienced employees stop explaining why.

At some point the distinction between process and compensation becomes difficult to see, particularly for people far enough away from the work that they encounter only the outcome. Capable people can keep these arrangements functioning for a surprisingly long time.

This creates a peculiar kind of stability.

Performance can look stable because people are compensating for the very conditions causing disengagement.

That does not mean they have stopped caring. Some of the people carrying the greatest compensatory load care deeply about the quality of the work, about customers, about their colleagues, sometimes about an organization they have served for decades. They may be working harder than ever.

What changes is where they are willing to place their intelligence. They continue solving the problem in front of them. They may stop raising the problem behind it. They keep the work moving. They become more selective about challenging assumptions that have repeatedly survived challenge. They use judgment to prevent immediate failure while becoming less willing to offer that judgment where it has little influence on what happens next.

People learn which concerns will be taken seriously and which ones will be deferred again. They know when raising an issue will produce examination and when it will simply produce another meeting. Eventually, some questions stop being asked. And not because no one sees the problem but because people have seen it many times.

This is one reason the change can be difficult to recognize from performance indicators alone. The person may still be highly productive; the team may meet its commitments. A function that once generated visible friction may become noticeably easier to manage.

That apparent calm can be reassuring. It can also mean that people have become skilled at deciding where effort is worth spending.

Candor becomes selective as curiosity narrows toward what can actually be acted upon. Initiative remains, but it gets placed closer to the work, where somebody can still do something with it. Cross-functional questions are asked less often when the answers do not travel very far toward a resolution. As a result, people begin protecting their own capacity.

Meanwhile, the organization continues to benefit from what these people know.

This is where the picture becomes more complicated than the usual language of engagement suggests. For example, withdrawal does not necessarily appear first as less effort. Some forms of effort may increase: people compensate; they remember; they repair what they can.

A manager makes one more call because she knows the official route will take too long. An employee checks the Ancient Spreadsheet because somewhere in its aging cells is the answer the current system cannot produce. Someone stays late to reconcile information that never agrees without their manual intervention.

The organization may receive extraordinary effort from people who have already begun withdrawing another kind of contribution. It receives the solution to today's problem while hearing less about why the problem keeps returning.

It still has access to people's intelligence locally, while it may be losing access to that intelligence systemically. That loss is easy to miss because nothing has necessarily stopped. Orders are being filled. Meetings happen routinely. Decisions get made. Financial results may continue to arrive.

But stability produced through continuous human compensation is different from stability produced by a system capable of supporting its own work. For a while, the difference can remain almost invisible. Then one of the people carrying the workaround resigns. Pressure increases. The familiar exception handled by them manually encounters a condition it cannot absorb. So, what appears to be a sudden operational problem may turn out to have a much longer history.

By then, the question is no longer simply whether people are engaged. It is what the organization has gradually stopped receiving from them, even while the work continues.

2. WHAT DISENGAGEMENT ACTUALLY WITHDRAWS

If the work is still moving, and people may even be working harder to keep it moving, what exactly has been withdrawn?

This is where the usual language of engagement becomes less useful.

Disengagement is often recognized through changes in motivation, commitment, or effort. Those changes matter. But they do not explain the employee who continues producing excellent work while no longer offering an opinion in meetings, or the manager who will stay late to solve an operational problem but has stopped trying to change the process that keeps producing it.

Work is still being performed. Something else has changed.

Describing disengagement as the withdrawal of discretionary effort gets us part of the way there. Organizations can require attendance, assign tasks, establish performance expectations, and hold people accountable for outcomes. There are other forms of contribution they cannot require in the same way.

You cannot mandate that someone notice what does not fit.

You cannot write a job description that produces judgment at exactly the moment judgment is needed. An employee can be expected to report a problem, but the quality of what she notices, the connection she makes to something that happened six months ago, or her willingness to tell someone senior that the proposed solution will create another problem somewhere else does not arrive through compliance alone.

Much of what makes an organization intelligent enters through this discretionary layer.

By intelligence, we do not mean intelligence as status, education, or cognitive horsepower. We mean the human capacity brought to the work: noticing, interpreting, remembering, questioning, making connections, sensing that something has shifted before the metric moves. It includes judgment shaped by experience and knowledge that has never been fully captured in a process map. Sometimes it is simply the recognition that everyone is about to repeat a mistake the room has somehow agreed not to remember.

Organizations use this intelligence constantly, whether they name it or not.

It shows up when someone catches the odd detail in a customer request. When a supervisor notices that a team is complying with a new procedure without actually understanding it. When someone from one function asks a question that reveals an assumption another function did not know it was making. It is present in the pause before a decision when somebody says, “I don’t think we understand this yet.”

None of these contributions is particularly dramatic. Often they are folded into ordinary work and disappear into the outcome.

They are also contributions people can learn to ration.

When contribution repeatedly fails to influence what happens next, people can adjust. They may not make a conscious decision to disengage. There may be no moment when someone says, “I will no longer offer my judgment here.” Experience does the teaching.

A concern is raised and goes nowhere.

Later, something close to the predicted problem occurs. The next concern is raised with less conviction. Or later in the process. Perhaps to fewer people. Eventually the employee decides whether the subject is worth pursuing before saying anything at all.

The intelligence has not disappeared. Its destination has changed.

This matters because organizations often interpret continued effort as evidence that engagement remains intact. Yet the person doing the compensatory work described in the previous section may already have become quite selective about what else she contributes.

She may use considerable judgment to keep today’s work moving while withholding judgment about the system producing the work. She may improvise around a weak process without continuing to argue that the process is weak. She may care enough to prevent a customer problem and no longer believe that explaining the recurring source of that problem will change anything.

From the organization’s point of view, she is still contributing. From hers, an important distinction has already been made. Some intelligence still has somewhere to go.

Some does not.

This is the form of disengagement this paper is concerned with: selective withdrawal rather than simple absence.

People do not necessarily detach from everything at once. Their relationship to the work becomes more discriminating. They learn where candor has consequence and where it merely creates exposure. Where initiative is welcomed, where it will be absorbed without acknowledgment, and where taking initiative simply means inheriting permanent responsibility for something no one else intends to fix.

That learning is itself intelligent. It is also costly.

An organization can continue receiving the benefit of someone’s experience at the level closest to the work while losing access to what that experience could tell the larger system.

The engineer fixes the immediate defect. The operations manager reconstructs the missing information. The team leader makes the handoff work because the customer should not have to suffer for an internal problem.

Each action may be appropriate. Sometimes it is the only responsible action available in the moment. But the better people become at containing the immediate consequence, the easier it can be for everyone else to miss the recurring condition.

This is where compensation and disengagement can begin to reinforce one another.

The employee sees the problem, repairs around it, and protects the outcome. Because the outcome is protected, the system receives less pressure to examine the source. Because the source remains, the employee encounters the problem again. Over time, raising it begins to feel less like contribution and more like repetition.

Eventually, people may stop spending intelligence where they have learned it will not travel. They do not become less intelligent. They become more exacting about where they invest it.

This distinction also helps explain why disengagement can coexist with loyalty. A person may remain deeply attached to colleagues, customers, the craft of the work, or even the institution itself. Sometimes loyalty is precisely what keeps the compensatory labor going. And that can confuse the diagnosis.

The organization sees commitment because the person keeps showing up for what matters to her. What it may not see is the boundary she has quietly drawn around what she will continue trying to change.

The cost appears in what stops traveling upward and outward. A warning stays inside the function that already knows it.

A question that once would have crossed a departmental boundary remains local. Someone who could have challenged a decision decides instead to make the decision work. Knowledge can become concentrated in the people who need it for immediate execution rather than circulating through the system where it might change assumptions, priorities, or design.

The organization has not lost the intelligence. It has lost access to some of it. That difference is central to understanding disengagement.

People can remain capable, responsible, highly productive, and deeply knowledgeable while reducing the range of contribution they are willing to make. In some cases, they become exceptionally good at operating inside the boundary they have drawn.

From a distance, that can look like stability. It can even look like engagement. The question for leadership is therefore not simply how much effort people are giving. It is where their intelligence still travels, where it stops, and what the organization may no longer be hearing.

3. WHY LEADERS MISS IT

Leaders are not necessarily overlooking disengagement because they are inattentive. Often, they are looking at exactly what the organization has taught them to look at.

Revenue. Delivery. Productivity. Turnover. Engagement scores. Customer performance. Project status. A growing list of measures intended to make the condition of the organization visible.

These measures matter, but they do not all tell leadership the same thing. Some report outcomes that have already occurred. Others, including engagement measures, make defined aspects of people's experience of the work visible. None, by itself, shows what people had to do to produce the result.

A conventional performance dashboard can report accurately on what happened and still tell you very little about what people had to do to make it happen. The order shipped on time. The dashboard records the shipment.

It does not record the supervisor who noticed that two pieces of information did not agree, called someone in another department, reconstructed what had happened, and corrected the order before the discrepancy reached the customer. The quarter closes. The compensation disappears into the result.

This creates an asymmetry in what leadership can see. Outcomes are recorded because organizations are built to record them. Much of the human activity that protects those outcomes is absorbed into ordinary work. Roles and responsibilities begin to organize themselves around this ordinary compensatory work. Over time, the tasks can become part of someone's job, part of how the organization understands that person's value, and in some cases, an entire career.

When the outcome is good, there may be little reason to examine what prevented it from being bad. And so the organization learns something potentially misleading from its own success: the process worked, the team delivered, the problem was handled.

Perhaps. Or perhaps people handled what the process could not.

That difference becomes consequential when the same people have also begun narrowing the intelligence they are willing to offer beyond the immediate work. The indicators leadership usually associates with disengagement may not move at the same time.

A capable employee can continue performing after she has stopped challenging a recurring assumption. A manager can keep a team productive after he has concluded that another escalation will accomplish very little. Someone can remain in the organization long after deciding that certain conversations are no longer worth entering.

Nothing in those choices requires an immediate decline in output. Some may temporarily make the organization easier to run. There are fewer objections to resolve, fewer questions slowing the meeting. A person who once insisted that a problem needed attention may simply fix what she can and move on. The team knows how to manage around the constraint now. She may even be nicknamed “the squeaky wheel.”

From above, the friction has diminished. Ironically, that can look like improvement. It may instead be adaptation.

This is one reason visible outcomes such as turnover, burnout, and productivity decline can appear late. Engagement measures can make other aspects of the employee experience visible, but they do not necessarily reveal what the system has stopped hearing from the people inside it.

Turnover is visible because someone leaves. Silence is harder to quantify. The employee who stays may possess years of accumulated knowledge about where the operation is fragile. If she continues meeting expectations, the organization has little conventional reason to ask whether it still has access to everything she knows.

The same problem appears with productivity. If people compensate effectively, productivity may remain an especially poor early signal. Work continues because people have become skilled at preserving the work.

Then conditions change. Volume increases. A new system is introduced. A key person leaves, or the organization needs to do something unfamiliar rather than repeat something it already knows how to hold together.

The workarounds that preserved yesterday’s performance may no longer be sufficient under the new condition. This is when a system can discover, rather abruptly, that performance and adaptive capacity were not the same thing.

What makes that distinction difficult to see is that successful adaptation can leave surprisingly little evidence behind. The preventable failure never occurs. A weak assumption is caught before it becomes strategy. Someone connects information across functions before the customer ever sees the gap.

What becomes easier to measure is what happens when adaptation no longer succeeds.

Delivery falters. Turnover increases. A customer problem escapes containment. The person everyone depended on leaves, and only afterward does the organization discover how many things she was quietly holding together.

What appears on the performance dashboard may therefore be less the beginning of disengagement than the point at which compensation can no longer conceal its effects.

This is why visible performance deserves a more careful reading. Results tell you what the organization has produced, but they do not always tell you what the organization is becoming capable, or incapable, of doing. And they do not tell you which people have stopped recording the system's gaps.

4. THE HIDDEN COST: ADAPTIVE CAPACITY

If performance tells you what the organization produced, adaptive capacity tells you something about what it will be able to do when the conditions change.

The distinction matters because organizations do not struggle only with poor execution. They can also become vulnerable when they discover too late that something important has shifted, when information no longer travels far enough to alter a decision, or when people who can see the problem have stopped expecting the larger system to do anything useful with what they know.

Adaptive capacity lives partly in this movement of intelligence through the organization.

It is present when information travels beyond the place where it was first noticed and someone with a different vantage point can alter the interpretation. A disagreement can improve a decision rather than merely delay it. Experience can reach strategy before strategy hardens around an assumption that no longer holds.

An organization does not need perfect information to adapt. It does need enough access to what people are seeing to recognize that its current understanding may be incomplete.

The form of disengagement this paper is concerned with can interfere with that access.

Knowledge can remain inside the organization after it stops moving reliably through it. The operational weakness is still known, and its implications may be understood. What leadership encounters, however, is often the managed result.

Nothing has necessarily been hidden deliberately. People have simply learned how far information is likely to travel. Over time, that changes the quality of the signals moving through the organization.

Risks may be softened when the unsoftened version has not been useful before. Complexity can be translated into language more likely to survive the meeting. A concern that could have been raised early may wait until there is enough evidence to make it undeniable, which is another way of saying that the organization hears it later.

Sometimes something is widely known to be wrong, and that shared knowing becomes part of the culture people live inside. They just know different parts of it.

One function knows the process is fragile. Another sees customers beginning to behave differently. Somewhere closer to the work, people already understand that the next initiative cannot simply be added without something else giving way.

The information exists. The organization has not assembled it into knowledge it can act on. That is a different kind of information problem. The issue may appear to be absence, but it is separation.

This is where organizational silence becomes more consequential than an employee choosing to no longer speak up in a meeting. Silence can accumulate structurally. What one part of the system no longer raises, another never receives. A decision proceeds without the observation that might have changed it. Eventually the organization is working with a version of reality that is technically informed and materially incomplete.

What looks like alignment can be adaptation through selective withdrawal. The loss is not always visible because adaptation is partly anticipatory. Its value lies in responding while there is still room to choose.

A weak signal noticed early may require a conversation. If it persists without response, the eventual intervention may be larger, more expensive, and much less optional. The condition did not necessarily become visible when it became serious. It may have become visible when it became impossible to continue to quietly compensate for it.

Relationships matter here in ways that can be difficult to quantify. Information does not move through an organization simply because an org chart says two functions are connected. People cross boundaries because there is enough trust, familiarity, curiosity, or practical need to make the exchange worth having.

When those connections thin, capacity begins to reorganize locally.

People invest more in what they can influence directly. Informal conversations that once supplied context disappear. The meeting still happens, but more of the conversation stays inside the confines of role and agenda.

The organization may become cleaner administratively while becoming poorer informationally. And because disengagement is selective, these losses are uneven.

One part of the system may still have extraordinary capacity. Another may have become dependent on one person who knows how everything connects. A team may retain deep technical judgment while having very little influence over the decisions that determine how that judgment is used.

This unevenness can make the organization difficult to read. Capability is still present, sometimes in abundance. It is simply not available everywhere the system needs it.

The same can happen with values. Values have adaptive force when they help people decide what should hold under pressure. But when the organization repeatedly chooses differently from what it says matters, people may stop using stated values to predict what will actually happen. The values remain visible; their operational force weakens.

More interpretation then has to happen locally. People read precedent, hierarchy, politics, history, and which stated priority is actually operative this time around. The official system continues to speak, but people learn to navigate by another set of signals. What the organization experiences as culture may increasingly include the adaptations people have developed to make the system workable.

And the system can continue this way for a long time.

Adaptive capacity often becomes most visible after it is needed. Before that, its erosion can look like efficiency. There are fewer challenges to resolve and decisions move more quickly. People know how to get things done without reopening questions that have already proved difficult to move.

The organization may feel calmer. But calm and capacity are not the same thing. A system that has stopped signaling distress can appear remarkably stable right up until the condition changes enough that yesterday's accommodations no longer work.

Then leaders may discover that what they believed was resilience depended heavily on familiar people solving familiar problems in familiar ways; their effort was never visible in the result.

Adaptation asks something different. It asks whether the organization can notice what it has not seen before, allow unfamiliar information to alter existing assumptions, and reorganize around what the new conditions require.

That capacity depends on much more than whether people are still working hard. It depends, in part, on whether the organization can still make legible, across the system, what its people know.

---

5. HOW FALSE STABILITY BECOMES EXPENSIVE

The cost of disengagement rarely begins as a line item called disengagement. In its early stages, the organization may be paying for it through ordinary work.

A manager spends part of every week reconciling information that should arrive complete. An experienced employee carries knowledge no system has captured. Teams build routines around exceptions that were once supposed to be temporary. None of these activities necessarily appears as loss. People are working. Salaries have already been budgeted. The customer is still being served.

What is less visible is that the cost is being absorbed through human effort.

This is one reason false stability can persist. Human compensation subsidizes conditions the organization would otherwise have to confront. That does not make every workaround wasteful. Workarounds are part of real work. People improvise, solve unexpected problems, and adapt to circumstances no process could have anticipated.

The problem begins when compensation is no longer exceptional but becomes infrastructure. Capacity that could have gone toward improvement, learning, customer development, or work no one has yet imagined is used to maintain conditions the organization already knows how to survive.

That cost may remain largely invisible because the people carrying it are still productive. Their compensatory work is mixed into the work leadership intended to pay them to do. Over time, something subtle happens to the economics of the system.

For some forms of work, the organization can effectively begin paying twice.

It pays for the process, technology, structure, or role intended to carry the work. Then it pays again in human time and attention when people bridge what the formal system does not. Sometimes the second payment is small. Sometimes it becomes ordinary enough that no one recognizes it as a second payment anymore. When technology no longer supports the work cleanly, that second payment can expand as people compensate for the gap.

This is where invisible compensation begins to accumulate as absorbed organizational cost.

Not all of that cost can be recovered by making a process more efficient. Some of it has already moved into dependency. A person becomes the only one who understands how two systems reconcile. A manager becomes indispensable because she knows where every incomplete handoff needs to be repaired. A team becomes unusually valuable because it has learned how to absorb work that has no clear organizational home.

Their value is real. So is the vulnerability created when the organization depends on that value being available in exactly the same way tomorrow.

The financial consequence becomes easier to see when something interrupts the arrangement.

The person leaves. Volume changes. A new market demands a different response. The organization implements technology based on the formal process and discovers that the formal process was never the whole process. What looked efficient now requires recovery.

Work has to be reconstructed. Knowledge has to be rediscovered. Someone else must learn the workaround while also doing the work the workaround was protecting. Decisions slow because the person who knew how to interpret the exception is no longer there.

The expense may appear sudden. Its history is not.

False stability also carries a timing cost. The organization can continue to look intact while the range of available responses quietly narrows. For instance, a problem identified while people still have room to examine it can be very different from the same problem after it has reached a customer, disrupted delivery, weakened a relationship, or narrowed the organization’s strategic choices.

Delay changes what is possible. An issue that could once have been corrected through conversation or redesign may later require additional staffing, outside expertise, new technology, restructuring, or leadership attention pulled away from other priorities.

The important point is not that every unattended signal becomes expensive. Many do not. It is that compensation can postpone the moment when the organization discovers which ones matter. By protecting the immediate outcome, people can unintentionally protect the underlying condition from scrutiny.

This is the paradox at the center of false stability.

The people preventing today's cost may also be delaying visibility into tomorrow's. There is another cost that is harder to calculate but easier to recognize once you know to look for it: opportunity.

When experienced people spend capacity preserving weak connections, that capacity is unavailable elsewhere. The question is not simply how many hours were consumed by rework. It is what those hours, that judgment, or that attention might otherwise have produced.

What did the organization not learn because its most knowledgeable people were busy containing familiar problems? Or, what did a manager not build because she spent another quarter manually coordinating work that should have coordinated through the system? Which customer signal received less attention because the person most capable of recognizing it was occupied keeping yesterday's process alive?

These costs may not appear in the same place.

Some may show up in labor. Others may appear as slower decisions, delayed change, repeated errors, or leadership attention consumed by problems that might have been resolved closer to their source. Opportunity costs may never acquire a clean accounting code at all.

The organization experiences them as pressure.

More work seems to require more effort than it should. Capable people have less room. Leaders feel pulled into operational detail. Change becomes harder to absorb because existing capacity is already committed to maintaining the current arrangement.

At this stage, the organization may respond by adding something: another person, a new system, perhaps an initiative intended to improve communication, strengthen culture, or increase engagement. Sometimes that addition is exactly what is needed.

Sometimes it adds another layer to a system that has not yet understood what its existing capacity is doing. The new resource enters the same operating environment and may begin adapting to it. This is how cost can compound without any single decision looking unreasonable.

One way cost can compound is through a reinforcing loop. People compensate for a weak condition. Their compensation preserves the outcome. The preserved outcome can reduce urgency to address the condition, so compensation continues and capacity becomes increasingly committed to maintaining it. When circumstances change, the organization may then have less room to respond, and intervention occurs under greater pressure.

The financial consequence is downstream from all of this.

It may eventually become visible as additional labor, disruption associated with knowledge loss or turnover, recovery work when compensatory arrangements fail, or the cost of correcting a problem later than the organization might have.

We should be careful here because not every disengaged system produces all of these outcomes, and not every instance of these costs indicates disengagement. The argument is more specific.

When an organization depends on invisible human compensation to sustain performance, organizational resources are already being consumed even if conventional financial reporting has not isolated that consumption as an expense.

The organization is already paying for the stability it appears to have.

And as more capacity is committed to maintaining conditions that no longer work cleanly, it has less available for whatever comes next. That is where the cost of disengagement becomes strategic. The loss is no longer confined to what the organization is spending; it begins to include what the organization is becoming less able to do.

The cost of disengagement unfolds across time. Some costs are already being absorbed into normal operations and may never appear as distinct expenses. Others become visible later, when compensation fails or conditions change. Still others are harder to see because they appear as foreclosed capacity: the learning, adaptation, and strategic room the organization never has because so much of its capability is already committed to maintaining the present.

By the time these costs become visible enough to command attention, disengagement has often been communicating about the system for quite some time. The question is whether leadership knows how to read the signal.

---

6. WHAT DISENGAGEMENT IS TELLING YOU

If disengagement is a signal, the first task is not simply to correct it. It is to understand what it is reporting.

That question changes the leadership inquiry.

Instead of beginning with who is disengaged, how engagement scores can be improved, or what managers should do to increase commitment, leadership can begin closer to the conditions people are responding to.

What are people adapting to?

The question is deceptively simple. It asks leadership to look at behavior without assuming the behavior explains itself. A concern that is no longer raised, a workaround that has become ordinary, an indispensable manager, or a team that appears unexpectedly calm may each contain information about the conditions around the work.

None tells you everything about the system. They do tell you where to look.

Disengagement becomes more informative when it is read alongside the conditions surrounding it: where responsibility and authority have drifted apart, where information stops traveling, where recurring workarounds have become ordinary, where pace no longer leaves room for integration, or where people continue carrying outcomes without believing the larger condition will change.

The point is not to treat every frustration or act of withdrawal as proof of systemic failure. People disengage for many reasons. Organizations are complicated, and behavior is rarely produced by one condition alone.

The value of the signal lies in what it invites leadership to examine.

- Where has compensation become part of the operating model?
- Where is the organization still receiving effort but less challenge?
- What knowledge remains available locally but no longer travels far enough to alter a decision?
- Where does performance depend on people doing work that disappears into the result?

These questions move leadership closer to the system people are actually experiencing.

They also make blame less useful.

When behavior represents an adaptation to the conditions around it, labeling the behavior without examining the condition tells us very little. The silence may be frustrating. The workaround may be inefficient. The reluctance to engage another initiative may look like resistance. But each may contain information about what the organization has already taught people to expect.

This does not relieve anyone of accountability. It makes accountability more legible, without reducing it to a litigation of blame.

People remain responsible for the choices they make. Leaders remain responsible for performance. But leadership also carries responsibility for examining the conditions under which those choices are being made, particularly when the same adaptations appear repeatedly across people, teams, or functions.

Patterns deserve attention. One workaround may be improvisation, but a network of workarounds may be telling you something about the design of the work.

One employee withholding an opinion may reflect temperament, fatigue, or circumstance. When experienced people across a system learn to ration candor, leadership has a different question in front of it.

The same is true of overfunctioning. An extraordinary employee will sometimes do extraordinary things. That is not automatically evidence of incoherence. The concern begins when extraordinary effort becomes necessary for ordinary work to succeed.

This is where Coherence becomes useful as a way of seeing.[1] It asks whether the conditions of the system allow values, authority, information, capacity, and decision-making to move together well enough for people to contribute what the work actually requires.

The question is not whether an organization is perfectly aligned. No living system is.

The question is what happens when misalignment appears. Can the system register it? Can information travel far enough to matter? Can a problem be named before someone has to become heroic to contain it? Can a leader revise an assumption when the evidence arriving from the work no longer supports it?

A coherent system does not eliminate friction. Friction can be useful. Nor does it eliminate disagreement, uncertainty, pressure, or the need for people to improvise. What changes is whether those experiences can become information the system is capable of deciphering and using.

That is why disengagement deserves more than a response strategy.

It deserves attention.

Not because disengagement predicts collapse, and not because every sign of withdrawal means an organization is in trouble. Its value can be diagnostic. It can help reveal where intelligence is still present but no longer traveling, where human compensation is preserving outcomes the structure can no longer, or cannot yet, carry, and where apparent stability may be costing more than the organization knows.

Read this way, disengagement is not a verdict on the people inside the system.

It is information about the relationship between those people and the conditions in which they are being asked to work. And perhaps the most useful leadership question is not how to make people care more.

It is whether the organization can still hear what their adaptations are telling it before the cost becomes the only signal left.

RESEARCH NOTES

I Anselm Strauss, "The Articulation of Project Work: An Organizational Process," The Sociological Quarterly 29, no. 2 (1988): 163-178, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1988.tb01249.x; Ian Hampson and Anne Junor, "Invisible Work, Invisible Skills: Interactive Customer Service as Articulation Work," New Technology, Work and Employment 20, no. 2 (2005): 166-181, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-005X.2005.00151.x.

II Elizabeth Wolfe Morrison, "Employee Voice and Silence: Taking Stock a Decade Later," Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior 10 (2023): 79-107, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-054654; James R. Detert and Amy C. Edmondson, "Implicit Voice Theories: Taken-for-Granted Rules of Self-Censorship at Work," Academy of Management Journal 54, no. 3 (2011): 461-488, https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.61967925; Elad N. Sherf, Michael R. Parke, and Sofya Isaakyan, "Distinguishing Voice and Silence at Work: Unique Relationships with Perceived Impact, Psychological Safety, and Burnout," Academy of Management Journal 64, no. 1 (2021): 114-148, https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2018.1428.

III William A. Kahn, "Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work," Academy of Management Journal 33, no. 4 (1990): 692-724, https://doi.org/10.5465/256287.

IV Yuqing Ren and Linda Argote, "Transactive Memory Systems 1985-2010: An Integrative Framework of Key Dimensions, Antecedents, and Consequences," Academy of Management Annals 5, no. 1 (2011): 189-229, https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2011.590300.

V Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Arnold B. Bakker, and Marisa Salanova, "The Measurement of Work Engagement With a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study," Educational and Psychological Measurement 66, no. 4 (2006): 701-716, https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471.

VI Hilda Bo Lyng et al., "Balancing Adaptation and Innovation for Resilience in Healthcare - A Metasynthesis of Narratives," BMC Health Services Research 21 (2021): 759, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06592-0; Marlys K. Christianson, Kathleen M. Sutcliffe, Melissa A. Miller, and Theodore J. Iwashyna, "Becoming a High Reliability Organization," Critical Care 15, no. 6 (2011): 314, https://doi.org/10.1186/cc10360.

VII Christianson et al., "Becoming a High Reliability Organization." The high-reliability literature emphasizes preoccupation with failure, sensitivity to operations, reluctance to simplify, resilience, and deference to expertise as ways of detecting and responding to emerging problems.

VIII Tony Simons, "Behavioral Integrity: The Perceived Alignment Between Managers' Words and Deeds as a Research Focus," Organization Science 13, no. 1 (2002): 18-35, https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543.

IX Christian Bartelheimer, Verena Wolf, and Daniel Beverungen, "Workarounds as Generative Mechanisms for Bottom-Up Process Innovation - Insights from a Multiple Case Study," Information Systems Journal 33, no. 5 (2023): 1085-1150, https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12435; Lyng et al., "Balancing Adaptation and Innovation for Resilience in Healthcare." Together, these studies support treating workarounds as context-dependent adaptations that can either reveal and improve misfits or, when repeated as short-term firefighting, mask underlying system deficiencies.

X Nataliya Galan, "Knowledge Loss Induced by Organizational Member Turnover: A Review of Empirical Literature, Synthesis and Future Research Directions (Part I)," The Learning Organization 30, no. 2 (2023): 117-136, https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-09-2022-0107.

XI Christoph Brielmaier and Martin Friesl, "The Attention-Based View: Review and Conceptual Extension Towards Situated Attention," International Journal of Management Reviews 25, no. 1 (2023): 99-129, https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12306; Nahuel I. Depino-Besada, Xose H. Vazquez, Antonio Sartal, et al., "An Integrative Review and Research Agenda on Organizational Slack: Addressing Assumptions, Conflicted Theoretical Proposals and Conclusions," Management Review Quarterly 76 (2026): 1201-1249, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-025-00502-y.

---

1 In this paper, capitalized Coherence refers to the Institute for UNLearning's organizational systems framework for examining whether values, authority, information, capacity, and decision-making remain in usable relationship as conditions change. It does not imply perfect alignment.