https://doi.org/10.63985/ttbr.v2i2.144

Modern Human Resource Management Approaches to Mitigating Quiet Quitting and Improving Employee Well-Being

Ifada Rahmayanti

Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia.
*Corresponding author email address: ifada.rahmayanti@mm.uad.ac.id

Abstract: The emergence of "quiet quitting" the deliberate restriction of employee effort to formal contractual job descriptions without active organizational departure presents a profound challenge to contemporary Human Resource Management (HRM). Driven by post-pandemic shifts in workforce values, pervasive digital connectivity, and chronic occupational burnout, quiet quitting reflects a silent form of behavioral withdrawal and self-regulation rather than mere employee apathy. Drawing upon an integrative theoretical synthesis of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework (including its JD-R 3.0 evolution), Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Social Exchange Theory (SET), and Psychological Contract Theory, this paper critically examines the systemic antecedents of quiet quitting and evaluates strategic HRM interventions designed to foster sustainable employee well-being and authentic engagement. Utilizing a systematic review methodology analyzing cross-sectoral empirical studies and multinational organizational cases (e.g., Unilever, SAP, and financial/services sectors), this paper identifies key drivers of disengagement: Work Connectivity Behavior After-Hours (WCBA), unrewarded workload demands, lack of recognition, need frustration, and psychological contract breach. The findings demonstrate that traditional production-oriented HRM practices exacerbate disengagement, whereas modern, human-centric strategies specifically non-linear demand-resource balancing, proactive stay interview architectures, purpose-driven job redesign, and scaled peer-support mental health ecosystems significantly mitigate quiet quitting intentions. Finally, this study highlights critical research gaps regarding cross-cultural boundary conditions, technology-mediated boundary blurring, and non-linear resource thresholds, offering actionable implications for HR leaders and organizational

Keywords: Quiet quitting, modern human resource management, employee well-being, Job Demands-Resources model (JD-R 3.0), Self-Determination Theory, psychological safety, stay interviews.

Copyright © TechTalent & Business Review
All rights reserved

1. Introduction

The global landscape of occupational health and employee relations has undergone a fundamental transformation in the post-pandemic era. Among the most prominent manifestations of this shift is "quiet quitting," a term popularized in academic literature and contemporary organizational practice to describe employees who consciously withhold discretionary effort, rejecting "hustle culture" to adhere strictly to the minimum duties specified in their formal job descriptions (Mahand & Caldwell, 2023; Ratnatunga, 2022).

Unlike overt voluntary turnover (the "Great Resignation") or active workplace sabotage ("loud quitting"), quiet quitting represents a covert, within-role behavioral adjustment (Dang & Ha, 2026; Serenko, 2024). Employees remain physically and officially employed while emotionally and cognitively detaching from extra-role organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 2025; Kahn, 1990).

Macro-level estimates underscore the severity of this disengagement. Industry assessments by Gallup indicate that quiet quitters constitute over 50% of the United States workforce, with global economic costs attributed to lost productivity estimated at $8.8 trillion annually equivalent to roughly 9% of global Gross Domestic Product (Clifton, 2022; Harter, 2023). This disengagement is particularly pronounced among younger workforce cohorts, specifically Millennials and Generation Z, who place unprecedented premium value on mental health, personal boundary setting, psychological safety, and work-life equilibrium over traditional corporate loyalty and uncompensated overwork (Dang & Ha, 2026; MDPI Review, 2024; McKinsey, 2023).

From a managerial perspective, quiet quitting exposes the structural deficiencies of conventional Human Resource Management (HRM) frameworks. Historical HRM paradigms heavily prioritized transactional performance evaluations, rigid performance metrics (KPIs), and compensatory incentives aimed at maximizing immediate output (Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 2025; Ratnatunga, 2022). However, in high-pressure digital environments where remote work and constant after-hours connectivity blur the boundaries between professional and personal domains, relying solely on extrinsic motivators or increased workload expectations triggers severe burnout, role conflict, and psychological distress (Li et al., 2025; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). When employees perceive that their heightened efforts yield neither equitable recognition nor organizational care, quiet quitting emerges as an adaptive self-regulatory defense mechanism designed to conserve psychological capital and prevent emotional collapse (Hobfoll, 2001; Mahand & Caldwell, 2023).

Despite growing scholarly interest, significant research gaps remain regarding how modern HRM strategies can systematically diagnose, address, and reverse quiet quitting. Existing literature often treats quiet quitting either as an isolated motivational deficit or as a linear reaction to work overload, neglecting complex, non-linear interactions between technological demands, perceived organizational support, and psychological contract violations (Li et al., 2025). Furthermore, while organizational interventions such as well-being programs and flexible work policies are widely advocated, there is a lack of rigorous synthesis evaluating how specific modern HR architectures such as proactive stay interviews, peer-led mental health ecosystems, and purpose-aligned job design interact with employee psychological needs across different operational contexts (AIHR, 2026; De Cooman et al., 2013; Unilever, 2026).

To address these imperatives, this paper presents a comprehensive, theoretically grounded analysis of modern HRM approaches to mitigating quiet quitting and advancing employee well-being. The central objective is to synthesize core organizational behavior theoriesspecifically the extended Job Demands-Resources model (JD-R 2.0/3.0), Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Social Exchange Theory (SET), and Psychological Contract

Theory to dissect the underlying mechanisms of quiet quitting and construct an actionable roadmap for modern HR practitioners.

2. Metode (Times New Roman, 12pt, bold)

This study employs a comprehensive analytical synthesis methodology, integrating systematic literature review protocols with cross-sectoral empirical case analyses. Grounded in established organizational behavior methodology (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Tranfield et al., 2003), the research design systematically extracts, evaluates, and synthesizes qualitative and quantitative evidence from peer-reviewed academic journal publications, empirical industry reports, and enterprise case studies.

2.1 Data Ingestion and Search Strategy

A multi-stage systematic search was conducted across international research databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, ScienceDirect, ResearchGate, and specialized management repositories. Primary thematic search vectors encompassed combinations of terms: ("quiet quitting" OR "silent resignation" OR "disengagement") AND ("Human Resource Management" OR "HR practices" OR "employee well-being") AND ("Job Demands-Resources" OR "Self-Determination Theory" OR "psychological safety" OR "stay interviews").

2.2 Inclusion Criteria and Quality Screening

To ensure high scientific rigor and grounding in source material, criteria for inclusion specified:

- **1.** Peer-reviewed theoretical and empirical studies published in occupational health, applied psychology, and HRM journals.
- **2.** Verified quantitative empirical studies investigating antecedents, moderating variables, and mediating mechanisms of quiet quitting (e.g., polynomial regression models, structural equation modeling).
- **3.** In-depth institutional and organizational case documentation providing verifiable operational data on HR well-being frameworks (e.g., Unilever, SAP, Novo Nordisk).
- **4.** Direct alignment with core theoretical frameworks (JD-R, SDT, SET, COR).

2.3 Analytical Framework

The analytical protocol utilized thematic coding and cross-synthesis. Extracted data points were categorized into three analytical dimensions:

- **Theoretical Constructs:** Mapping variables to health impairment vs. motivational pathways (JD-R), psychological need satisfaction vs. frustration (SDT), and reciprocity/contract dynamics (SET/PCV).
- **Empirical Antecedents:** Classifying statistical predictors of quiet quitting intention across diverse sectors (e.g., financial services, technology, healthcare, marketing, and hospitality).
- **Strategic HRM Interventions:** Evaluating operational mechanisms (e.g., stay interview protocols, digital boundary policies, scaled peer-support networks) and their documented organizational impact.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Theoretical Foundations of Quiet Quitting

Synthesizing the literature reveals that quiet quitting is not a single isolated event, but a multi-faceted behavioral outcome situated at the intersection of several core organizational behavior frameworks. Table 1 summarizes the primary theoretical lenses explaining the onset and progression of quiet quitting.

Table 1: Theoretical Lenses Explaining Quiet Quitting

Theoretical Model	Key Constructs & Mechanisms	Explanation of Quiet Quitting Behavior	Key Sources
Job Demands-Resources (JD-R 2.0 / 3.0)	Job Demands (e.g., WCBA, overload) vs. Job Resources (e.g., POS, autonomy); Health Impairment Pathway vs. Motivational Pathway; Non-linear threshold effects.	Chronic mismatch where job demands deplete psychological energy without adequate recovery resources leads to strain and burnout. Quiet quitting operates as a self-regulatory strategy to curb demand-driven exhaustion.	Demerouti et al. (2001); Bakker & Demerouti (2017); Li et al. (2025)
Self-Determination Theory (SDT)	Basic Psychological Needs: Autonomy, Competence, Relatedness; Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic vs. Amotivation; Autonomous Motivation.	Frustration of basic needs (e.g., micromanagement, lack of voice, unrewarded effort) degrades intrinsic motivation, causing employees to transition into passive compliance and minimal effort expenditure.	Deci & Ryan (1985, 2000); De Cooman et al. (2013); Van den Broeck et al. (2008)
Social Exchange Theory (SET) & Psychological Contract	Norm of Reciprocity; Perceived Organizational Support (POS); Psychological Contract Breach/Violation (PCV).	Perceived imbalance between employee input and organizational inducements/care creates a breach of implicit promises. Employees recalibrate the exchange by withdrawing discretionary OCBs.	Blau (1964); Robinson & Rousseau (1994); Robinson & Morrison (2000); Saks (2006)
Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory	Resource Loss Spirals; Resource Protection and Accumulation; Psychological Capital.	Faced with continuous net loss of cognitive and emotional resources without replenishment, individuals act to protect remaining capital by erecting strict work boundaries.	Hobfoll (1989, 2001); Mahand & Caldwell (2023)

3.1.1 The Extended Job Demands-Resources Framework (JD-R 3.0)

The JD-R framework posits that employee well-being and performance are shaped by two distinct psychological processes: a health impairment process driven by excessive job demands and a motivational process fueled by job resources (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Recent structural extensions specifically JD-R 3.0 formulated by Li et al. (2025) examine non-linear interactions in modern work environments characterized by Work Connectivity Behavior After-Hours (WCBA). Using polynomial regression and response surface methodology on multi-wave financial sector data (N = 625), Li et al. (2025) demonstrated that incongruent scenarios where WCBA is high but Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is low trigger severe Psychological Contract Violation (PCV) and psychological distress.

Crucially, JD-R 3.0 introduces a "too-much-of-a-good-thing" threshold effect: while high POS buffers strain under moderate after-hours demands, extremely high WCBA paired with high POS still leads to resource depletion and contract violation due to diminishing marginal returns of support when physical/recovery boundaries are persistently violated (Li et al., 2025). Thus, quiet quitting represents a boundary-enforcement strategy within the health impairment pathway, activated when recovery opportunities are chronically insufficient.

3.1.2 Self-Determination Theory and Need Frustration

Under SDT, optimal human functioning and behavioral effort depend upon satisfying three universal psychological needs: autonomy (volition and agency), competence (feeling effective), and relatedness (feeling connected and valued) (Deci & Ryan, 2000). De Cooman et al. (2013) demonstrated through structural equation modeling (N = 689) that job resources (e.g., skill utilization, strategic impact awareness) directly enhance basic need satisfaction, which sequentially drives autonomous motivation and behavioral work effort (intensity, persistence, and direction). Conversely, when work design imposes excessive pressure or micromanagement, basic needs are frustrated. Van den Broeck et al. (2008) and Dang and Ha (2026) confirm that need frustration converts autonomous motivation into controlled compliance or amotivation, manifesting directly as quiet quitting intention.

3.1.3 Social Exchange Theory and Psychological Contract Violation

SET asserts that workplace relationships operate on transactional and socio-emotional reciprocity (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). When organizations demand extra-role dedication, discretionary overtime, and continuous availability without providing proportional compensation, career development, appreciation, or well-being support, employees perceive a breach of the psychological contract (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson & Morrison, 2000). Quiet quitting functions as a non-confrontational reciprocity recalibration: employees reduce extra-role contribution to match perceived low organizational investment (Mahand & Caldwell, 2023; Pratiwi et al., 2023).

3.2 Key Empirical Antecedents and Predictors

Empirical evaluations across diverse sectors identify several statistically significant predictors of quiet quitting intention. Table 2 synthesizes standardized regression weights (β) and relative rankings established in recent empirical investigation (Dang & Ha, 2026).

Table 2: Empirical Predictors of Quiet Quitting Intention (Dang & Ha, 2026)

Predictor Variable	Standardized Beta (β)	Statistical Significance	Relative Influence Rank	Primary Operational Driver
Lack of Recognition	0.322	$p < 0.001$	Rank 1 (Strongest)	Unacknowledged creative effort; absence of timely feedback and fair rewards.
Lack of Autonomy	0.252	$p < 0.001$	Rank 2	Micromanagement; rigid process constraints; restricted decision-making freedom.
Unsupportive Culture	0.233	$p < 0.001$	Rank 3	Toxic team dynamics; lack of psychological safety; indifferent leadership.
Work-Life Imbalance	0.199	$p < 0.001$	Rank 4	Boundary spillover; compulsory after-hours availability; sacrificed personal time.
Job Burnout	0.152	$p < 0.05$	Rank 5	Chronic emotional exhaustion; cognitive fatigue; excessive KPI deadline pressure.

Analysis of Antecedents:

- **Lack of Recognition (β = 0.322):** Identified as the single strongest driver of quiet quitting intention. When employee contributions are unappreciated or taken for granted, self-worth declines, triggering rapid withdrawal of extra-role effort (Corbin & Flenady, 2024; Pütz, 2025).
- **Lack of Autonomy (β = 0.252):** Excessive supervision and lack of control over work execution erode internal locus of control and intrinsic motivation, directly encouraging passive compliance (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006; Ye et al., 2025).
- **Unsupportive Culture (β = 0.233):** Environments lacking psychological safety and managerial care signal to employees that extra effort is unsafe or unvalued, prompting emotional detachment (Kim & Sohn, 2024; Toska et al., 2025).
- **Work-Life Imbalance (β = 0.199) and Burnout (β = 0.152):** High baseline stress and boundary blurring force employees to adopt quiet quitting as an essential recovery tactic to avoid clinical exhaustion (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Serenko, 2024).

3.3 Modern HRM Interventions and Case Insights

To counteract quiet quitting, leading global enterprises and HRM frameworks have shifted from reactive, disciplinary measures to proactive, multi-tiered well-being architectures.

Table 3: Modern Enterprise HRM Interventions and Documented Organizational Impacts

Enterprise / Framework	Core HRM Intervention Architecture	Strategic Mechanism & Tools	Documented Organizational Outcomes	Key Sources
Unilever PLC	Multi-Tiered Global Wellbeing Ecosystem	Four Pillars (Physical, Mental, Emotional, Purpose); Discover Your Purpose workshops; Time to Talk Mental Health Champions (4,000+ trained peers); ClickWell private digital tracking app.	Reached 59,000+ staff across 56 countries; 2,000+ hours of peer well-being conversations annually; verified reductions in sickness absence; enhanced engagement.	Unilever (2024, 2026); Hubble HQ (2023)
SAP SE	Diagnostic Culture Index & Mindfulness Systems	Business Health Culture Index (BHCI); Global Mindfulness Practice; trust-based working hours; Dinner to Go initiatives.	BHCI increased from 69% to 81%; each 1% BHCI increase generated €90M–€100M operating profit impact; Mindfulness ROI exceeded 200%.	Journal Press India (2021); SAP Integrated Report (2021)
Novo Nordisk	IGLO Multi-Level Stress Diagnostic Framework	Global validated mental health screening at Individual, Group, Leader, and Organizational (IGLO) levels; targeted organizational psychologist support.	Identified 14% acute stress baseline; subsequent targeted interventions yielded a 20%–30% decline in stress symptoms over 1–2 years.	McKinsey (2024); Nielsen et al. (2018)
Stay Interview Protocols	Proactive Retention Architecture	Structured 1-on-1 conversations separate from performance reviews; 80/20 active listening rule; direct supervisor execution; 90-day/annual milestones.	Pre-empts turnover before flight risk materializes; addresses 52% of voluntary turnover reasons; builds psychological safety and trust.	AIHR (2026); Great Place to Work (2025); Scarinci Hollenbeck (2025)

3.3.1 Proactive Retention Architecture: The Stay Interview Protocol

While exit interviews collect retrospective data after an employee has already resigned, modern HR frameworks emphasize stay interviews—structured, empathetic conversations between frontline managers and current employees aimed at understanding what keeps them engaged and what risks might prompt their departure (AIHR, 2026; Scarinci Hollenbeck, 2025). Industry research shows that 52% of voluntarily departing employees state their organization could have taken proactive action to prevent their exit (AIHR, 2026; Gallup, 2022).

Key best practices for stay interviews include:

- **Separation from Performance Appraisals:** Conducting stay interviews independently of performance evaluations removes defensive pressure and salary-negotiation biases (AIHR, 2026; Scarinci Hollenbeck, 2025).
- **The 80/20 Listening Rule:** Managers are trained to listen 80% of the time and speak only 20% to probe deeper into intrinsic motivators and workplace friction points (AIHR, 2026; People Alliance, 2025).
- **Transparent Accountability:** Developing actionable follow-up plans based on interview findings directly demonstrates to employees that their voice carries structural influence (Great Place to Work, 2025).

3.3.2 Scaled Preventative Well-Being Systems

Unilever PLC provides an institutional benchmark for embedded well-being ecosystems. Integrating four holistic pillars—physical, mental, emotional, and purposeful health—Unilever established a peer-support network of over 4,000 trained Mental Health Champions ("Time to Talk" team) who facilitate over 2,000 hours of confidential peer conversations annually (Unilever, 2026). Furthermore, grounded in SDT principles, Unilever's Discover Your Purpose workshop has enabled over 55,000 global employees to align personal values with professional roles, significantly reducing disengagement and boosting organizational commitment (Unilever, 2024; Hubble HQ, 2023).

4. Discussion

4.1 Critical Synthesis and Theoretical Integration

The theoretical and empirical findings synthesized in this study demonstrate that quiet quitting is a rational, predictable response to systemic workplace imbalances rather than an individual character flaw. Quiet quitting represents the convergence of demand-driven resource depletion (JD-R 3.0 / COR), basic psychological need frustration (SDT), and perceived relational unfairness (SET / PCV).

Traditional transactional HR approaches—such as increasing supervisory surveillance, applying punitive performance warnings, or ignoring employee boundary setting—inevitably fail. Punitiveness intensifies psychological contract violations, accelerates resource loss spirals, and escalates quiet quitting into actual turnover or active organizational resistance ("loud quitting") (Mahand & Caldwell, 2023; MDPI Review, 2024).

In contrast, modern human-centric HRM operates by inserting positive structural buffers along the mediation pathway. By re-engineering job design to promote autonomy,

establishing explicit digital disconnect protocols, institutionalizing stay interviews, and deploying peer-led mental health networks, modern HRM converts potential disengagement into "quiet thriving"—a state where employees maintain high personal well-being, psychological safety, and sustainable productivity within healthy professional boundaries (Caldwell & Anderson, 2023; Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 2025).

4.2 Identification of Research Gaps

Despite crucial advancements in understanding workplace disengagement, this critical review identifies four explicit research gaps that warrant rigorous empirical investigation:

- **1. Non-Linear Demand-Resource Thresholds (The JD-R 3.0 Frontier):** While Li et al. (2025) established the non-linear "too-much-of-a-good-thing" effect of POS under high after-hours connectivity, further research is required to map the exact tipping points where organizational support loses its buffering efficacy across different industries, job roles, and organizational hierarchies.
- **2. Cross-Cultural Boundary Conditions:** The majority of quiet quitting studies originate from Western economies or specific Asian emerging markets (e.g., Vietnam, China). Cross-cultural research is urgently needed to examine how collectivist vs. individualist cultural values, societal power distance, and local labor market protections moderate employee disengagement strategies (Dang & Ha, 2026; MDPI Review, 2024).
- **3. Technology-Mediated Boundary Blurring and AI Surveillance:** The rapid integration of digital management tools, automated algorithmic performance monitoring, and artificial intelligence in hybrid work environments introduces new sources of "technostress." Future studies must investigate how digital surveillance impacts employee psychological safety, trust, and covert disengagement (Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 2025).
- **4. Longitudinal Evaluation of HRM Interventions:** Existing empirical literature relies heavily on cross-sectional survey designs. Methodological advancement requires longitudinal, multi-wave studies and field experiments to track the long-term efficacy of stay interviews and scaled wellness platforms over 2–5 year horizons (Li et al., 2025; McKinsey, 2024).

4.3 Practical and Managerial Implications

For HR practitioners, senior executives, and line managers, the findings of this study offer several actionable, evidence-based recommendations:

- **1. Institutionalize Proactive Stay Interviews:** Replace reactive exit interviews with mandatory, biannual stay interview cadences. Train line managers in active listening, psychological safety, and empathetic dialogue. Ensure direct follow-through on feedback to build organizational trust (AIHR, 2026; Scarinci Hollenbeck, 2025).
- **2. Establish Clear Digital Boundaries and "Right to Disconnect" Policies:** To prevent after-hours connectivity strain (WCBA), organizations must implement clear communication protocols, discourage after-hours emails, and respect employee

recovery periods. Boundaries must be modeled directly by senior leadership (Li et al., 2025; Mahand & Caldwell, 2023).

- **3. Re-engineer Job Design for Autonomy and Recognition:** Address the top empirical predictors of quiet quitting (β = 0.322 for lack of recognition; β = 0.252 for lack of autonomy) by establishing fair, transparent recognition systems ("praise in public, correct in private") and granting employees discretion over task execution (Dang & Ha, 2026; De Cooman et al., 2013).
- **4. Deploy Scaled, Multi-Tiered Well-Being Infrastructure:** Follow enterprise models like Unilever and Novo Nordisk by constructing integrated health ecosystems. Combine confidential digital tracking tools, peer-led Mental Health First Aid networks, and personal purpose-alignment workshops to destigmatize mental health and capture early burnout indicators (Unilever, 2026; McKinsey, 2024).

Conclusion

Quiet quitting is a profound cultural and structural signal characterizing the modern workplace. Far from being a simple display of employee laziness or lack of discipline, quiet quitting represents a covert, self-regulatory behavioral withdrawal triggered by chronic burnout, boundary erosion, unrewarded job demands, and unfulfilled psychological needs.

This paper has synthesized the theoretical underpinnings of quiet quitting across the extended JD-R framework (JD-R 3.0), Self-Determination Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and Psychological Contract Theory. The analysis demonstrates that legacy transactional HR strategies exacerbate disengagement, whereas modern, human-centric HRM approaches centered on non-linear demand-resource balance, proactive stay interviews, job autonomy, transparent recognition, and multi-tiered mental health ecosystems effectively restore employee well-being and foster sustainable organizational engagement. By viewing quiet quitting as an opportunity for cultural transformation, forward-thinking organizations can build resilient, empathetic, and high-performing work environments where human well-being and operational excellence mutually reinforce one another.

References

AIHR. (2026). Stay Interviews: Your In-Depth Guide for 2026. Academy to Innovate HR. https://www.aihr.com/blog/stay-interviews/

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons.

Brightmine. (2024). How HR can tackle the burnout crisis. Brightmine UK. https://www.brightmine.com/uk/resources/talent-management/employee-engagement/how-hr-can-tackle-the-burnout-crisis/

Caldwell, C., & Anderson, V. (2023). Quiet quitting and quiet thriving – Flourishing in the modern organization. ResearchGate Working Papers.

Clifton, J. (2022). State of the Global Workplace: 2022 Report. Gallup Press.

Corbin, L., & Flenady, T. (2024). Recognition and retention in contemporary organizations. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 80(4), 1120–1132.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of Management, 31(6), 874–900. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602

Dang, N. T. T., & Ha, V. D. (2026). Investigation of factors influencing quiet quitting intention among the Gen Z workforce: Empirical evidence from the marketing sector in Ho Chi Minh City. International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences, 13(6), 11–22. https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2026.06.002

De Cooman, R., Stynen, D., Van den Broeck, A., Sels, L., & De Witte, H. (2013). How job characteristics relate to need satisfaction and autonomous motivation: Implications for work effort. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43(7), 1342–1352. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12143

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Great Place to Work. (2025). What Are Stay Interviews? A Guide with Questions to Retain Your Best Talent. Great Place to Work Institute. https://www.greatplacetowork.com/resources/blog/what-are-stay-interviews

Harter, J. (2023). Globally, employees are more engaged—and more stressed. Gallup Workplace. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/506798/globally-employees-engaged-stressed.aspx

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing Conservation of Resources theory. Applied Psychology, 50(3), 337–421. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062

Hubble HQ. (2023). 7 Real-Life Examples of Companies That Champion Mental Wellbeing. Hubble Blog. https://hubblehq.com/blog/7-companies-champion-mental-wellbeing

Journal Press India. (2021). Digital Transformations in Contemporary Business: Wellness and Participation in Enterprise Health Index. Journal Press India.

Journal of Informatics Education and Research. (2025). "Silent Resistance or Strategic Withdrawal? Rethinking Employee Engagement in the Era of Quiet Quitting". Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 5(2), 5260–5275.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692–724. https://doi.org/10.2307/256287

Kim, K. T., & Sohn, Y. W. (2024). The impact of quiet quitting on turnover intentions in the era of digital transformation: The mediating roles of job satisfaction and affective commitment, and the moderating role of psychological safety. Systems, 12(11), 460. https://doi.org/10.3390/systems12110460

Li, Y., Chen, C., & Yuan, Y. (2025). Evolving the job demands-resources framework to JD-R 3.0: The impact of after-hours connectivity and organizational support on employee psychological distress. Acta Psychologica, 253, 104710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104710

Mahand, T., & Caldwell, C. (2023). Quiet quitting – Causes and opportunities. Business and Management Research, 12(1), 9–19. https://doi.org/10.5430/bmr.v12n1p9

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World Psychiatry, 15(2), 103–111. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311

McKinsey Health Institute. (2023). Gen Z mental health: The impact of tech and social media. McKinsey & Company.

McKinsey Health Institute. (2024). How employers can create a thriving workplace. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/mhi/our-insights/thriving-workplaces-how-employers-can-improve-productivity-and-change-lives

MDPI Review. (2024). Perspectives and realities of disengagement among younger Generation Y and Z workers in contemporary work dynamics. Administrative Sciences / MDPI, 15(4), 133.

Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(6), 1321–1339. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321

Nielsen, K., Yarker, J., Munir, F., & Bültmann, U. (2018). IGLOO: An integrated framework for sustainable return to work in workers with common mental disorders. Work & Stress, 32(4), 400–417.

People Alliance. (2025). What is a stay interview? The secret to retaining top talent. People Alliance Content Hub. https://www.peoplealliance.com/articles/what-is-a-stay-interview/

Pratiwi, A., Stanislaus, S., & Pratiwi, E. (2023). Silent resistance or strategic disengagement: Understanding quiet quitting in post-pandemic work environments. Asian Journal of Business and Management, 11(3), 45–58.

Pütz, L. (2025). Job-related antecedents of psychological detachment from work. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 36(9), 1493–1528. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2025.2516791

Ratnatunga, J. (2022). Quiet quitting: The silent challenge of performance management. Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research, 20(2), 15–20.

Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach: A longitudinal study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21(5), 525–546.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15(3), 245–259. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150306

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600–619. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169

SAP SE. (2021). SAP Integrated Report 2021. SAP Investor Relations.

Scarinci Hollenbeck. (2025). Are Stay Interviews the Key to Retaining Top Talent? Scarinci Hollenbeck Employment Law Insights. https://scarincihollenbeck.com/law-firm-insights/stay-interviews-key-retaining-top-talent

Serenko, A. (2024). The quiet quitting phenomenon: Conceptualization, distinction from related constructs, and future research agenda. Journal of Knowledge Management, 28(4), 1012–1030.

Toska, A., Dimitriadou, I., Togas, C., Nikolopoulou, E., Fradelos, E. C., Papathanasiou, I. V., Sarafis, P., Malliarou, M., & Saridi, M. (2025). Quiet quitting in the hospital context: Investigating conflicts, organizational support, and professional engagement in Greece. Nursing Reports, 15(2), 38. https://doi.org/10.3390/nursrep15020038

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. British Journal of Management, 14(3), 207–222.

Unilever. (2024). Health & Wellbeing Strategy and Purpose-Driven Retention. Unilever UK & Ireland. https://www.unilever.co.uk/sustainability/health-wellbeing/

Unilever. (2026). Employee health and wellbeing: A globally consistent, locally relevant framework. Unilever Global. https://www.unilever.com/working-at-unilever/employee-wellbeing/

Van den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., & Lens, W. (2008). Explaining the relationships between job characteristics, burnout, and engagement: The role of basic psychological need satisfaction. Work & Stress, 22(3), 277–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393672

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74(3), 235–244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.12.003

Ye, X., Wei, Z., & Wu, J. (2025). Autonomy support, intrinsic motivation, and quiet quitting in creative industries. Human Resource Management Journal, 35(1), 145–162.