



# The impact of quiet quitting on employee well-being and organization performance

Submitted by

**Pawan singh**

BBA

Batch – (2023– 26)

Roll No.: 2302010275

System ID:2023432678


Under The Guidance Of- **KALI RAM GOLA**

Internal Supervisor      Designation



<https://doi.org/10.55041/ijst.v2i4.203>

**Cite this Article:** singh, P. (2026). The impact of quiet quitting on employee well-being and organization performance. International Journal of Science, Strategic Management and Technology, 02(04). <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijst.v2i4.203>

**License:**  This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are properly credited.

## ABSTRACT

*(Max 300 words: Briefly describe problem statement, business context, methodology, outcomes, and business implications.)*

**Key Words:** 3-7 words

## Introduction

The concept of "quiet quitting" is far more than a simple HR metric; it is a profound human response to a world that has, for too long, asked for more than it gives back. It represents the moment an individual decides to quietly reclaim their identity from their job title, shifting away from a "live to work" mentality toward a philosophy of "work to live." Rather than walking away from their desks, these employees are choosing to stay while mentally checking out of the "hustle" culture. This silent boundary-setting is often a survival mechanism—a way to protect one's mental health and physical energy in an era where the lines between home and office have become dangerously blurred. By performing only what is written in their job description, they aren't necessarily being lazy; they are often simply tired of the unreciprocated expectation to go "above and beyond" at the cost of their own well-being.

This phenomenon reached a boiling point following the COVID-19 pandemic, a period that acted as a global catalyst for self-reflection. When the world slowed down, many realized that the extra hours and constant availability didn't always lead to fulfillment or security, but rather to burnout and missed moments with loved ones. Today, the impact of this shift is felt on both sides of the professional aisle. While employees may find temporary relief from stress and a better sense of work-life harmony, organizations face a subtle but damaging erosion of innovation and collective morale. When the "spark" of discretionary effort disappears, the workplace can feel more like a transaction than a community.

To address this, organizations must move beyond the superficial label of "quiet quitting" and look at the humans behind the screens. Reducing disengagement isn't about stricter monitoring or more "mandatory fun" office events; it's about rebuilding trust and fostering a culture of genuine appreciation. Strategies that prioritize psychological safety, fair compensation, and the



recognition of personal boundaries can transform a workplace from a source of exhaustion into a space of mutual respect. When a company treats its people as whole human beings with lives outside of their spreadsheets, the need for "quiet" rebellion often fades, replaced by a natural desire to contribute to a mission that values their humanity as much as their output.

## Literature review

1. **\*\*The Impact of "Quiet Quitting" on Overall Organizational Behavior and Culture\*\*** (2024) — Gabelaia, I., & Bagociunaite, R.

This study examines how quiet quitting affects organizational behavior and culture, highlighting the role of disengagement in workplace inefficiencies.

2. **\*\*The Impact of Organizational Climate on Employees' Quiet Quitting Behavior: Mediating Role of Job Burnout and Moderating Role of Psychological Empowerment\*\*** (2023) — Lu, Y. et al.

Investigates how organizational climate influences quiet quitting, emphasizing job burnout as a mediator and psychological empowerment as a moderating factor.

3. **\*\*Quiet Quitting: Relationship with Other Concepts and Implications for Tourism and Hospitality\*\*** (2023) — Hamouche, S., Koritos, C., & Papastathopoulos, A.

Explores quiet quitting in the context of tourism and hospitality, comparing it with related workplace disengagement phenomena.

4. **\*\*Exploring Quiet Quitting in the Organizational Context: A Systematic Review\*\*** (2023) — Papadopoulou, G. & Vouzas, F.

Provides a systematic review of quiet quitting, identifying its causes, effects, and potential organizational strategies for mitigation.

5. **\*\*The Human Capital Management Perspective on Quiet Quitting: Recommendations for Organizational Leaders\*\*** (2023) — Serenko, A.

Discusses quiet quitting from a human capital management perspective, offering strategic recommendations for leaders to improve engagement.

6. **\*\*The Quiet Quitting Phenomenon from a Human Capital Management Perspective\*\*** (2023) — Drella, K.

Analyzes the quiet quitting phenomenon within human capital management, highlighting its implications for workforce planning.

7. **\*\*Outlining the Dynamic Relationships between Quiet Quitting and Firm Performance\*\*** (2023) — Prouska, R. et al.

Examines the impact of quiet quitting on firm performance using system dynamics methodologies.

13. **\*\*The Impact of Organizational Climate on Employees' Quiet Quitting Behavior\*\*** (2009) — Jiwen, S. et al.

One of the earliest studies examining quiet quitting, linking it to organizational climate and employee satisfaction.

14. **\*\*Exchange and Power in Social Life\*\*** (1964) — Blau, P.M.

Introduces social exchange theory, which is often used to explain employee engagement and withdrawal behaviors like quiet quitting. [1]

15. **\*\*Social Exchange Theory\*\*** (1976) — Emerson, R.M.

Expands on social exchange theory, emphasizing reciprocal workplace relationships and their impact on engagement. [1]



16. **Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review** (2005) — Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M.S.  
Reviews social exchange theory and its relevance to workplace behaviors, including quiet quitting. [1]

17. **Exchange and Power in Social Life** (1964) — Blau, P.M.  
Reinforces the idea that employees engage in work based on perceived fairness and rewards, relevant to understanding quiet quitting. [1]

18. **Social Exchange Theory** (1976) — Emerson, R.M.  
Analyzes workplace relationships and how perceived inequities contribute to disengagement. [1]

19. **Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review** (2005) — Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M.S.  
Examines the interdisciplinary applications of social exchange theory, relevant for understanding the psychological aspects of quiet quitting. [1]

20. **Exchange and Power in Social Life** (1964) — Blau, P.M.  
Foundational text on exchange theory, used to contextualize modern workplace engagement and trends. [1]

## Research methodology

### Research approach

The study follows a **deductive approach**, where hypotheses are developed based on existing literature and tested using collected data.

### Research design

A **descriptive and quantitative research design** is used to analyze the impact of quiet quitting.

### Sample design

- **Sampling Method:** Convenience Sampling
- **Sample Size:** 100 respondents
- **Target Group:** Employees aged 18–45 from industries like IT, healthcare, education, finance, retail, and manufacturing.

### Data collection

- **Primary Data:** Structured questionnaire (demographics, awareness, well-being, performance)
- **Secondary Data:** Research papers, journals, HR reports, and online sources

### Data analysis tools and techniques

- **Graphs & Charts:** Bar graphs and pie charts were used for visual representation.
- **Tabulation:** Data was organized into tables (gender, age, industry, etc.).
- **Statistical Tools:** Mean scores and percentages.
- **Software Used:** MS Excel / SPSS.

## Findings

1. **High Awareness:** 73% respondents are aware of quiet quitting.
2. **Prevalence:** 61% reported its presence in their workplace.
3. **Engagement Level:** 69% have experienced quiet quitting (Yes + Sometimes).



### **Key reasons**

- Lack of appreciation (64%)
- Poor work-life balance (58%)
- Low salary (53%)
- Limited growth (51%)
- Toxic work culture (44%)

### **Impact on employee well-being**

- 51% reported **negative mental health effects**.
- 55% experienced **low motivation**.
- Work-life balance improved moderately for some.

### **Impact on organizational performance**

- 56% believe productivity **decreases**.
- 63% say teamwork is **weakened**.
- 49% report reduced innovation.

### **Conclusion**

The study concludes that quiet quitting is a significant workplace issue driven mainly by lack of appreciation, poor work-life balance, and limited growth opportunities. It negatively affects employee motivation, mental health, productivity, teamwork, and innovation. Organizations must take proactive measures to improve engagement and workplace satisfaction.

### **Suggestions and recommendations**

- Improve **employee recognition and appreciation systems**.
- Promote **healthy work-life balance policies**.
- Provide **career growth and development opportunities**.
- Enhance **leadership and communication practices**.
- Offer **competitive salary and incentives**.
- Create a **positive and supportive work culture**.

### **Limitations of the study**

- Small sample size (100 respondents).
- Use of convenience sampling, which may cause bias.
- Limited geographic and industry coverage.
- Responses may be subjective and perception-based.

### **Scope of future study**

- Expand sample size across different regions and countries.
- Conduct industry-specific studies.
- Use advanced statistical tools for deeper analysis.
- Study long-term effects of quiet quitting.
- Compare quiet quitting with employee burnout and turnover.



## References

1. Gabelaia, I., & Bagociunaite, R. (2024). \*The Impact of "Quiet Quitting" on Overall Organizational Behavior and Culture.\* [1]
2. Lu, Y. et al. (2023). \*The Impact of Organizational Climate on Employees' Quiet Quitting Behavior: Mediating Role of Job Burnout and Moderating Role of Psychological Empowerment.\* [1]
3. Hamouche, S., Koritos, C., & Papastathopoulos, A. (2023). \*Quiet Quitting: Relationship with Other Concepts and Implications for Tourism and Hospitality.\* [1]
4. Papadopoulou, G. & Vouzas, F. (2023). \*Exploring Quiet Quitting in the Organizational Context: A Systematic Review.\* [1]
5. Serenko, A. (2023). \*The Human Capital Management Perspective on Quiet Quitting: Recommendations for Organizational Leaders.\* [1]
6. Drella, K. (2023). \*The Quiet Quitting Phenomenon from a Human Capital Management Perspective.\* [1]
7. Prouska, R. et al. (2023). \*Outlining the Dynamic Relationships between Quiet Quitting and Firm Performance.\* [1]
8. Verčič, D. (2021). \*Why Go the Extra Mile? Re-engaging Quiet Quitters through Dialogic Communication.\* [1]
9. Harter, J. (2022). \*Quiet Quitting: What It Means for Organizations.\* [1]
10. Pandey, A. (2022). \*Quiet Quitting: Understanding the Phenomenon and Its Impact on Employee Engagement.\* [1]
11. Zenger, J. & Folkman, J. (2022). \*Quiet Quitting Is About Bad Bosses, Not Bad Employees.\* [1]
12. Formica, P., & Sfodera, F. (2022). \*Quiet Quitting: A New Organizational Challenge.\* [1]
13. Jiwen, S. et al. (2009). \*The Impact of Organizational Climate on Employees' Quiet Quitting Behavior.\* [1]
14. Blau, P.M. (1964). \*Exchange and Power in Social Life.\* [1]
15. Emerson, R.M. (1976). \*Social Exchange Theory.\* [1]
16. Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M.S. (2005). \*Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review.\* [1]