International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Scope (IRJMS), 2025; 6(2): 1181-1195

Original Article | ISSN (0): 2582-631X

# **Quiet Quitting: Impact of Performance and Well-Being**

Swarn Priya<sup>1</sup>, Rimjhim Jha<sup>1</sup>\*, Narendra Singh Chaudhary<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Symbiosis Institute of Business Management, Nagpur Campus, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Pune India, <sup>2</sup>Sparsh Global Business School, Greater Noida, India. \*Corresponding Author's Email: rimjhimjha1@gmail.com

#### Abstract

This study examines the impact of Employee Well-Being on Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting in the IT sector in India, focusing on the mediating role of Employee Performance and the moderating role of gender. Data from 282 IT employees in India is analysed, using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM). Results reveal that Employee Well-Being significantly enhances Employee Performance and reduces Quiet Quitting. Employee Performance does not mediate the Employee Well-Being and Quiet Quitting relationship, indicating that Employee Well-Being directly influences Quiet Quitting rather than through Employee Performance. Gender moderates the Employee Well-Being–Employee Performance link, with males benefiting more from Employee Well-Being improvements and being less likely to engage in Quiet Quitting. Gender does not significantly affect how Employee Well-Being or performance influences Quiet Quitting. These findings are helpful, but they mostly apply to IT employees in big cities. So, they may not fit all work settings. Future research could explore longitudinal effects, organisational culture, and technology-driven engagement strategies. Organisations should focus on mental health support, flexible work arrangements, and fostering a supportive workplace culture to sustain employee productivity. The study is grounded in JD-R Theory, which explains how job demands and resources affect well-being, performance, and Quiet Quitting. This study contributes to the literature by addressing gaps in understanding how Employee Well-Being, Employee Performance, and gender interact to influence Quiet Quitting in the IT sector in India.

**Keywords:** Employee Performance, Employee Well-Being, Gender Moderation, Quiet Quitting.

# Introduction

A healthy workplace starts with a healthy and happy mind. Happiness has been used as a counterpart to well-being (1). One of the most enduring interests among researchers appears to be the quest for well-being (2, 3). Employee Well-Being is not generic well-being (4). It is analysed in the workplace and its related environment. It has three distinct dimensions: life well-being, which encompasses overall satisfaction with life; workplace well-being, focused on the individual's conditions and experiences within their work environment; and psychological well-being, which addresses mental and emotional health. Employee Well-Being is a broad concept. Organisations are keenly looking into Employees' Well-Being as it influences job satisfaction, productivity, and commitment, making it a crucial factor in workplace management (5). Happy workers often perform better than their unhappy counterparts Employee Well-Being has become (6, 7).increasingly significant due to its connection with improved Employee Performance (8-10). Employee Performance measures how efficiently

and effectively employees complete their assigned tasks and responsibilities in the workplace within the timeline (11, 12). In today's competitive landscape, businesses must swiftly adapt to evolving market demands. Achieving peak Employee Performance requires a coordinated organisational effort, ensuring that each employee excels, which benefits their team and, ultimately, the entire organisation (13). Employees are not only a vital component of an organisation; rather, the success of an organisation is heavily reliant on Employee Performance (14). Organisations implement various strategies to enhance Employee Well-Being, such as offering pay scales, job security, recognition, and opportunities for professional development, all of which contribute to improve Employee Performance (15). Employee Performance is a crucial factor in organisational success, but employees are increasingly restricting their efforts to only what is required, leading to a decline in discretionary effort, engagement, and overall productivity (16). Quiet Quitting was coined by economist Mark Badger in 2009 and

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

(Received 17th January 2025; Accepted 22nd April 2025; Published 30th April 2025)

gained widespread recognition after the COVID-19 pandemic (17-19). It refers to employees limiting their commitment to only the tasks explicitly stated in their job descriptions (20-22). It involves minimal investment in work activities, leading to Quiet Quitting, where employees avoid going above and beyond their defined duties (23-26) and avoid extra efforts like helping others, staying late, or taking initiative. Gender differences in workplace behaviours and engagement have been widely studied, with research indicating that men and women may respond differently to Employee Well-Being initiatives, workplace expectations, and jobrelated stress (27, 28). Gender influences work attitudes, Employee Performance outcomes, and withdrawal patterns, making it an essential factor in understanding Quiet Quitting behaviours. This study examines the relationship between Employee Well-Being, Employee Performance, and Quiet Quitting, with gender as a moderating factor. Using PLS-SEM, data from IT/ITES employees in India is analysed to assess how Employee Well-Being influences Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting. The study also explores the mediating role of Employee Performance and evaluates the model's predictive accuracy. Findings will provide insights into mitigating Quiet Quitting through workplace Employee Well-Being initiatives and highlight the need for gender-sensitive policies to enhance engagement and organisational success. To explain these interconnections, the study uses JD-R Theory to explain how workplace factors influence employee outcomes.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study is anchored in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory (1), which helps explain how workplace conditions affect Employee Well-Being, performance, and disengagement behaviours like Quiet Quitting. According to JD-R, when job demands are too high and resources too low, Employee Well-Being suffers which can hurt performance and lead to withdrawal behaviours like Quiet Quitting. On the other hand, sufficient job resources enhance well-being, boost performance, and reduce the urge to disengage. This framework helps explain the central role of Employee Well-Being in influencing both performance and Quiet Quitting.

# Employee Wellbeing and Employee Performance

Employee Well-Being is complex and difficult to define (29). Over the last few decades, employee wellbeing or work-related wellbeing has emerged as a significant concern in organisational life, attracting increasing global interest (30). Organisations recognise that fostering Employee Well-Being is crucial for maintaining competitive advantage, as happy employees are more likely to be productive and contribute positively to organisational performance (31). Moreover, organisations that prioritise Employee Well-Being often witness improved financial performance, as a healthy workforce is more productive and engaged (32, 33). In light of these findings, it is hypothesised that enhancing Employee Well-Being will lead to significant improvements in individual Employee Performance consequently, and, overall organisational success. Thus, based on the analysis of the literature, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H1: Employee Well-Being has a positive impact on Employee Performance

# **Employee Well-Being and Quiet**

### Quitting

Employee Well-Being at work extends beyond job satisfaction, including overall life satisfaction, emotional health, and a sense of purpose (34-36). Recent studies have highlighted a connection between diminished Employee Well-Being and the emergence of "Quiet Quitting," where employees show a lack of involvement and limit their efforts to the bare minimum required. This behaviour often stems from overall Employee Well-Being, prompting employees to withdraw from work to protect their mental health (37-41). Research indicates that unfavourable work conditions, such as lack of job security and limited career advancement opportunities, can lead to increased job burnout and decreased Employee Well-Being, which in turn may result in Quiet Quitting behaviours (42). Conversely, fostering a supportive work environment that promotes Employee Well-Being can mitigate the likelihood of such disengagement, which leads to Quiet Quitting (43). Based on an extensive literature review, the following hypothesis is posited:

H2. Employee Well-Being has a negative impact on Quiet Quitting.

# Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting

A decline in employee commitment and Employee Performance often stems from managerial failures to engage and inspire their teams (44). The disconnect from work can lead employees to perform only the bare minimum required, a hallmark of Quiet Quitting. Employees who lack clear understanding of their roles are more susceptible to dissatisfaction and job tension, leading to reduced engagement and increased likelihood of Quiet Quitting (45). Crafting a culture of clarity, outlining specific Employee Performance parameters, and correct communication of managerial expectations are essential to prevent a lack in Employee Performance, which may lead to Quiet Quitting behaviours (46, 47). Extensive research has established a significant relationship where "Quiet Quitting"— where employees disengage and perform only minimal required tasks-negatively impacts overall Employee Performance (48, 49). However, the reverse relationship—where Employee Performance directly influences the likelihood of Quiet Quitting—remains underexplored. Understanding whether factors such as role clarity, job expectations, and managerial support affect Employee Performance levels, thereby leading employees to engage in Quiet Quitting, is crucial. This study aims to empirically test this relationship, providing insights into how Employee Performance dynamics may contribute to employee Quiet Quitting. The following hypothesis is posited:

H3. Employee Performance has a negative impact on Quiet Quitting.

# Employee Performance as a Mediator between Employee Well-Being and Quiet Quitting

Employee Well-Being plays a crucial role in shaping workplace behaviours, influencing both Employee Performance and disengagement tendencies like Quiet Quitting. Research suggests that employees with higher Employee Well-Being tend to perform better, as they experience greater job satisfaction, motivation, and resilience in their roles. In turn, higher Employee Performance is often linked to lower engagement in Quiet Quitting behaviours, as productive employees are more likely to feel valued and committed to their work. This suggests that Employee Performance mediates the relationship between Employee Well-Being and Quiet Quitting, where Employee Well-Being enhances Employee Performance, which subsequently reduces the likelihood of Quiet Quitting. However, if Employee Performance does not improve despite Employee Well-Being initiatives, employees may still detach from their roles, reinforcing the complex interplay between these workplace factors (50).

H4: Employee Performance mediates the relationship between Employee Well-Being and Quiet Quitting

# Gender, Employee Well-Being,

# **Employee Performance, Quiet Quitting**

Research indicates that men and women may experience and respond to workplace dynamics differently, influencing their levels of engagement and intentions to withdraw (51). Understanding these gender-specific dynamics is crucial for organisations aiming to implement effective interventions that promote Employee Well-Being and sustain high Employee Performance across their workforce (52, 53). This study examines how gender moderates the relationship between Employee Well-Being, Employee Performance, and Quiet Quitting. The hypotheses incorporating the moderating role of gender in the relationships between Employee Well-Being, Employee Performance, and Quiet Quitting:

H5: Gender has a direct effect on Quiet Quitting and Employee Performance.

H6: Gender moderates the relationship between Employee Well-Being and Employee Performance

H7: Gender moderates the relationship between Employee Well-Being and Quiet Quitting

H8: Gender moderates the relationship between Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting

Therefore, the discussed relationships, grounded in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory, are illustrated in the preliminary model shown in Figure 1, highlighting the links between Employee Well-Being, Employee Performance, and Quiet Quitting.



Figure 1: Conceptual Model Based on the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory

# Methodology

### Sample

The primary data for this study was collected through an online questionnaire across various IT/ITES sector companies in India. The data was collected in mid-2024, during the post-pandemic period when most IT companies had shifted to hybrid or remote work setups. The target respondents were employees working in these companies using convenience sampling (54). Data was obtained using a self-managed questionnaire, which collected information on demographic cnaracteristics like age, gender, marital status, and number of dependents. Before sharing the questionnaire with the participants, the draft was sent to six academicians and researchers to ensure its validity. After revision for more clarity, the final survey started, where 315 questionnaires were shared. From the same, 296 were completed and returned. After excluding incomplete or unsuitable responses, 282 valid questionnaires were retained for the final sample analysis. Demographic data about the respondents are presented in Table 1.

| Demographic Variable  | Category                      | Frequency | %   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----|
| Gender                | Male                          | 117       | 41% |
|                       | Female                        | 164       | 58% |
|                       | Prefer not to say             | 1         | 0%  |
| Age group             | Less Than 30 years            | 182       | 65% |
|                       | 30-40 Years                   | 59        | 21% |
|                       | 40-50 Years                   | 38        | 13% |
|                       | 50-60 Years                   | 3         | 1%  |
| Highest qualification | Below bachelor's degree       | 8         | 3%  |
|                       | Bachelor degree or equivalent | 108       | 38% |
|                       | Master's degree or equivalent | 159       | 56% |
|                       | Ph.D. or equivalent           | 7         | 2%  |
| Marital status        | Unmarried                     | 173       | 61% |
|                       | Married                       | 105       | 37% |
|                       | Separated/Divorced            | 4         | 1%  |
| Number of Dependents  | No dependents                 | 53        | 19% |
|                       | 1-2                           | 144       | 51% |

Table 1: Demographic Information about the Respondents

|                       | 3-4                     | 77  | 27% |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----|-----|
|                       | 5-6                     | 7   | 2%  |
|                       | More than 6             | 1   | 0%  |
| Income                | Below 5 Lacs            | 72  | 26% |
|                       | 5 -10 Lacs              | 134 | 48% |
|                       | 10-15 Lacs              | 22  | 8%  |
|                       | 15-20 Lacs              | 11  | 4%  |
|                       | Above 20 Lacs           | 43  | 15% |
| Designation           | Executive-Entry Level   | 35  | 12% |
|                       | Junior Management Level | 130 | 46% |
|                       | Middle Management Level | 95  | 34% |
|                       | Senior Management Level | 22  | 8%  |
| Type of employment    | Fulltime                | 252 | 89% |
|                       | Part-time               | 16  | 6%  |
|                       | Contractual             | 14  | 5%  |
| Total work experience | Less than 5 years       | 129 | 46% |
|                       | 5-10 years              | 82  | 29% |
|                       | 10-15 years             | 35  | 12% |
|                       | 15-20 years             | 23  | 8%  |
|                       | Above 20 years          | 13  | 5%  |
| Mode of Working       | Hybrid                  | 135 | 48% |
|                       | Work from Office        | 115 | 41% |
|                       | Work from Home          | 32  | 11% |

#### Measures

The items measuring the latent constructs were sourced from existing literature. The scale used to measure Employee Performance in this study is adapted from the previous work, utilising a 5-point Likert scale (54). The scale used to measure Employee Well-Being in this study is derived from the prior research work (55). The scale used to measure Quiet Quitting in this study is adapted from the existing literature. (14), utilizing a 5-point Likert scale. The Quiet Quitting scale captures disengagement and low extra effort, including reduced initiative and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). Higher scores mean stronger Quiet Quitting.

#### **Data Characteristics**

In the study, out of 315 questionnaires distributed to the target group, 282 were returned with valid

responses. However, 33 were incomplete and thus excluded from the analysis. The study employs PLS-SEM to analyse the data and evaluate the hypotheses, chosen over Covariance-Based SEM (CB-SEM) due to the sample size, normality characteristics, and research objectives (56-58). Given the complexity of the relationships among the constructs in the model, the PLS-SEM technique was used for the analysis.

### Results

The study utilizes PLS-SEM to analyse the data and assess the hypotheses, as it effectively tests both reliability and validity, yielding robust predictive values. Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the indicators, showing the mean and standard deviation for each variable of interest.

| <br>Name   | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|------------|------|--------------------|
| <br>Gender | 0.42 | 0.50               |
| EP1        | 3.66 | 0.91               |
| EP2        | 3.68 | 0.85               |
| EP3        | 3.82 | 0.90               |
| EP4        | 3.64 | 0.96               |
|            |      |                    |

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation

| EP5   | 3.77 | 0.97 |
|-------|------|------|
| EP6   | 3.75 | 1.00 |
| QQ1   | 2.21 | 1.25 |
| QQ2   | 2.28 | 1.08 |
| QQ3   | 2.21 | 1.17 |
| QQ4   | 2.41 | 1.20 |
| QQ5   | 2.28 | 1.18 |
| QQ6   | 2.30 | 1.17 |
| QQ7   | 2.31 | 1.24 |
| QQ8   | 2.32 | 1.29 |
| EWB1  | 4.57 | 1.74 |
| EWB2  | 4.97 | 1.73 |
| EWB3  | 4.98 | 1.77 |
| EWB4  | 4.91 | 1.71 |
| EWB5  | 5.16 | 1.72 |
| EWB6  | 4.86 | 1.69 |
| EWB7  | 5.20 | 1.71 |
| EWB8  | 4.95 | 1.71 |
| EWB9  | 5.21 | 1.66 |
| EWB10 | 5.26 | 1.82 |
| EWB11 | 5.06 | 1.72 |
| EWB12 | 4.97 | 1.70 |
| EWB13 | 4.82 | 1.69 |
| EWB14 | 4.72 | 1.71 |
| EWB15 | 4.87 | 1.69 |
| EWB16 | 4.86 | 1.68 |
| EWB17 | 4.81 | 1.74 |
|       |      |      |

EP – Employee Performance, QQ – Quiet Quitting, EWB – Employee Well-Being

### Measurement Model

The research hypothesis was assessed using PLS-SEM due to its reliability and ease of handling complex models (59). PLS-SEM targets the most impactful parts of the independent variables to boost prediction accuracy for the dependent variables, making it ideal for research focused on analysing and forecasting outcomes from established relationships (60). The measurement model states the estimates of reliability and validity. Also, it uses Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability to check how consistently a survey measures a concept. Table 3 outlines the reliability and validity metrics for the constructs employed in the research. The minimum threshold for Cronbach's Alpha and rho\_a (for unstandardized data) is 0.7 (61). For rho\_c (for standardized data), the value should exceed the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and the AVE itself should be at least 0.5 to affirm the reliability and validity of any construct.

| Table | 2. | Cuamba | ah'a  | Almha  | Commonito | Daliahilitar | and AVE |
|-------|----|--------|-------|--------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Table | з: | CLOUDS | ICH S | Агрпа, | composite | Renadinty,   | and AVE |

|                      | Cronbach's<br>alpha | Composite<br>reliability (rho_a) | Composite<br>reliability<br>(rho_c) | AVE  |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|
| Employee Performance | 0.91                | 0.93                             | 0.93                                | 0.68 |
| Employee Well-Being  | 0.97                | 0.97                             | 0.97                                | 0.68 |
| Quiet Quitting       | 0.94                | 0.95                             | 0.95                                | 0.72 |

For this study, the Employee Performance Cronbach's Alpha is reported at 0.909, indicating a high level of internal consistency, which is corroborated by a Composite Reliability of 0.929. The AVE for this construct stands at 0.684, surpassing the 0.5 threshold and confirming good convergent validity. The Employee Well-Being construct shows even higher reliability, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.97 and Composite Reliability of 0.973, demonstrating excellent internal consistency. Its AVE of 0.677 further validates the strong convergent validity of the construct. Quiet Quitting also exhibits robust reliability metrics, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.944 and a Composite Reliability of 0.953. The AVE for Quiet Quitting is 0.719, significantly exceeding the standard benchmark, which confirms its solid convergent validity. These metrics collectively ensure that the constructs are accurately measured and reflect a strong theoretical grounding, as indicated by their internal consistency and validity measures (62). To confirm the discriminant validity, the next value analysed is the Fornell and Larker criterion. This criterion requires that the square root of the AVE for each construct must exceed the correlations between that construct and any other in the model. This ensures each construct is distinctly different from others.

| Table 4: Fornell-Larcker Criterion | l |
|------------------------------------|---|
|------------------------------------|---|

|                      | Employee    | Employee   | Quiet    | Condor |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|----------|--------|
|                      | Performance | Well-Being | Quitting | Genuer |
| Employee Performance | 0.827       |            |          |        |
| Employee Well-Being  | 0.324       | 0.823      |          |        |
| Quiet Quitting       | -0.228      | -0.716     | 0.848    |        |
| Gender               | -0.104      | -0.115     | -0.038   | 1      |

In Table 4, the diagonal values in bold represent the square roots of the AVE for each construct, while the off-diagonal elements show the correlations between constructs. The bold diagonal values for Employee Performance, Employee Well-Being, Quiet Quitting, and gender are 0.827, 0.823, 0.848, and 1.000, respectively. These values exceed the correlations listed in their corresponding rows and columns. This arrangement confirms that our measurement models have successfully established both discriminant and convergent validity, as the diagonal values (square roots of AVEs) are greater than all respective inter-construct correlations, affirming that each construct is distinct and welldefined in the context of our study. In PLS-SEM, assessing discriminant validity also involves using the hetero-trait mono-trait ratio (HTMT) of correlations (63). This criterion compares the average correlations between indicators across different constructs to the average correlations within the same constructs. If HTMT exceeds 0.90, it indicates a potential overlap, suggesting insufficient discriminant validity. For more distinct constructs, the threshold should be lower, around 0.85, to ensure clearer separation between constructs.

 Table 5: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

|                         | Employee<br>Performance | Employee<br>Well-Being | Quiet<br>Quitting | Gender | Gender x<br>Employee<br>Well-Being | Gender x<br>Employee<br>Performance |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Employee                |                         |                        |                   |        |                                    |                                     |
| Performance             |                         |                        |                   |        |                                    |                                     |
| Employee Well-<br>Being | 0.33                    |                        |                   |        |                                    |                                     |
| Quiet Quitting          | 0.23                    | 0.74                   |                   |        |                                    |                                     |
| Gender                  | 0.11                    | 0.12                   | 0.06              |        |                                    |                                     |
| Gender x                |                         |                        |                   |        |                                    |                                     |
| Employee Well-          | 0.18                    | 0.08                   | 0.07              | 0.04   |                                    |                                     |
| Being                   |                         |                        |                   |        |                                    |                                     |
| Gender x                |                         |                        |                   |        |                                    |                                     |
| Employee                | 0.07                    | 0.16                   | 0.11              | 0.06   | 0.36                               |                                     |
| Performance             |                         |                        |                   |        |                                    |                                     |

Table 5 effectively demonstrates that all HTMT values are below the conservative threshold of 0.85, significantly distinguishing each construct from the others. This confirms that discriminant validity has been firmly established for the study. Consequently, we can conclude that each construct is well-defined and distinct within the model, providing a strong foundation for the validity of the research findings.

### **Structural Model**

The measurement model tables created from the analysis showed that the model used fits the data accurately. This good fit ensures that we can confidently move forward to the next step, which is testing the hypotheses we have about the relationships between variables using PLS-SEM. The second stage of this process involves bootstrapping, which employs 5,000 resamples to rigorously estimate standard errors and confidence intervals, thereby ensuring precise hypothesis testing. Path analysis in structural equation modelling involves latent variables, which were analysed to examine the relationships between constructs. This analysis utilises path coefficients to reveal both the strength and direction of these relationships, providing insights into how constructs influence one another. On the right side of the model, the principal construct is Employee Performance (Figure 1). The path coefficient analysis will also serve as the basis for our hypothesis testing, and all the values are presented in Table 6. The results of H1 suggest the relationship between Employee Well-Being and Employee Performance is positive and significant ( $\beta$  = 0.306, p < 0.001) which aligns with previous studies highlighting that improved well-being leads to better performance (4, 5). The result of H2

| Table | 6: Path | Coefficient | and | p-Values |
|-------|---------|-------------|-----|----------|
|-------|---------|-------------|-----|----------|

states a substantial negative impact of Employee Well-Being on Quiet Quitting is significant ( $\beta$  = -0.729, p < 0.001), matching past studies that link well-being to lower disengagement (6, 7). While, in the H3 result, a negligible and statistically nonsignificant effect of Employee Performance on Quiet Quitting, with values ( $\beta = -0.003$ , p = 0.939), which suggests that performance alone may not predict disengagement, as also noted in other studies (8). The results of H4 indicates a minimal and statistically non-significant mediating impact of Employee Performance on relation of Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting, with  $\beta$  = -0.001, p = 0.942. H5 states the influence of gender on Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting is minor and not statistically significant ( $\beta$  = -0.063, p = 0.277 for Employee Performance;  $\beta = -0.123$ , p = 0.002 for Quiet Quitting), indicating that while gender has a significant effect on Quiet Quitting; it does not significantly impact Employee Performance. Interaction effects were also examined in further hypothesis. H6 suggests that gender combined with Employee Well-Being has a effect significant positive on Employee Performance ( $\beta$  = 0.135, p = 0.030), though H7 states that its impact on Quiet Quitting is not significant ( $\beta$  = -0.013, p = 0.791). Lastly, H8 suggests that the interaction of gender with Employee Performance shows a negligible effect on Quiet Quitting ( $\beta$  = 0.005, p = 0.896), highlighting that gender differences do not significantly alter the relationship between Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting behaviours. Overall, gender was found to influence how well-being affects performance, with male employees showing stronger performance benefits (9, 10). However, gender did not significantly change the effects of well-being or performance on Quiet Quitting.

|                 | Original<br>Sample<br>β | Sample<br>Mean<br>(M) | Standard<br>Deviation<br>(STDEV) | T statistics<br>( 0/STDEV ) | p-<br>Value | Accepted/<br>Rejected |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| EWB -> EP       | 0.306                   | 0.312                 | 0.063                            | 4.874                       | 0           | Accepted              |
| EWB -> QQ       | -0.729                  | -0.73                 | 0.037                            | 19.78                       | 0           | Accepted              |
| EP - > QQ       | -0.003                  | -0.005                | 0.04                             | 0.077                       | 0.939       | Rejected              |
| EWB -> EP -> QQ | -0.001                  | -0.002                | 0.013                            | 0.073                       | 0.942       | Rejected              |
| G->EP           | -0.063                  | -0.064                | 0.058                            | 1.086                       | 0.277       | Rejected              |
| G -> QQ         | -0.123                  | -0.123                | 0.039                            | 3.147                       | 0.002       | Accepted              |
| G*EWB -> EP     | 0.135                   | 0.134                 | 0.062                            | 2.173                       | 0.03        | Accepted              |
| G*EWB -> QQ     | -0.013                  | -0.012                | 0.051                            | 0.266                       | 0.791       | Rejected              |
| G*EP -> QQ      | 0.005                   | 0.004                 | 0.04                             | 0.131                       | 0.896       | Rejected              |

EWB: Employee Well-Being, EP – Employee Performance, QQ – Quiet Quitting, G -Gender

The coefficient of determination  $(R^2)$ , indicates the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be predicted from the independent variable(s) while the Adjusted R-squared (Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>) values provide these estimates

accounting for the number of predictors in the model, offering a more precise measure by adjusting for potential over fitting. Table 7 holds the value of the same.

| Construct            | R-squared (Original) | Adjusted R-squared<br>(Original) |  |  |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Employee Performance | 0.127                | 0.118                            |  |  |
| Quiet Quitting       | 0.528                | 0.519                            |  |  |

The R-squared value for Employee Performance is 0.127, suggesting that approximately 12.7% of the variability in Employee Performance is explained by the independent variables included in the model. The Adjusted R-squared, a more conservative estimate, is slightly lower at 0.118, indicating a slight adjustment when accounting for the number of predictors. For Quiet Quitting, the R-squared value is notably higher at 0.528, demonstrating that about 52.8% of the variance in Quiet Quitting behaviours can be explained by the

model's predictors. The Adjusted R-squared for Quiet Quitting stands at 0.519, affirming the substantial explanatory power of the model while slightly adjusting for the number of included variables. Finally, predictive relevance of the model was assessed using the PLS Predict method. It was applied to the data to assess the model's predictive accuracy and reliability (64). Table 8 presents the predictive relevance and accuracy metrics for our model, focusing on Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting.

Table 8: PLS Predict Summary

|                         |                        | Q <sup>2</sup> predict |                 | RMSE    |        | MAE     |        |
|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Employee<br>Performance |                        | 0.101                  |                 | 0.962   |        | 0.707   |        |
| Quiet Quitting          |                        | 0.514                  |                 | 0.702   |        | 0.529   |        |
|                         | Q <sup>2</sup> predict | PLS-<br>SEM_RMSE       | PLS-<br>SEM_MAE | LM_RMSE | LM_MAE | IA_RMSE | IA_MAE |
| EP1                     | 0.094                  | 0.865                  | 0.643           | 0.896   | 0.668  | 0.909   | 0.702  |
| EP2                     | 0.066                  | 0.828                  | 0.639           | 0.857   | 0.66   | 0.856   | 0.686  |
| EP3                     | 0.075                  | 0.868                  | 0.6             | 0.898   | 0.661  | 0.903   | 0.649  |
| EP4                     | 0.055                  | 0.94                   | 0.741           | 0.985   | 0.765  | 0.966   | 0.776  |
| EP5                     | 0.047                  | 0.946                  | 0.685           | 0.969   | 0.721  | 0.969   | 0.731  |
| EP6                     | 0.08                   | 0.962                  | 0.714           | 0.983   | 0.743  | 1.003   | 0.772  |
| QQ1                     | 0.275                  | 1.071                  | 0.856           | 1.086   | 0.878  | 1.258   | 0.994  |
| QQ2                     | 0.37                   | 0.862                  | 0.675           | 0.878   | 0.682  | 1.086   | 0.855  |
| QQ3                     | 0.378                  | 0.93                   | 0.747           | 0.942   | 0.746  | 1.178   | 0.965  |
| QQ4                     | 0.358                  | 0.968                  | 0.751           | 1.015   | 0.795  | 1.208   | 1.005  |
| QQ5                     | 0.371                  | 0.94                   | 0.713           | 0.985   | 0.765  | 1.185   | 0.968  |
| QQ6                     | 0.386                  | 0.921                  | 0.727           | 0.956   | 0.76   | 1.176   | 0.952  |
| QQ7                     | 0.346                  | 1.002                  | 0.763           | 1.02    | 0.785  | 1.239   | 1.02   |
| QQ8                     | 0.45                   | 0.957                  | 0.735           | 0.971   | 0.761  | 1.291   | 1.072  |

As demonstrated, the  $Q^2$  values for Quiet Quitting indicated a substantial predictive relevance (0.514), suggesting the model's robust ability to predict outcomes related to this construct. Conversely, Employee Performance showed a lower predictive relevance with a  $Q^2$  value of 0.101, indicating moderate predictability. Figure 2 illustrates the model that has been tested through empirical methods. This visual representation not only enhances comprehension but also aids in the discussion of the findings and their implications in the broader context of the research field.



Figure 2: Empirically Tested Model

# Discussion

The results of this study underscore the intricate interplay between Employee Performance, Quiet Quitting, and the overarching influence of Employee Well-Being within the workplace, analysed through a robust PLS-SEM approach. These findings align with the JD-R Theory, which explains how job demands and resources shape Employee Well-Being, performance, and withdrawal behaviours. The high reliability and validity metrics associated with these constructs reinforce the strength and applicability of our findings. A strong and positive relationship was observed between Employee Well-Being and Employee Performance ( $\beta = 0.306$ , p < 0.001), emphasising that employees with higher Employee Well-Being tend to perform better. This confirms that fostering a healthy work environment not only benefits employee morale but also enhances productivity and creativity (65, 66). The significance of this relationship highlights the importance of Employee Well-Being programs as a strategic tool for improving organisational outcomes. The results show that Employee Well-Being significantly reduces Quiet Quitting ( $\beta = -$ 0.729, p < 0.001), indicating that employees who experience higher Employee Well-Being are less likely to engage in Quiet Quitting. This finding underscores the critical role of Employee Well-Being initiatives in preventing workplace withdrawal and reinforces the idea that organisations can mitigate Quiet Quitting by prioritising employee support systems, mental health resources, and job satisfaction strategies. The relationship between Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting was found to be negligible and statistically non-significant ( $\beta = -0.003$ , p = 0.939). Research states that an employee's performance level does not directly determine their likelihood of engaging in Quiet Quitting behaviours. These finding contrasts with traditional assumptions that lower Employee Performance may signal disengagement from work, indicating that other factors, such as workplace conditions or intrinsic motivation, play a more dominant role in predicting Quiet Quitting. Researchers suggested that Employee Performance mediates the relationship between well-being and Quiet Quitting, but in this study, the mediation analysis result indicates that Employee Performance does not mediate the relationship between Employee Well-Being and Quiet Quitting ( $\beta = -0.001$ , p = 0.942), as the indirect effect is both negligible and statistically non-significant. This suggests that the impact of Employee Well-Being on Quiet Quitting operates through a direct pathway, rather than being contingent upon an employee's level of performance. This is consistent with JD-R Theory, which emphasizes that insufficient resources or high demands can directly impact employee disengagement, independent of performance levels. This indicates that even high-performing employees may still engage in Quiet Quitting if their Employee Well-Being is compromised, possibly due to burnout or feeling unrecognized. Conversely, employees with strong Employee Well-Being are less likely to Quiet Quitting, regardless of their Employee Performance levels. These findings emphasize that Employee Well-Being plays a more critical role in preventing Quiet Quitting than Employee Performance alone, reinforcing the need for organizations to prioritize Employee Well-Being initiatives over performance-driven interventions.

The impact of gender on Employee Performance was significant (67), but this study states that the effect of gender on Employee Performance was not significant ( $\beta$  = -0.063, p = 0.277), suggesting that Employee Performance levels do not differ meaningfully between male and female employees. This finding aligns with broader research indicating that, when provided with equal opportunities, gender does not inherently predict differences in Employee Performance. Instead, contextual factors such as role expectations and industry-specific dynamics may be more influential.

A statistically significant negative relationship was found between gender and Quiet Quitting ( $\beta$  = -0.123, p = 0.002), indicating that males (coded as 1) are less likely to engage in Quiet Quitting compared to females (68). This suggests that workplace Quiet Quitting may manifest differently across genders, potentially influenced by varying work expectations, job satisfaction levels, or perceived career advancement opportunities.

However, gender significantly moderates the relationship between Employee Well-Being and Employee Performance ( $\beta = 0.135$ , p = 0.030), indicating that Employee Well-Being has a stronger impact on Employee Performance for male employees (coded as 1) compared to female employees as also stated in another research works (69). This suggests that males may derive greater Employee Performance benefits from improved Employee Well-Being, potentially due to differences in coping mechanisms, workplace stressors, or role expectations.

Gender did not significantly moderate the impact of Employee Well-Being on Quiet Quitting ( $\beta$  = -0.013, p = 0.791), indicating that Employee Well-Being consistently reduces Quiet Quitting for both males and females. This reinforces the universal importance of Employee Well-Being initiatives in mitigating Quiet Quitting, suggesting that such interventions are equally effective across genders. Researchers demonstrate a positive moderating effect of gender on the relationship between Employee Performance and Quiet Quitting; however, in this study, the moderating effect of gender on the Employee Performance-Quiet Quitting relationship was not significant ( $\beta = 0.005$ , p = 0.896), indicating that Employee Performance does not influence Quiet Quitting behaviours differently for males and females. This finding suggests that while Employee Performance levels vary across individuals, they do not directly dictate Quiet Quitting behaviours based on gender. Instead, Quiet Quitting is likely driven by broader workplace factors such as job satisfaction, leadership styles, and work-life balance. These results emphasize that while gender does not independently determine Employee Performance or Quiet Quitting, it plays a moderating role in how employees respond to Employee Well-Being and Employee Performance-related factors. Organizations should consider tailoring Employee Well-Being programs and engagement strategies to account for these moderating effects, ensuring that workplace interventions are designed to maximize effectiveness for different employee groups.

This study shows that Employee Well-Being has a strong and direct role in lowering Quiet Quitting, no matter how well someone is performing. As Quiet Quitting may be shaped by local culture and norms, its patterns and causes might differ in non-Indian or non-IT contexts. The results reflect the experiences of IT employees in Indian cities, where work pressure and digital demands are high. At the same time, how employees respond to these challenges may differ in other work settings or cultures. Even so, the core message remains clear — when employees feel supported and valued, they stay more engaged.

### **Practical Implications of the Study**

This study highlights that Employee Well-Being plays a key role in reducing Quiet Quitting, especially in high-demand sectors like IT and ITES. While Employee Performance is important, it is not sufficient to prevent disengagement if well-being is overlooked. Based on these findings, organizations-particularly in the tech sectorneed to rethink how they support their workforce. For HR Professionals: HR should recognize that well-being is not a perk but a key factor in longterm engagement and productivity. It should be embedded into the organizational culture through structured practices such as pulse surveys, digital well-being tools, and early-warning indicators of disengagement. These tools help track stress levels and identify withdrawal patterns early. HR should also include well-being as a performance criterion in managers' KRAs, ensuring that leaders are accountable for their team's psychological health. Additionally, HR must organize offline well-being workshops separately for men and women to better understand their unique stressors and support needs, as different genders may experience and respond to workplace stress differently.

For Managers: Managers should be trained to recognize early signs of Quiet Quitting, such as reduced participation, limited collaboration, or disengagement from tasks beyond core responsibilities. Regular one-on-one interactions with team members are essential for maintaining trust and connection. In remote or hybrid setups, consistent efforts—such as virtual team-building activities or informal check-ins-can help reduce isolation and improve engagement. These practices should be on-going rather than one-time interventions. Recognizing employee contribution -ns during team meetings can also serve as a simple but effective motivator. Well-being indicators should be integrated into managerial performance evaluations to promote shared accountability. Additionally, small gestures such as personalized appreciation, creative recognition titles, or public praise can strengthen emotional engagement and help employees feel genuinely valued.

At the Policy Level: Organizations should embed Employee Well-Being into their performance management systems. This includes setting clear expectations regarding manager involvement in well-being, allocating time for regular check-ins, and defining structured responses to early signs of disengagement. Organizations should also redesign their reward systems to acknowledge not only outcomes but also effort and collaboration. These rewards can include both tangible and experiential options—such as family dining vouchers, team vacation outings, or wellnessfocused benefits like a day off, gym or dance class memberships, access to dieticians, or mental health helplines. Such initiatives foster a culture that promotes sustained engagement and recognizes employees beyond just performance metrics.

# Conclusion

The study's findings emphasize the critical role of Employee Well-Being in both enhancing Employee Performance and reducing Quiet Quitting, reinforcing the need for organizations to invest in Employee Well-Being strategies. These findings reinforce the relevance of JD-R Theory in understanding how workplace conditions shape employee behaviour. Gender differences were evident in Quiet Quitting behaviours but not in performance levels, suggesting that while males are less likely to engage in Quiet Quitting, Employee Performance outcomes remain stable across genders. Additionally, the interaction effects highlight that Employee Well-Being has a stronger influence on performance for males, but its impact on Quiet Quitting remains consistent across genders. These insights provide valuable guidance for organizations seeking to optimize employee engagement and Employee Performance while mitigating workplace Quiet Quitting.

### **Future Research Directions**

This study opens several avenues for future research aimed at deepening our understanding of workplace dynamics. Future investigations could explore the influence of demographic factors like age and education on Employee Well-Being and Employee Performance, providing insight into the development of tailored management strategies. A longitudinal approach would also be beneficial in examining the long-term effects of Employee Well-Being initiatives and their impact on Quiet Quitting. To enhance contextual relevance, future research can also integrate regional or crosscultural studies, as Quiet Quitting may vary across countries, cultures, and generations based on different work values and engagement norms. Additionally, examining the role of organizational culture and technology in shaping employee experiences can offer guidance on optimizing work environments in a digital age. Together, these research directions promise to enrich our

theoretical and practical knowledge of organizational behaviour, aiding in the development of more supportive and effective workplace environments.

#### Abbreviations

AVE: Average Variance Extracted, PLS-SEM: Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling.

#### Acknowledgement

None.

#### **Author Contributions**

All authors contribute equally.

#### **Conflict of Interest**

The authors declare no competing interests.

### **Ethics Approval**

Not applicable (no human or animal data involved).

### Funding

No funding was received for this study.

### References

- 1. Russell B. The conquest of happiness. 1930 cited 2025 Apr 17. https://russell-j.com/beginner/COH-TEXT.HTM
- 2. Diener E. Subjective well-being. Psychol Bull. 1984;95(3):542–75.
- 3. Wright TA, Cropanzano R. Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. J Occup Health Psychol. 2000;5(1):84–94.
- 4. Zheng X, Zhu W, Zhao H, Zhang C. Employee wellbeing in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. JOrgan Behav.2015;36(5):621–44.
- Juchnowicz M, Kinowska H, Paliszkiewicz J, Ratajczak M. Employee well-being and digital work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Information. 2021;12(8):293.
- Brief AP. Attitudes in and around organizations. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications; 1998 cited 2025 Apr 17. https://books.google.com/books/about/Attitudes\_I n\_and\_Around\_Organizations.html?id=MjuZkEZkiAC
- 7. Yasmin HS. Job satisfaction of NF railway employees of Tinsukia Division, Assam 2016. https://books.google.com/books/about/Job\_Satisfa ction.html?id=\_AXCgAAQBAJ
- 8. Cooper B, Wang J, Bartram T, Cooke FL. Well-beingoriented human resource management practices and employee performance in the Chinese banking sector: The role of social climate and resilience. Hum Resour Manag. 2019; 58(1):85-97.
- 9. Guest DE. Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. Hum Resour Manag J. 2017;27(1):22–38.
- 10. Nielsen K, Nielsen MB, Ogbonnaya C, Känsälä M, Saari E, Isaksson K. Workplace resources to improve both

employee well-being and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. WorkStress. 2017; 31(2): 101-20.

- 11. Diamantidis AD, Chatzoglou P. Factors affecting employee performance: An empirical approach. Int J Product Perform Manag. 2019; 68(1):171–93.
- 12. Sabuhari R, Sudiro A, Irawanto DW, Rahayu M. The effects of human resource flexibility, employee competency, organizational culture adaptation, and job satisfaction on employee performance. Manag Sci Lett. 2020; 10:1777–86.
- 13. Kozlowski SWJ, Klein KJ. A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. In: Klein KJ, Kozlowski SW, editors. Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2000. p. 3–90.
- 14. Inayat W, Khan MJ. A study of job satisfaction and its effect on the performance of employees working in private sector organizations, Peshawar. Educ Res Int. 2021; 1:1751495.
- 15. Serenko A. The human capital management perspective on quiet quitting: recommendations for employees, managers, and national policymakers. Journal of Knowledge Management. 2024 Jan 5:28 (1):27-43.
- 16. Anand A, Doll J, Ray P. Drowning in silence: A scale development and validation of quiet quitting and quiet firing. Int J Organ Anal. 2024;32(4):721–43.
- 17. Atalay M, Dağıstan U. Quiet quitting: A new wine in an old bottle? Pers Rev. 2024;53(4):1059–74.
- Richardson SD. Reimagining quiet quitting. In: 2023;
   p. 105–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-29211-8\_8
- 19. Formica S, S Fodera F. The Great Resignation and Quiet Quitting paradigm shifts: An overview of current situation and future research directions. J Hosp Mark Manag. 2022; 17:31(8):899-907.
- 20. Hamouche S, Koritos C, Papastathopoulos A. Quiet quitting: Relationship with other concepts and implications for tourism and hospitality. Int J Contemp Hosp Manag. 2023;35(12):4297–312.
- 21. Nimmi MP, Jayakumar D, Muthuraman N, Nair GP, Donald WE. Workplace antecedents of quiet quitting behavior: Insights from graduate workers in India. HRMS. 2024; 6(4): 3450.
- 22. Dutta DS, Thomas A, Shiva A, Papa A, Cuomo MT. The hustle behind knowledge: role of workplace ostracism and knowledge hiding towards quiet quitting in knowledge-intensive organisations. Journal of Knowledge Management. 2024,19;28(10):2911-39.
- 23. Liu-Lastres B, Karatepe OM, Okumus F. Combating quiet quitting: Implications for future research and practices for talent management. Int J Contemp Hosp Manag. 2024;36(1):13–24.
- 24. Talukder MF, Prieto L. A quiet quitting scale: Development and validation. Int J Organ Anal. 2024; ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-01-2024-4182/FULL/XML
- 25. Wortelboer G, Van der Steen MP. Precarious workers' wellbeing: Identity development through online discourses of quiet quitting. In The Palgrave Handbook of Fulfillment, Wellness, and Personal Growth at Cham: Springer International

Publishing.Work. 2023; 281-301.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35494-6\_15

- 26. Eagly AH, Crowley M. Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychologicalbulletin.1986;100(3):283.
- Padillo GG, Jalalon HJ, Cherreguine JB, Mejias MB, Manguilimotan RP. Work attitude and job-related stress among teachers in kindergarten. International Journal of Social and Management Studies.2024;13,5(4):60-79
- 28. Voukelatou V, Gabrielli L, Miliou I, Cresci S, Sharma R, Tesconi M, et al. Measuring objective and subjective well-being: Dimensions and data sources. Int J Data Sci Anal. 2021;11(4):279–309.
- 29. Grant AM, Christianson MK, Price RH. Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee wellbeing trade-offs. Acad Manag Perspect. 2007;21:51–63.
- 30. Chang R. The impact of employees' health and wellbeing on job performance. Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences. 2024;29(1):372-8.
- 31. Reilly C. Wellbeing positively impacts firm performance. Forbes; 2020 cited 2025 Apr 17. https://www.forbes.com/sites/colleenreilly/2020/ 06/09/wellbeing-positively-impacts-firmperformance/
- 32. Diener E, Seligman MEP. Beyond money: Toward an economy of well-being. Psychol Sci Public Interest. 2004;5(1):1–31.
- 33. Khan MS, Elahi NS, Abid G. Workplace incivility and job satisfaction: Mediation of subjective well-being and moderation of forgiveness climate in health care sector. Eur J Investig Health Psychol Educ. 2021;11(4):1107–19.
- 34. Warr PB. Decision latitude, job demands, and employee well-being. Work Stress. 1990;4(4):285– 94.
- 35. Batiste H. Management in times of crisis: a qualitative exploration of the great resignation from a social exchange perspective. Bus Horiz. 2024; 56(3):138–60.
- 36. Gabelaia I, Bagociunaite R. The impact of "quiet quitting" on overall organizational behavior and culture. Lect Notes Netw Syst. 2024; 913:366–78.
- 37. Kim KT, Sohn YW. 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.2024;12(11):460.
- 38. Rocha HCF, Duarte M, Dominique-Ferreira S. The impact of work-life conflict on employees' emotional well-being and the adoption of quiet quitting—a study case applied to the Portuguese hospitality industry. Smart Innov Syst Technol. 2024; 384:229– 39.
- 39. Smith B. The protective power of hope and belonging in the workplace. Strateg HR Rev. 2024. https://doi.org/10.1108/SHR-07-2024-0054
- 40. Xueyun Z, Al Mamun A, Masukujjaman M, Rahman MK, Gao J, Yang Q. Modelling the significance of organizational conditions on quiet quitting intention among Gen Z workforce in an emerging economy. Scientific reports. 2023; 18:13(1):15438.
- 41. Pratiwi PE, Stanislaus S, Pratiwi PC. The tendency of quiet quitting workers in terms of engagement and

well-being at work. Philanthr J Psychol. 2023;7(2):132.

- 42. Gone YSP, Naim MF, Peethambaran M. Sounding the silence: examining the antecedents and outcomes of quiet quitting. Int J Organ Anal. 2025; ahead of print. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-09-2024-4794
- 43. Suan CL, Nasurdin A. Role clarity, supervisory support, peer support, and work engagement of customer-contact employees in hotels: A future research agenda. Tourismos. 2013; 1: 8(1):315-29.
- 44. Khaund N. Quiet quitting is a leadership issue. Ivey Bus J. 2022; W31833.3. https://iveybusinessjournal.com/quiet-quitting-isa-leadership-issue//
- 45. Turner K. What is 'quiet quitting' and how should leaders respond? RVR Consult Grp 2023. https://rvrteam.com/2023/02/what-is-quietquitting-and-how-should-leaders-respond/
- 46. Galanis P, Katsiroumpa A, Vraka I, et al. Quiet quitting among employees: a proposed cut-off score for the "Quiet Quitting" Scale. Res Sq [Preprint].2023. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3076541/v1.
- 47. Prentice C, Dominique-Ferreira S, Wang X, Tuominen J, Duarte M, Rocha H. Work-life imbalance, burning out, feeling down, I will quit, but quietly-the case of hospitality employees. JHospMarkManag. 2025, 2; 34(1):24-45.
- 48. Saraiva M, Nogueiro T. Perspectives and Realities of Disengagement Among Younger Generation Y and Z Workers in Contemporary Work Dynamics. Administrative Sciences. 2025 Apr 3;15(4):133.
- 49. Son Hing LS, Sakr N, Sorenson JB, Stamarski CS, Caniera K, Colaco C. Gender inequities in the workplace: A holistic review of organizational processes and practices. Hum Resour Manag Rev. 2023;33(3):100968.
- 50. Artz B, Kaya I, Kaya O. Gender role perspectives and job burnout. Rev Econ Househ. 2021;20(2):447.
- 51. Loi NM, Loh JMI, Hine DW. Don't rock the boat: The moderating role of gender in the relationship between workplace incivility and work withdrawal. J Manag Dev. 2015;34(2):169–86.
- 52. Sarker M, Al-Muaalemi MA. Sampling techniques for quantitative research. In: Principles of social research methodology. Springer; 2022. p. 221–34. https://doi:10.1007/978-981-19-5441-2\_15.
- 53. Pradoto H, Haryono S, Wahyuningsih SH. The role of work stress, organizational climate, and improving employee performance in the implementation of work from home. Work. 2022,18; 71(2):345-55.
- 54. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB, Salanova M. Utrecht Work Engagement Scale-9 (UWES-9). APA PsycTests. 2006. https://doi.org/10.1037/t05561-000
- 55. Hair, Jr JF, Sarstedt M, Matthews LM, Ringle CM. Identifying and treating unobserved heterogeneity with FIMIX-PLS: part I–method. European business review. 2016, 11;28(1):63-76.
- 56. Leong LY, Hew TS, Ooi KB, Wei J. Predicting mobile wallet resistance: A two-staged structural equation modeling-artificial neural network approach. Int J Inf Manag. 2020;51:102047.
- 57. Peng DX, Lai F. Using partial least squares in operations management research: A practical guideline and summary of past research. Journal of operations management. 2012 1;30(6):467-80.

- 58. Hair JF, Sarstedt M, Pieper TM, Ringle CM. The use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in strategic management research: A review of past practices and recommendations for future applications. Long Range Plann. 2012;45(5-6): 320– 40.
- 59. Jöreskog KG. Simultaneous factor analysis in several populations. Psychometrika. 1971;36(4):409–26.
- 60. Cheah JH, Sarstedt M, Ringle CM, Ramayah T, Ting H. Convergent validity assessment of formatively measured constructs in PLS-SEM: On using singleitem versus multi-item measures in redundancy analyses. Int J Contemp Hosp Manag. 2018; 30(11):3192–210.
- 61. Henseler J, Ringle CM, Sarstedt M. A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. J Acad Mark Sci. 2015;43(1):115–35.
- 62. Shmueli G, Sarstedt M, Hair JF, et al. Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: Guidelines for using PL Spredict. Eur J Mark. 2019;53(11):2322-2347. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0189
- 63. Hassan S, Ansari N, Rehman A, Moazzam A. Understanding public service motivation, workplace spirituality and employee well-being in the public sector. Int J Ethics Syst. 2022;38(1):147–72.

- 64. Wright TA, Cropanzano R. The role of psychological well-being in job performance: A fresh look at an ageold quest. Organ Dyn. 2004;33(4):338–51.
- 65. Rajeswari K, Shwetha S, Pon SP, Christy NV, Sofia N. Gender discrimination and its impact on employee performance in educational institutions. Tech Voc Educ Train. 2024;39:557–63.
- 66. Adam N, Alfawaz A. Enhancing organizational performance: how gender diversity enhances employee engagement and commitment. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 2025, Feb 13:12(1):1-1.
- 67. Martínez-Martínez K, Llorens S, Cruz-Ortiz V, Reyes-Luján J, Salanova M. The main predictors of wellbeing and productivity from a gender perspective. Front Psychol. 2024; 15:1478826.
- 68. Sun N, Liang S, Li H, Song H. Ex post i-deals, work-life balance, and work well-being in the hospitality industry: the moderating role of gender. Int J Contemp Hosp Manag. 2023;35(9):3077–94.
- 69. Kundi YM, Aboramadan M, Elhamalawi EM, Shahid S. Employee psychological well-being and job performance: exploring mediating and moderating mechanisms. International Journal of Organizational Analysis. 2021 May 7:29(3):736-54.