Organizational Antecedents of Quiet Quitting: The Impact of Toxic Work Environments on Quiet Quitting

Tuğba Özsoy [ID]

Sakarya University of Applied Sciences, Geyve Vocational School, Management and Organization Department, Sakarya, Türkiye, tugbaozsoy@subu.edu.tr, ror.org/01shwhq58

Abstract: In the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, quiet quitting has become widely discussed, attracting significant empirical research. Despite increasing studies on its antecedents, the organizational factors contributing to quiet quitting remain underexplored. This study examines the relationship between organizational toxicity and quiet quitting by focusing on four key dimensions: toxicity stemming from aggressive behaviors, narcissistic behaviors, unethical behaviors, and rigid behaviors. Data were collected from 245 employees working in the public and private sectors through an online survey and analyzed using statistical analyses. The findings indicate a positive and significant relationship between organizational toxicity and quiet quitting. Multiple regression analysis revealed that rigid behaviors were the strongest predictor of quiet quitting among the dimensions of organizational toxicity. Additionally, younger employees exhibited a greater tendency toward quiet quitting. These findings suggest that toxic work environments play a crucial role in employees' disengagement and withdrawal behaviors, emphasizing the need for organizations to address workplace toxicity to foster employee commitment and well-being.

Keywords: Quiet Quitting, Organizational Toxicity, Narcissistic Behaviors, Aggressive Behaviors, Unethical Behaviors, Rigid Behaviors

1. Introduction

The concept of quiet quitting, which refers to employees only fulfilling the tasks within the scope of their job descriptions and avoiding additional external responsibilities (Formica & Sfodera, 2022), attracted attention in academic and social circles in early 2022 and has become an important topic of discussion. The concept has had a wide repercussion in both the media and the business world and has offered a new perspective on changes in workforce dynamics. The increasing attention to quiet quitting has been largely driven by social media discussions advocating that work should not be the center of life. Quiet quitting has often been considered an extension of the Great Resignation process. During the COVID-19 pandemic, many practices, such as mandatory isolation and remote work, have allowed employees to reevaluate their professional lives (Lal et al., 2023). With the calls to return to workplaces in the spring of 2021, many employees' decisions not to continue in their current jobs paved the way for the emergence of the Great Resignation (Dominique Ferreira et al., 2023). While it is believed that many people turned to alternative job opportunities during the Great Resignation, quiet quitting has become a way for employees who do not have the opportunity to change jobs to maintain their current positions (Arar et al., 2023).

While some define quiet quitting as a new phenomenon, others argue that it has existed for a long time but has often been ignored or described in different terms (Aydın & Azizoğlu, 2022; Hamouche et al., 2023; Nimmi et al., 2024). Although quiet quitting has received increased attention during the pandemic, it can be considered a longstanding organizational issue with roots dating back much further (Arar et al., 2023). In recent years, numerous studies have examined quiet quitting across different cultures and sample groups (Nguyen & Vu, 2025; Xueyun et al., 2025). Within this context, research has focused on the antecedents of quiet quitting (Helmy et al., 2024; Galanis et al., 2024), its consequences (Galanis et al., 2023a; Öztürk et al., 2023), and its measurement (Galanis et al., 2023b). A significant research area in the study of quiet quitting is gaining a better understanding of its antecedents.

It can be argued that quiet quitting has various organizational, individual, and sectoral antecedents (Nimmi et al., 2024; Öztürk et al., 2023). In this context, organizational dynamics can be considered one of the key determinants of quiet quitting (Toska et al., 2025). Notably, a toxic work environment may be one of the primary factors facilitating quiet quitting, yet empirical research on this issue remains limited (Mohammadi et al., 2024).

Toxic organizations are characterized by unfulfilled commitments, widespread injustice, and unethical practices (Öztürk et al., 2023). In such organizations, poor communication, flawed decision-making processes, and persistent uncertainty lead to resource waste and disrupt organizational functioning (Braje, 2022). Furthermore, manipulative workplace relationships and self-serving behaviors weaken organizational cohesion and collaboration while negatively affecting employee morale and motivation (Demir, 2020). Additionally, negative emotions such as hopelessness, low morale, and distrust contribute to reduced work efficiency, increased absenteeism, and higher employee turnover (Brett & Stroh, 2003).

All these factors have the potential to pave the way for the development of quiet quitting. Accordingly, toxic organizational environments may play a role in the emergence and progression of quiet quitting. Therefore, to empirically examine this assumption, the present study aims to contribute to a better understanding of the factors that trigger quiet quitting by investigating the impact of organizational toxicity on this phenomenon.

The present study tried to explain the relationship between organizational toxicity and quiet quitting within the framework of Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964). According to the Social Exchange Theory, individuals expect a satisfactory and fair return for their effort and contribution. In terms of organizational context, employees encounter injustice, disrespect, or destructive behavior; it might weaken their belief in justice, and attachment to the organization. Thus, employees may fulfill only the responsibilities specified in their job descriptions without actively reacting, and their voluntary contribution to the organization may be limited. Therefore, a toxic work environment might lead to quiet quitting due to disrupting the balance of social exchange.

1.1. Quiet quitting

Some sources claim that economist Mark Boldger introduced the concept of quiet quitting at an economics symposium at Texas A&M University in 2009 (Çalışkan, 2023; Formica & Sfodera, 2022). However, it is still unclear whether the concept was indeed introduced by Mark Bolger (Mahand & Caldwell, 2023). The term was later associated with the Tang Ping (lying flat) movement—an approach advocating for reduced work, contentment with achievable goals, and prioritizing rest—that emerged in China in 2021 and quickly became a global topic of discussion (Yuan, 2022).

In China, young people developed this movement in response to the intense pressures of productivity, competitiveness, and continuous self-improvement expectations imposed by the prevailing work culture (Xueyun et al., 2025). The Tang Ping movement specifically arose as a reaction to China's "996" work culture, which requires employees to work from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., six days a week. Quiet quitting reached a broader audience in July 2022 after software engineer Zaid Khan posted a video on TikTok explaining the concept. In this video, Khan described quiet quitting as: "You don't quit your job, but you give up the idea of putting in extra effort. You do your tasks, but you do not let work define your life" (Galanis et al., 2024; Önder, 2022). The hashtag #QuietQuitting used in the video has received over 17 million views on TikTok and rapidly gained popularity. The term has since been widely discussed in global media and has resonated across multiple social media platforms, from Twitter to LinkedIn (Yıldız & Özmenekşe, 2022).

The popularization of the concept has also attracted significant attention from the business world and was further explored in The Wall Street Journal article titled "If Your Co-Workers Are Quiet Quitting, Here's What That Means" by Lindsay Ellis and Angela Yang, published on August 12, 2022 (Elgan, 2022).

Quiet quitting refers to employees showing minimal commitment to their jobs, strictly adhering to the responsibilities outlined in their job descriptions, avoiding additional duties, and reducing their emotional investment in work (Mahand & Caldwell, 2023; Mathushan et al., 2025; Karrani et al., 2024). Although employees remain in their workplaces, they limit their contributions to what is strictly required in exchange for their salary, refraining from discretionary efforts such as working overtime, arriving early, or attending non-mandatory meetings (Liu-Lastres et al., 2024). Unlike traditional resignation, quiet quitting does not stem from job dissatisfaction leading to actual departure but is linked to employees setting personal boundaries and establishing a more balanced work-life dynamic (Hamouche et al., 2023; Hopke, 2022). Employees prioritize maintaining these boundaries and take a more detached approach toward organizational expectations (Formica & Sfodera, 2022; Özer, 2022).

There are notable distinctions between quiet quitting and actual resignation. In quiet quitting, employees remain in their jobs but disengage psychologically, losing motivation and commitment to their roles. These employees prefer to exert minimal effort while fulfilling their responsibilities. In contrast, employees who resign actively leave their jobs and seek new employment opportunities (Galanis et al., 2023).

Gupte (2022) states that quiet quitting process follows three fundamental stages before an employee leaves. The first stage, emotional disengagement, begins when employees feel undervalued at work or perceive that their contributions are not sufficiently recognized. This stage triggers emotional withdrawal and internal conflict between remaining in the job and considering departure. The second stage, mental disengagement, is characterized by employees losing their commitment to their jobs while continuing to perform their essential duties. At this point, employees attempt to minimize work-related stress by stepping away from the "hustle culture" and gradually realizing their weakening connection to the organization (Ayabakan, 2023). The final stage, physical disengagement, is the most overt, as employees openly express their dissatisfaction and intentions to leave. At this stage, they vocalize their concerns about work-life balance and acknowledge that they are actively exploring external job opportunities. According to Gupte (2022), managers who recognize these stages and proactively engage with employees can better manage quiet quitting process and enhance employee commitment.

1.2. Organizational toxicity

The concept of toxicity is a term whose origins are based on the English words "toxic" and Latin "toxic" and generally means "poisonousness" or "the quality of being harmful" (Kasalak, 2015). This concept, which was first used in science and health sciences, was used to express the potential to harm living things in chemical and biological processes. However, this term has gained metaphorical meanings over time and has begun to be used in emotional and social contexts to describe effects that harm individuals or communities (Carlock, 2013). The concepts of toxicity was first addressed in the social sciences literature by Whicker (1996). The first name to define the concept of toxicity in the field of organization and management, to introduce organizational toxicity to the literature, and to elaborate on this concept was Frost (2003) (Kasalak, 2019). Organizational toxicity is a hostile work environment that negatively affects employees' morale, motivation, and productivity (Appelbaum & Roy-Girard, 2007). Such environments cause widespread and intense negative emotions that weaken employees' attachment to the organization (Maitlis, 2008).

Organizational toxicity can manifest itself directly in the form of verbal or physical abuse, harassment, discrimination, and threats, as well as in more subtle forms such as favoritism and lack of support for

employees (George, 2023). These negative environments make it difficult for employees to view their workplaces as places with personal meaning due to the impact of their experiences at work.

1.3. Research hypothesis

Toxic organizations include disrespect, ethical violations, excessive competition, and abuse of authority (Garver, 2022). In such organizations, behaviors such as slander, gossip, and damage to reputation to cause conscious harm are common (Neuman & Baron, 1998). In addition, unethical behaviors that violate employees' rights and include actions contrary to professional values are also seen (Gül, 2006; Hitt, 1990). In addition, this environment also includes rigid behaviors such as a lack of understanding, resistance to change, and accepting one's own opinion as the absolute truth (Beerel, 2009; Frost, 2003). Therefore, a toxic organization contains several factors that cause employees to have negative experiences in the work environment. These factors include disrespectful treatment of employees, an overly competitive work environment, and misuse of power and authority (Garver, 2022).

Toxic workplace environments can cause employees to lose their desire to take an active role and to perceive their work experiences negatively (Gunderman & Sechrist, 2019). Such environments can weaken organizational commitment by reducing job participation, job satisfaction, and motivation (Wolf et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2020). It can also negatively affect job performance by reducing individual and professional motivation (Rasool et al., 2021). Working in a constantly toxic environment can increase employees' tendency to leave their jobs, leading to increased turnover rates, and can also lead to decreased productivity (George, 2023; Rasool et al., 2019, 2021). In short, organizational toxicity negatively affects employees' attitudes and behaviors towards the organization, their managers, and their jobs, including issues such as injustice, poor leadership, psychological harassment of employees, excessive workload, and favoritism. According to the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), this situation may weaken employees' attachment to the job and the organization, preventing them from exhibiting extra-role behaviors for the organization's benefit. As a result of all this, their likelihood of quiet quitting is expected to increase. The hypothesis created in this direction is as follows.

H₁: There is a positive relationship between organizational toxicity and quiet quitting.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants and data collection procedure

The data for this study were collected through an online survey from blue- and white-collar employees working in the public and private sectors in Türkiye. A total of 257 individuals from various industries participated in the study. However, responses from participants who provided incorrect answers to control questions or submitted incomplete or erroneous survey forms (12 survey forms) were excluded from the analysis. Consequently, the final analyses were conducted based on the valid responses of 245 participants. The survey form consisted of questions related to participants' demographic characteristics and measures of quiet quitting and organizational toxicity. Data were collected on a voluntary basis, and ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ethics committee of the author's affiliated university prior to data collection.

245 employees from different industries in the public and private sectors participated in the study. In terms of demographic distribution, 39.5% of the participants were male, while 60.5% were female. Regarding marital status, 66.5% were married, and 33.1% were single, with one participant (0.4%) not disclosing their marital status.

In terms of educational background, 1.6% had completed primary school, 2% had completed high school or an equivalent degree, 6.6% held an associate degree, 43% held a bachelor's degree, 36.9% held a master's degree, and 9.8% had earned a doctorate. One participant (0.4%) did not provide information on their education level.

Regarding job positions, 90% of the participants were white-collar employees, while 10% were blue-collar employees.

When assessed based on their hierarchical position within the organization, 22.7% held lower-level positions, 59.5% were in mid-level positions, and 17.8% held upper-level positions. Among the participants, 29.9% held managerial positions, while 70.1% were non-managers. One participant (0.4%) did not indicate their managerial status. Among those in managerial positions, 22.7% were lower-level managers, 59.5% were mid-level managers, and 17.8% were upper-level managers. Regarding sectoral distribution, 64.5% of the participants worked in the public sector, while 35.5% were employed in the private sector. Three participants (1.2%) did not specify their sector of employment. Participants' work experience ranged from 1 to 35 years (M = 11.48, SD = 7.34), while their ages varied between 22 and 56 years (M = 35.95, SD = 6.90).

2.2. Ethical statement

This study received ethical approval from the Ethics Committee of Sakarya University of Applied Sciences (Approval Date: 20 January 2025; Approval Number: E-26428519-050.99-156955).

2.3. Scales

Quiet Quitting Scale (QQS). The QQS (Anand et al., 2024; Turkish version: Kerse et al., 2024) comprises seven items and assesses quiet quitting as a single dimension. A sample item is: "I often arrive late and leave early from work." Participants rate items on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). Higher scores indicate a stronger tendency toward quiet quitting.

Perceived Organizational Toxicity Scale (POTS). The POTS, originally developed in Turkish by Kasalak (2015) consists of 16 items across four dimensions. The first dimension, Toxicity Stemming from Narcissistic Behavior, includes items such as "In my workplace, condescending attitudes are exhibited." The second dimension, Toxicity Stemming from Aggressive Behavior, assesses behaviors such as "In my workplace, jealousy-related behaviors are displayed." The third dimension, Toxicity Stemming from Unethical Behavior, includes statements like "In my workplace, rules and regulations are violated." Lastly, Toxicity Stemming from Rigid Behavior contains items such as "In my workplace, rude behaviors are exhibited." Participants evaluate the statements using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The scale was administered in its original Turkish form. Higher scores indicate higher perceived organizational toxicity.

Demographics. Participants first responded to demographic questions, including gender (1 = male, 2 = female), marital status (1 = married, 2 = single), and education level (1 = primary education, 2 = high school or equivalent, 3 = associate degree, 4 = bachelor's degree, 5 = master's degree, 6 = doctorate). Additionally, participants indicated their employment category (1 = white-collar, 2 = blue-collar) and their position within the organizational hierarchy (1 = lower level, 2 = middle level, 3 = upper level).

Furthermore, participants were asked whether they held a managerial position (1 = yes, 2 = no) and, if applicable, the level of their managerial role (1 = lower-level manager, 2 = mid-level manager, 3 = upper-level manager). Open-ended questions were also included to collect information about participants' age and years of work experience.

2.4. Data analysis

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and internal consistency analyses (Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability) for the variables included in the study are presented in Table 1. Correlation analysis findings are provided in Table 2, while multiple regression analysis findings are displayed in Table 3.

3. Results

The internal consistency scores of the study variables, as measured by Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability, ranged from acceptable (.73) to excellent (.92). Overall, participants exhibited low levels of quiet quitting, while their perceived organizational toxicity was at a mild level (Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency Scores in the Psychometric Scales

Variables	M	SD	α	CR
Quiet Quitting	2.10	0.72	.73	.81
Organizational Toxicity (Total)	2.51	0.99		
Toxicity Stemming from Narcissistic Behavior	2.50	1.17	.92	.85
Toxicity Stemming from Aggressive Behavior	2.45	1.10	.85	.82
Toxicity Stemming from Unethical Behavior	2.57	1.11	.87	.85
Toxicity Stemming from Rigid Behavior	2.53	1.21	.91	.80

Note: M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, α = Cronbach's Alpha, CR = Composite Reliability

The correlation analysis results indicate that *quiet quitting* was positively and significantly associated with *organizational toxicity (total score) (r = .61, p < .001)*. Similarly, all four subdimensions of organizational toxicity demonstrated positive and significant correlations with each other as well as with *quiet quitting* (Table 2). These findings provide empirical support for the study's hypotheses.

Furthermore, *marital status* and *gender* were not significantly correlated with any of the study variables. However, *age* was negatively and significantly associated with *quiet quitting (r = -.23, p < .001)*. Additionally, *work experience (years)* was negatively and significantly correlated with all study variables, including *quiet quitting (r = -.35, p < .001)* and *organizational toxicity (r = -.26, p < .001)*, suggesting that employees with more experience exhibited lower levels of these constructs (Table 2).

Table 2

Correlation Matrix of Study Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Quiet Quitting	1	.							
2. OT(Total)	.61***	1							
3. Toxicity SNB	.48***	.88***	1						
4. Toxicity SAB	.55***	.82***	.59***	1					
5. Toxicity SUB	.48***	.76***	.61***	.55***	1				
6. Toxicity SRB	.63***	.90***	.75***	.73***	.61***	1			
7. Marital Status	.11	.04	-.01	.08	-.06	.05	1		
8. Gender	.09	.12	.12	.07	.11	.12	-.04	1	
9. Age	-.23***	-.10	-.08	-.08	-.07	-.14*	-.36***	-.12	1
10. WE (Years)	-.35***	-.26***	-.19*	-.24***	-.21***	-.26***	-.32***	-.15*	.84***

*Note: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001. Gender (1 = Male, 2 = Female), Marital Status (1 = Married, 2 = Single), OT (Total) = Organizational Toxicity; Toxicity SNB = Toxicity Stemming from Narcissistic Behavior; Toxicity SAB = Toxicity Stemming from Aggressive Behavior; Toxicity SUB = Toxicity Stemming from Unethical Behavior; Toxicity SRB = Toxicity Stemming from Rigid Behavior; WE(Years) = Work Experience (Years).*

Table 3

Multiple Regression Analysis Findings

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: Quiet Quitting		
	β	t	Adjusted R²
Toxicity stemming from narcissistic behavior	-.05	-.64	
Toxicity stemming from aggressive behavior	.17*	2.29	
Toxicity stemming from unethical behavior	.13*	2.04	.41
Toxicity stemming from rigid behavior	.46***	5.24	

Note: Adjusted R^2 represents model fit, β represents Standardized Coefficients Beta, *$p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$

To assess the predictive power of organizational toxicity subdimensions on *quiet quitting*, multiple regression analysis was conducted. The results indicated that except for *toxicity stemming from narcissistic behavior (β = -.05, p > .05)*, the other subdimensions, *toxicity stemming from aggressive behavior (β = .17, p < .05)*, *toxicity stemming from unethical behavior (β = .13, p < .05)*, and *toxicity stemming from rigid behavior (β = .46, p < .001)*, were significant predictors of *quiet quitting*. Among these, *toxicity stemming from rigid behavior* was identified as the strongest predictor of *quiet quitting* (Table 3).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Although quiet quitting has attracted global attention in recent years, it is still an under-researched phenomenon in the academic literature. The limited number of existing studies necessitates a more in-depth examination of the causes and consequences of this situation. Factors such as work-life balance problems, job dissatisfaction, lack of communication, employees not feeling valued, unfair distribution of workload, unfair reward systems and managers not having a supportive leadership approach are among the factors that may increase the tendency to quiet quitting.

The present study examined the relationship between organizational toxicity and quiet quitting as another possible reason for quiet quitting. The findings revealed that a toxic organizational environment is significantly related to employees' tendency to quiet quitting and supported the study's hypothesis.

This finding shows that a toxic environment in organizations is an important factor that may increase quiet quitting as expected based on Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964). The most fundamental finding that stands out within the scope of the research is that organizational toxicity strongly triggers quiet quitting, as expected. It is expected since toxic behaviors in organizations, such as threatening and humiliating acts toward employees, manifested as abusive supervision, can damage employees' organizational commitment (Serdar & Özsoy, 2019). Another important finding in the multiple regression analysis is that toxicity resulting from harsh behaviors is the variable that most strongly predicts quiet quitting compared to other components of organizational toxicity. Toxicity resulting from harsh behaviors is followed by toxicity resulting from aggressive behaviors and unethical behaviors, respectively, and all three are found to significantly predict quiet quitting in the multiple regression analysis. However, toxicity resulting from narcissistic behaviors did not significantly predict quiet quitting in the multiple regression analysis. Another important finding is that younger employees are more likely to engage in quiet quitting. First of all, harsh behaviors have a structure that lacks understanding and flexibility, gives harsh feedback, shows adverse reactions, and includes authoritarian-oppressive behavior patterns. Such toxic work environments are expected to deplete employees' psychological and emotional resources in the long term (Zheng et al., 2025). Similarly,

aggressive behaviors create a work environment that is associated with harsh behaviors, as they create a work environment where employees can be harmed both physically and psychologically (Appelbaum & Roy-Girard, 2007).

Since unethical behaviors cause violations of justice, equality, and employee rights, toxicity resulting from unethical behaviors is likely to negatively affect employees' attitudes and behaviors toward work (Yücel & Zarper, 2024). However, it is an unexpected finding that toxicity resulting from narcissistic behaviors does not predict quiet quitting in the multiple regression analysis. Narcissistic managers, supervisors, or employees can create the ground for many destructive behaviors by exhibiting arrogant, opportunistic, belittling, and entitlement attitudes and behaviors (Badar et al., 2023; Miller et al., 2017; Özsoy & Ardıç, 2017). However, factors such as the possibility of managers with narcissistic tendencies being perceived as charismatic in multiple regression analysis, narcissism triggering destructive behaviors less in organizations compared to other dark personality traits, and narcissism being perceived as the "bright" aspect of dark personality traits (Nevicka et al., 2018; Özsoy, 2019; Volmer et al., 2016), bring up the possibility that organizational toxicity created by narcissistic employees and managers may be less disturbing to employees compared to other organizational toxicity components.

Finally, the perspective of Generation Y and younger employee groups on work-life may include factors such as objecting more, seeking their rights more, getting bored more easily, and shaping their expectations within the framework of flexibility and understanding (Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Ng et al., 2010). These may be the main reasons for the negative relationship between age and quiet quitting (Nguyen & Vu, 2025). Quiet quitting is an important problem for organizations because it creates uncertainty and complicates management strategies. The fact that the concept is open to different interpretations makes it difficult for managers to understand this phenomenon correctly and develop effective solutions. In addition, some employers misinterpret this situation, making the conditions of employees difficult and indirectly leading them to quiet quitting (Hamouche et al., 2023). In order to prevent quiet quitting, organizations need to develop proactive and supportive strategies (Aydın & Azizoğlu, 2022).

Employers who want to analyze the reasons behind quiet quitting and prevent this situation should reconsider Generation Z employees' work motivations and perspectives (Mahand & Caldwell, 2023). In addition, leaders should analyze how quiet quitting affects the organization and take strategic steps. In this regard, managers are responsible for preventing quiet quitting's adverse effects. Eliminating the factors that lead to this process can increase employee loyalty, increase productivity in the workplace, and contribute to organizational success. In order to support employee motivation, policies that consider work-life balance should be developed, and opportunities for career development should be provided. In addition, managers should strengthen employees' sense of belonging by creating a supportive and valuable work environment that includes all employees.

In some cases, the generalized, negative, and strict attitudes developed by managers and certain employees due to not fulfilling their work roles can negatively affect the general climate of the organization. From this point of view, constructively solving problems by establishing open communication with employees who do not fulfill their responsibilities, it is important to ensure that employees currently motivated and contributing to the organization are not affected by these negative attitudes.

4.1. Limitations and future research recommendations

There are some limitations to the study. First, all employees who were not discriminated against in terms of any sector, occupational group, or demographic feature were included in the sample selection. However, since the convenience sampling method was used, the sample has limitations regarding representing the general employee population. Although the study allowed the participation of

employees from different sectors and with various demographic features, the limited sample size and demographic diversity make it difficult to generalize the findings to all employees. Future studies with a more comprehensive and representative sample will contribute to a more in-depth examination of the subject and increase the generalizability of the findings. In addition, self-report questionnaires were used to measure the variables. Since the participants' responses are based on their perceptions, there is always a possibility of possible biases, such as self-indulgence, that may affect the accuracy of the data. In order to understand quiet quitting phenomenon more comprehensively, future studies should address the factors affecting this concept from a broader perspective. In addition, how quiet quitting is shaped at the individual and organizational levels should be examined in detail. Employees' sociodemographic characteristics and personality structures should be investigated to determine how they affect this process at the individual level. For example, as discussed in the present article, younger employees may be more prone to quiet quitting than their more experienced colleagues. In addition, personality traits are also one of the determining factors that shape quiet quitting tendencies. Individuals' attitudes and behaviors in the work environment may differ depending on their personality structure. In addition, employees' quiet quitting tendencies may vary depending on their institutional structure and cultural dynamics. Studies on how quiet quitting is shaped in different sectors, organizational structures, and cultural contexts will contribute to a better understanding of this issue.

In conclusion, although it is a conceptually current issue, employees not exhibiting additional role behaviors beyond their job responsibilities is actually a very old phenomenon. However, many different factors need to be taken into consideration to understand why this concept, which is considered as "quiet quitting" today, is increasing. When considered in terms of organizational dynamics, this research shows that the toxic work environment within the organization strongly predicts quiet quitting. The main issue that stands out among the toxicity components is that employees are greatly disturbed by rigid behaviors and this situation is directly or indirectly reflected in the workplace.

References

Anand, A., Doll, J., & Ray, P. (2024). Drowning in silence: A scale development and validation of quiet quitting and quiet firing. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 32*(4), 721-743. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-01-2023-3600

Appelbaum, S. H., & Roy-Girard, D. (2007). Toxins in the workplace: Affect on organizations and employees. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society, 7*(1), 17-28.

Arar, T., Çetiner, N., & Yurdakul, G. (2023). Quiet quitting: Building a comprehensive theoretical framework. *Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi (AKAD), 15*(28), 122-138. https://doi.org/10.20990/kilisiibfakademik.1245216

Ayabakan, B. Ç. (2023). İş etiği penceresinden sessiz istifa. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimlerde Yenilikçi Yaklaşımlar Dergisi, 7*(2), 106-126. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijiasos.2023.574.3

Aydin, E., & Azizoğlu, Ö. (2022). A new term for an existing concept: Quiet quitting—a self-determination perspective. In *Proceedings of the International Congress on Critical Debates in Social Sciences* (pp. 285-295).

Badar, K., Aboramadan, M., & Plimmer, G. (2023). Despotic vs narcissistic leadership: Differences in their relationship to emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 34*(4), 818-837.

Beerel, A. (2009). *Leadership and change management*. Sage.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* Wiley.

Braje, I. N. (2022). Can toxic organizational culture really cause the great resignation: In search of answers. *Full Paper Proceeding Multidisciplinary Studies, 6*(3), 1-9.

Brett, J. M., & Stroh, L. K. (2003). Working 61 plus hours a week: Why do managers do it? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(1), 67.

Carlock, D. H. (2013). *Beyond bullying: A holistic exploration of the organizational toxicity phenomenon* [Doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine University].

Çalışkan, K. (2023). Sessiz istifa: Sonun başlangıcı mı yeniden diriliş mi? *Journal of Organizational Behavior Review*, *5*(2), 190-204.

Demir, B. (2020). Örgütlerde toksik lider ve toksik ilişkiler. *Balkan ve Yakın Doğu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6*, 31-35.

Dominique Ferreira, S., Oliveira, M., & Prentice, C. (2023). Organizational commitment: The role of organizational happiness and quiet quitting. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Tourism, Technology and Systems* (pp. 61-70). Springer Nature.

Elgan, M. (2022). It's time to quit quitting on the quiet quitters. https://www.computerworld.com/article/1613093/its-time-to-quit-quitting-on-the-quiet-quitters.html

Formica, S., & Sfodera, F. (2022). The Great Resignation and quiet quitting paradigm shifts: An overview of current situation and future research directions. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 31*(8), 899-907. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2022.2136601

Frost, P. J. (2003). Emotions in the workplace and the important role of toxin handlers. *Ivey Business Journal, 68,* 1–6.

Galanis, P., Moisoglou, I., Malliarou, M., Papathanasiou, I. V., Katsiroumpa, A., Vraka, I., Siskou, O., Konstantakopoulou, O., & Kaitelidou, D. (2023a). Quiet quitting among nurses increases their turnover intention: Evidence from Greece in the post-COVID-19 era. *Healthcare, 12*(1), 79. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12010079

Galanis, P., Katsiroumpa, A., Vraka, I., Siskou, O., Konstantakopoulou, O., Moisoglou, I., Gallos, P., & Kaitelidou, D. (2023b). The quiet quitting scale: Development and initial validation. *AIMS Public Health, 10*(4), 828-848. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38187899/

Galanis, P., Katsiroumpa, A., Vraka, I., Siskou, O., Konstantakopoulou, O., Katsoulas, T., Moisoglou, I., Gallos, P., & Kaitelidou, D. (2024). Nurses quietly quit their job more often than other healthcare workers: An alarming issue for healthcare services. *International Nursing Review, 71*(4), 850-859.

Garver, K. (2022, 30 March). 5 attributes of a toxic culture, according to Glassdoor reviews. *Staffing Hub*. https://staffinghub.com/employee-experience/5-attributes-of-a-toxic-culture-according-to-glassdoor-reviews/

George, A. S. (2023). Toxicity in the workplace: The silent killer of careers and lives. *Partners Universal International Innovation Journal, 1*(2), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7852087

Gunderman, R. B., & Sechrist, E. M. Z. (2019). How neglect fosters workplace toxicity. *Journal of the American College of Radiology, 16*(2), 252-254.

Gupte, A. (2022). Decoding quiet quitting. *LinkedIn*. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/decoding-quiet-quitting-ashlesha-gupte/

Gül, H. (2006). Etik dışı davranışlar ve ussallaştırılması: Devlet hastanelerinde bir uygulama. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi, 2006*(1), 65-79.

Hamouche, S., Koritos, C., & Papastathopoulos, A. (2023). Quiet quitting: Relationship with other concepts and implications for tourism and hospitality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 35*(12), 4297-4312.

Helmy, I., Azizah, S. N., Supriyani, T., & Pratama, F. (2024). Employee perception of CSR and quiet quitting behavior: The mediating role of work meaningfulness. *Grenze International Journal of Engineering & Technology (GIJET, 10*).

Hitt, W. D. (1990). *Ethics and leadership: Putting theory into practice.* Battelle Press.

Hopke, T. (2022). Quiet quitting: The culture reset gift most companies needed. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/teresahopke/2022/09/30/quiet-quittingthe-culture-reset-gift-most-companies-needed/

Karrani, M. A., Bani-Melhem, S., & Mohd-Shamsudin, F. (2024). Employee quiet quitting behaviours: Conceptualization, measure development, and validation. *The Service Industries Journal, 44*(3-4), 218-236.

Kasalak, G. (2015). *Organizational toxicity in higher education: Sources, effects, and coping strategies* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Akdeniz University].

Kasalak, G. (2019). Algılanan örgütsel toksisitenin iş doyumu üzerine etkisi: Duygusal bağlılığın aracılık rolü. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches, 13*(19), 1283-1309. https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.537424

Kerse, G., Deniz, V., & Çakıcı, A. B. (2024). Sessiz istifa ölçeğinin Türkçe formunun psikometrik özelliklerinin sınanması. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 15*(3), 749-762.

Lal, B., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Haag, M. (2023). Working from home during Covid-19: Doing and managing technology-enabled social interaction with colleagues at a distance. *Information Systems Frontiers*, *25*(4), 1333-1350. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-021-10182-0

Liu-Lastres, B., Karatepe, O. M., & Okumus, F. (2024). Combating quiet quitting: Implications for future research and practices for talent management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 36*(1), 13-24.

Lyons, S. T., & Kuron, L. K. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(S1), 139-157.

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

Maitlis, S. (2008). Organizational toxicity. In S. Clegg & J. Bailey (Eds). *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies.* Sage Publications.

Mathushan, P., Opatha, H. H. D. N. P., & Kengatharan, N. (2025). Is quiet quitting real? Evidence from a developing country. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management, 15*(1), 52-69.

Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., Hyatt, C. S., & Campbell, W. K. (2017). Controversies in narcissism. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 13*(1), 291-315.

Mohammadi, H., Ahmadi, H., & Rajabpour, E. (2024). Impact of toxic work environment on quiet quitting with psychological capital mediation. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management, 13*(1), 29-42.

Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management, 24*(3), 391-419.

Nevicka, B., Van Vianen, A. E., De Hoogh, A. H., & Voorn, B. (2018). Narcissistic leaders: An asset or a liability? Leader visibility, follower responses, and group-level absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(7), 703-715.

Ng, E. S., Schweitzer, L., & Lyons, S. T. (2010). New generation, great expectations: A field study of the millennial generation. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(2), 281-292. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9159-4

Nguyen, H. T., & Vu, M. H. (2025). Quiet quitting: Insights from Generation Z workers in Vietnam. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management, 13*(1), 8267-8282.

Nimmi, P. M., Syed, F., Manjaly, N. B., & Harsha, G. (2024). Employee's narrative on quiet quitting–A qualitative analysis. *Employee Relations: The International Journal, 46*(7), 1406-1421.

Önder, N. (2022). Herkesin konuştuğu sessiz istifa. *Marketing Türkiye*. https://www.marketingturkiye.com.tr/haberler/sessiz-istifa-nedir/

Özer, Y. (2022). Gürültülü sessizlik. *Dünya. Ekonomim.* https://www.ekonomim.com/kose-yazisi/gurultulu-sessizlik/670372

Özsoy, E. (2019). Yöneticilerin karanlık kişilik özelliklerinin çalışanların tükenmişlik düzeylerine etkisi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi, 22*(1), 194-203.

Özsoy, E., & Ardıç, K. (2017). Examining the effects of the dark triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy) on job satisfaction. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi, 24*(2), 391-406. https://doi.org/10.18657/yonveek.297733

Öztürk, E., Arıkan, Ö. U., & Ocak, M. (2023). Understanding quiet quitting: Triggers, antecedents, and consequences. *Uluslararası Davranış, Sürdürülebilirlik ve Yönetim Dergisi, 10*(18), 57-79. https://doi.org/10.54709/jobesam.1299018

Rasool, S. F., Maqbool, R., Samma, M., Zhao, Y., & Anjum, A. (2019). Positioning depression as a critical factor in creating a toxic workplace environment for diminishing worker productivity. *Sustainability, 11*(9), 2589.

Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Tang, M., Saeed, A., & Iqbal, J. (2021). How toxic workplace environment affects employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational support and employee wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(5), 2294.

Serdar, E., & Özsoy, E. (2019). İstismarcı yönetim: Bir literatür taraması. *İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 2*(1), 1-11.

Toska, A., Dimitriadou, I., Togas, C., Nikolopoulou, E., Fradelos, E. C., Papathanasiou, I. V., & Saridi, M. (2025). Quiet quitting in the hospital context: Investigating conflicts, organizational support, and professional engagement in Greece. *Nursing Reports, 15*(2), 38.

Volmer, J., Koch, I. K., & Göritz, A. S. (2016). The bright and dark sides of leaders' dark triad traits: Effects on subordinates' career success and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 101*, 413-418.

Wang, Z., Zaman, S., Rasool, S. F., Zaman, Q. U., & Amin, A. (2020). Exploring the relationships between a toxic workplace environment, workplace stress, and project success with the moderating effect of organizational support: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, *13*, 1055-1067.

Whicker, M. L. (1996). *Toxic leaders: When organizations go bad*. Quorum Books.

Wolf, L. A., Perhats, C., Delao, A. M., & Clark, P. R. (2017). Workplace aggression as cause and effect: Emergency nurses' experiences of working fatigued. *International Emergency Nursing, 33*, 48-52.

Xueyun, Z., Al Mamun, A., Yang, Q., Naznen, F., & Ali, M. H. (2025). Modeling quiet quitting intention among academics: Mediating effect of work addiction and satisfaction. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 40*(1), 84-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2024.2323636

Yıldız, S., & Özmenekşe, Y. O. (2022). Kaçınılmaz son: Sessiz istifa. *Al Farabi Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *7*(4), 14-24.

Yuan, S. (2022). Silent resistance against social pressures in China. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health, 6*(1), 11-12.

Yücel, E., & Zarper, A. (2024). The effects of unethical practices on the burnout level of accounting professionals and an implementation in Bursa Province. *Anadolu İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi, 8*(2), 93-111. https://doi.org/10.59293/anadoluiid.1507450

Zheng, X., Song, J., Shi, X., Kan, C., & Chen, C. (2025). The effect of authoritarian leadership on young nurses' burnout: The mediating role of organizational climate and psychological capital. *BMC Health Services Research, 25*(1), 292. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-12403-7

Article Information Form