

*Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi*

**Sessiz İstifa ve Sessiz İşten Çıkarmanın Çağrı Merkezi Çalışanlarının  
Bağlılığı ve Performansı Üzerindeki Etkileri**

**Zekeriya Şahin<sup>1</sup>**

*İstanbul Esenyurt Üniversitesi*

Orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2811-3264>

**Şaban Onur Viga<sup>2</sup>**

*İstanbul Esenyurt Üniversitesi*

Orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3026-5398>

**Yasemin Sarıcı<sup>3</sup>**

*İstanbul Esenyurt Üniversitesi*

Orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3026-5398>

**ÖZ**

Bu araştırmanın amacı, çağrı merkezi çalışanları arasında giderek yaygınlaşan sessiz istifa ve sessiz işten çıkarma eğilimlerinin örgütsel bağlılık ve iş performansı üzerindeki etkilerini incelemektir. Nicel araştırma modeliyle yürütülen çalışmanın örneklemini, Türkiye’de faaliyet gösteren bir çağrı merkezinde görev yapan 300 gönüllü çalışan oluşturmuştur. Veriler, “Sessiz İstifa ve Sessiz İşten Çıkarma Ölçeği”, “Örgütsel Bağlılık Ölçeği” ve “İş Performansı Ölçeği” kullanılarak çevrim içi anket formu aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Analiz sonuçları, sessiz istifa ve sessiz işten çıkarma düzeyleri arttıkça örgütsel bağlılık ve iş performansının anlamlı biçimde azaldığını göstermiştir. Buna ek olarak örgütsel bağlılık düzeyinin iş performansını pozitif yönde etkilediği belirlenmiştir. Demografik değişkenler açısından bakıldığında cinsiyet, eğitim durumu, departman ve geri bildirim sıklığı gibi faktörlerin özellikle sessiz işten çıkarma ve performans düzeylerinde istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar yarattığı saptanmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular, örgütlerde açık iletişim kanallarının güçlendirilmesinin, düzenli geri bildirim süreçlerinin kurulmasının ve çalışan destek mekanizmalarının geliştirilmesinin sessiz istifa ve sessiz işten çıkarma eğilimlerini azaltabileceğini göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak, çalışanların psikososyal ihtiyaçlarına duyarlı bir yönetim anlayışı, çağrı merkezlerinde bağlılığı artırarak performansı önemli ölçüde güçlendirebilir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:**Sessiz istifa, Sessiz işten çıkarma, Örgütsel bağlılık, İş performansı, Çağrı merkezi çalışanları

**The Effects Of Quiet Resignation And Quiet Dismissal On The Loyalty And  
Performance Of Call Center Employees**

**ABSTRACT**

Abstract, Times New Roman, 9 point, 1 line spacing, between 200-300 words. Abstract, Times New Roman, 9 point, 1 line  
The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of quiet resignation and quiet dismissal behaviors on organizational commitment and job performance among call center employees. The research was conducted through a quantitative design, and the sample consisted of 300 voluntary employees working in a call center in Turkey. Data were collected online using the “Quiet Resignation and Quiet Dismissal Scale,” the “Organizational Commitment Scale,” and the “Job Performance Scale.”

<sup>1</sup> **Sorumlu Yazar:** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Zekeriya Şahin, E-mail: [zekeriyasahin@esenyurt.edu.tr](mailto:zekeriyasahin@esenyurt.edu.tr)

<sup>2</sup> **Yazar:** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Şaban Onur VİGA, E-mail: [akifpamuk@marmara.edu.tr](mailto:akifpamuk@marmara.edu.tr)

<sup>3</sup> **Yazar:** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin SARICI, E-mail: [akifpamuk@marmara.edu.tr](mailto:akifpamuk@marmara.edu.tr)

The findings revealed that as levels of quiet resignation and quiet dismissal increased, both organizational commitment and job performance significantly decreased. Additionally, organizational commitment was found to have a positive effect on job performance. In terms of demographic variables, factors such as gender, educational level, department, and frequency of feedback created statistically significant differences, particularly in quiet dismissal and performance levels. These results indicate that strengthening communication channels, establishing regular feedback mechanisms, and developing employee-support systems within organizations may reduce tendencies toward quiet resignation and quiet dismissal. Overall, the study suggests that management practices attentive to employees' psychosocial needs can enhance organizational commitment and significantly improve performance in call center environments.

**Keywords:** Silent resignation, Silent dismissal, Organizational commitment, Job performance, Call center employees

## Introduction

In the post-pandemic era, organizational scholars and practitioners have increasingly shifted their attention toward subtle forms of employee disengagement that do not appear in the form of overt turnover yet significantly weaken organizational effectiveness (Zieba, 2023). Among these emerging phenomena, quiet resignation (quiet quitting) and quiet dismissal (quiet firing) stand out as critical indicators of a deteriorating psychological connection between employees and their organizations (Formica & Sfodera, 2022). Quiet resignation describes a pattern in which employees withdraw from discretionary effort, emotional involvement, and organizational citizenship behaviours while continuing to fulfil only the minimum formal requirements of their roles (Dillard, Cavallo & Zhang, 2025). Rather than reflecting indifference or laziness, this behaviour is closely linked to unmet psychological needs, perceptions of injustice, emotional exhaustion, and erosion of the psychological contract (Çitil, 2022; Kumar & Padhi, 2022). In contrast, quiet dismissal denotes a managerial approach through which employees become gradually marginalised via reduced responsibilities, exclusion from decision-making processes, and restricted access to developmental opportunities, thereby implicitly encouraging voluntary departure without formal termination. Together, these dynamics signal a fundamental breakdown in the reciprocal exchange relationship that underpins organizational commitment and sustained performance (Casey & Delaney, 2022).

The conceptual basis of these behaviours can be interpreted through psychological contract theory and social exchange theory. When employees perceive breaches in organizational promises concerning fairness, recognition, growth, or support, they often respond by reducing engagement and adopting symbolic withdrawal strategies (Ahmad et al., 2023). Within this framework, quiet resignation emerges as a coping mechanism in constrained organizational environments, whereas quiet dismissal reflects managerial power asymmetry manifested through subtle exclusionary practices. Both forms of silent disengagement gradually weaken affective commitment and diminish task performance, ultimately threatening long-term organizational sustainability (Oquendo, Bell & Kitenge, 2024).

These processes become particularly visible within call center environments, which operate under conditions of intense work pressure, continuous electronic surveillance, rigid performance metrics, high emotional labour, and limited autonomy. Research consistently shows that call center employees experience elevated levels of stress, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intention relative to many other service sectors (Chaudhary et al., 2023). The obligation to maintain emotional composure while managing repetitive and frequently confrontational customer interactions further intensifies psychological strain (Haidar, 2021). In such settings, quiet resignation often manifests through strict compliance with scripts, reduced initiative in problem-solving, and detachment from collaborative engagement, while quiet

dismissal may appear as diminished feedback, lower scheduling priority, or exclusion from professional development initiatives. Understanding how these dynamics unfold in call centers therefore holds critical importance for preserving workforce stability and sustaining service quality (Karrani et al., 2025).

Within the Turkish context, these issues gain additional significance due to shifting generational attitudes toward work, increased attention to psychological well-being, and the growing normalization of hybrid and flexible working arrangements. Younger employees increasingly emphasise work–life balance, meaningful participation, and psychological safety, frequently distancing themselves from traditional models focused solely on excessive performance demands (Shah & Parekh, 2023). Furthermore, the widespread adoption of data-driven performance monitoring systems in Turkish call centers has intensified perceptions of surveillance and reduced autonomy, both of which correlate negatively with engagement and organizational loyalty (Hasyim & Bakri, 2025). Despite this evolving context, empirical research addressing quiet resignation and quiet dismissal in Türkiye remains notably limited, especially within high-pressure service sectors such as call centers (Anderson, 2025).

Although recent studies have begun to address quiet quitting in relation to job satisfaction, burnout, and leadership style, much of the existing literature concentrates primarily on employee-driven withdrawal while giving comparatively little attention to managerial practices of silent exclusion and marginalisation (Galanis et al., 2025). Moreover, scholars often examine these phenomena in isolation, neglecting their combined influence on both organizational loyalty and job performance within specific sectoral environments (Al-Twal, Alawamleh & Jarrar, 2024). This situation reveals a critical gap: despite growing professional and academic discussion, systematic empirical evidence regarding the joint impact of quiet resignation and quiet dismissal on core organizational outcomes remains scarce, particularly in emerging economies such as Türkiye.

Against this theoretical and contextual backdrop, the present study explores the effects of quiet resignation and quiet dismissal on organizational loyalty and job performance among employees working in a major call center in Türkiye. Adopting a quantitative research design, the study collects data through structured questionnaires and examines how varying levels of silent disengagement relate to commitment and performance outcomes. The originality of the research lies in its integrated analysis of both employee-driven and management-driven disengagement within a sector characterised by high emotional and operational demands. By addressing a clearly underexplored gap in the literature, this study contributes theoretically by clarifying the dual dynamics of withdrawal and marginalisation, and practically by offering evidence-based insights to support managers in strengthening sustainable engagement, enhancing loyalty, and maintaining service excellence in call center environments.

## Literature

### The Concept of Silent Resignation

In recent years, the concept of quiet resignation has gained increasing prominence, particularly among Generation Z employees, and has come to represent a subtle yet consequential form of work disengagement. It describes a pattern in which employees continue to fulfil only the formal minimum requirements of their positions while deliberately withdrawing from discretionary effort, initiative, and emotional involvement (Alami et al., 2024). Unlike overt resignation, this behaviour reflects a psychological retreat rather than physical exit, progressively weakening employees' sense of identification with their organization and diminishing their intrinsic motivation to contribute (Grant & Shandell, 2022).

Existing literature associates quiet resignation with burnout, job dissatisfaction, reduced sense of meaning, and perceived lack of recognition. These conditions gradually erode employees' willingness to invest cognitive and emotional resources in their work, reinforcing

a cycle of disengagement (Vo, Tuliao & Chen, 2022). In high-pressure sectors such as call centers, where continuous performance monitoring, emotional labour, and limited autonomy prevail, this form of withdrawal becomes particularly visible and structurally embedded. Employees facing persistent performance pressure often restrict their effort strictly to prescribed task limits, leading to weakened engagement and reduced organizational belonging (Alami et al., 2024).

Beyond individual consequences, silent resignation carries significant organizational implications. Empirical studies demonstrate that employees who exhibit such withdrawal behaviours report lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, alongside diminished productivity and reduced contribution to team performance (Gabelaia & Bagociunaite, 2023). These findings suggest that silent resignation functions not merely as a personal coping strategy but as a structural threat to workforce stability and organizational effectiveness.

Taken together, the reviewed evidence indicates a consistent relationship between silent resignation and the erosion of key organizational outcomes, particularly commitment and performance. As employees disengage psychologically, their emotional bond with the organization weakens, and their willingness to exert effort beyond basic requirements declines. In light of this theoretical and empirical foundation, the following hypotheses are formulated:

**H1:** Silent resignation negatively affects the commitment levels of call center employees.

**H2:** Silent resignation negatively affects the performance of call center employees.

### **The Concept of Silent Dismissal**

The concept of quiet dismissal, also referred to as quiet firing, describes managerial practices through which employees are indirectly encouraged to leave the organization without formal termination procedures. This process typically involves systematic exclusion, demotivation, and restriction of developmental opportunities, thereby gradually creating an environment that becomes psychologically unsustainable for the employee (Atiku, Jeremiah & Genty, 2025). Unlike overt dismissal, quiet dismissal operates through subtle and often ambiguous actions that undermine employees' professional identity and erode their perceived value within the organization.

Such practices significantly damage trust and communication between employees and management, contributing to a deteriorating organizational climate. Behaviours including withholding constructive feedback, limiting access to promotions, assigning marginal roles, or excluding employees from decision-making processes weaken perceptions of organizational justice and reduce emotional attachment to the organization (Othman, Mahran & Ali, 2025). As a result, employees subjected to quiet dismissal increasingly experience psychological strain, feelings of rejection, and declining motivation, which ultimately disrupt both commitment and performance.

These effects become particularly pronounced in high-stress environments such as call centers, where employees already operate under constant performance monitoring and emotional labour demands. In such contexts, managerial signals of exclusion are interpreted more intensely and often accelerate psychological withdrawal. Empirical evidence indicates that quiet firing practices are associated with reduced employee trust, diminishing motivation, and lower productivity, reinforcing a cycle of disengagement and performance decline (Deery, Iverson & Walsh, 2022).

Taken together, the literature suggests that quiet dismissal does not merely function as an indirect managerial strategy for workforce reduction, but also as a critical determinant of employees' psychological connection to the organization. As perceptions of injustice and marginalisation increase, employees' loyalty weakens and their performance capacity

deteriorates. Based on this theoretical and empirical foundation, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H3:** Silent dismissal negatively affects the commitment levels of call center employees.

**H4:** Silent dismissal negatively affects the performance of call center employees.

### **Employee Loyalty**

Employee loyalty, often conceptualized as organizational commitment, reflects an individual's emotional, cognitive, and behavioural attachment to both their job and the organization. It encompasses not only job satisfaction but also identification with organizational values, a sense of purpose in work, and a willingness to contribute beyond formal role requirements (Murray & Holmes, 2021). Employees who demonstrate high levels of loyalty tend to align their personal goals with organizational objectives, display sustained effort, and maintain consistent performance even under demanding conditions.

The development of employee loyalty is strongly influenced by organizational factors such as perceived organizational support, leadership style, fairness, and working conditions. Supportive leadership and transparent communication foster trust and reinforce employees' sense of belonging, thereby strengthening commitment (Mahmood Aziz et al., 2021). In high-volume service sectors such as call centers, where employees frequently experience emotional strain and performance pressure, the presence of supportive managers and an open communication climate becomes a decisive factor in sustaining loyalty and preventing disengagement (Lee & Kim, 2023).

However, silent resignation and silent dismissal directly undermine these loyalty mechanisms. When employees perceive that their efforts are undervalued or that they are being gradually sidelined by management, their emotional attachment to the organization deteriorates. Feelings of invisibility, injustice, and lack of recognition weaken their sense of belonging, ultimately reducing their willingness to invest effort and remain committed (Sarwar et al., 2024). These dynamics suggest that loyalty is not merely an attitudinal construct, but a vulnerable outcome shaped by both employee withdrawal behaviours and managerial exclusion practices.

Given that loyal employees are more likely to sustain high performance, demonstrate proactive behaviours, and contribute to organizational continuity, understanding the relationship between loyalty and performance becomes essential, particularly in performance-driven environments such as call centers. Based on this theoretical and empirical foundation, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H5:** Employee loyalty has a positive effect on the performance of Assittt Call Center employees.

### **Job Performance**

Job performance is the total output of knowledge, skills, and motivational factors that reflects an individual's ability to achieve organizational goals within a specific period. Performance is measured not only by quantitative outputs but also by indicators of quality, productivity, customer satisfaction, and organizational behavior (Andreas, 2022). In the service sector, performance, especially in call centers, is closely linked to communication skills, stress management, and emotional resilience. Numerous studies have shown that individuals with high employee engagement in these types of jobs also perform better (Bohórquez et al., 2021).

Empirical evidence highlights that employees who demonstrate higher levels of engagement and psychological involvement tend to exhibit superior performance outcomes in demanding service roles. In call center environments, engaged employees are more likely to resolve customer issues effectively, maintain service standards, and adapt constructively to workload fluctuations (Bohórquez et al., 2021). These findings reveal that performance is not

solely a function of technical capacity, but also of employees' psychological alignment with organizational goals and their willingness to exert discretionary effort.

Conversely, covert disengagement processes such as silent resignation and silent dismissal constitute significant psychological determinants of declining performance. When employees experience emotional detachment, exclusion, or a diminished sense of relevance within the organization, their productivity, responsiveness, and service quality tend to deteriorate (Oquendo, Bell & Kitenge, 2024). A weakened identification with organizational goals translates into lower effort, reduced initiative, and minimal compliance behaviours. In contrast, employees who remain highly engaged demonstrate greater responsibility, voluntary effort, and sustained performance contributions, reinforcing the central role of psychological connection in performance sustainability (Klotz & Bolino, 2016).

Taken together, the literature suggests that job performance in call center contexts is highly sensitive to both employee-driven disengagement and managerial exclusion practices. As psychological withdrawal intensifies, performance outcomes increasingly suffer, indicating a direct relational pathway between silent disengagement and performance decline. This theoretical and empirical foundation highlights the necessity of examining job performance not only as an operational outcome, but as a construct intricately shaped by organizational loyalty, engagement, and silent withdrawal dynamics.

### **Relationships Between Variables and Research Model**

The literature consistently identifies organizational commitment as one of the most powerful predictors of employee performance, as committed employees demonstrate greater persistence, responsibility, and alignment with organizational goals (Cesário & Chambel, 2017). However, emerging forms of silent disengagement such as silent resignation and silent dismissal increasingly weaken this established relationship. Silent resignation disrupts commitment by eroding employees' emotional and cognitive attachment to the organization, while silent dismissal produces similar effects through managerial pressure, exclusion, and perceived injustice (Tuffaha, 2020).

When these two phenomena coexist, employees' sense of belonging and identification with organizational values progressively deteriorates, which subsequently translates into declining effort and performance. In this context, organizational commitment does not merely function as an independent attitudinal outcome but operates as an explanatory mechanism through which silent disengagement influences job performance. Previous empirical evidence supports the role of commitment as a mediating factor in the relationship between workplace stressors and performance outcomes (Al Zefeiti & Mohamad, 2017). Accordingly, and grounded in both theoretical and empirical foundations, this study proposes the following mediation hypothesis:

**H6:** Silent resignation and silent dismissal indirectly influence the relationship between employee commitment and performance.

## **Method**

### **Research Model**

This research was conducted to examine the effects of silent resignations and silent dismissals on the commitment and performance of call center employees. Quantitative research methods were utilized in the study.

The research sample consisted of employees working at Assistt Call Center. The call center industry, due to its high employee turnover and dynamic structure, has a large employee base. Therefore, simple random sampling was chosen to increase representativeness of the population. 300 employees who volunteered to participate were included in the sample.

### **Data Collection Tools**

**Data Collection Tools:** The study plans to use a Demographic Information Form, an Organizational Commitment Scale, an Employee Performance Scale, and a Quiet Resignation and Quiet Dismissal Scale. To assess the effects of quiet resignations and quiet dismissals on commitment and performance among call center employees, the researcher reviewed the literature and created a 10-question Personal Information Form (Şen, Yurtsever, & Polat, 2024; Altıntaş, 2024).

**Silent Resignation and Silent Dismissal Scale:** Silent Resignation and Silent Dismissal Scales were developed by Anand et al. (2023) and consist of two dimensions each with seven items rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree). The Turkish validity and reliability study was conducted by Şen, Yurtsever, and Polat (2024). The Silent Resignation Scale measures employees' tendencies toward low organizational commitment and minimal effort, while the Silent Dismissal Scale assesses perceptions of managerial behaviors that implicitly push employees to leave. All items are positively worded. Reported Cronbach's alpha values were 0.829 and 0.876 in the original study, and 0.890 and 0.927 in the present research, indicating high reliability. Each scale functions independently, with higher scores reflecting stronger perceptions of silent resignation or silent dismissal.

**Organizational Commitment Scale:** The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), originally developed by Meyer and Allen (1984) and adapted into Turkish by Boylu, Pelit, and Güçer (2007), was used to measure employees' organizational commitment levels. The scale consists of 17 items and evaluates commitment under three dimensions: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. It is a 5-point Likert-type scale, scored as 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. Items 1–6 measure affective commitment, items 7–12 measure continuance commitment, and items 13–17 measure normative commitment. Higher scores indicate stronger organizational commitment. Necessary permissions for the use of the scale were obtained and are included in the appendix.

**Job Performance Scale:** The 25-item performance scale developed by Goodman and Svyantek (1999, p. 261) was used as the Job Performance Scale. The first 16 items of this scale represent contextual performance, while the last 9 items represent task performance. Because items 4, 8, and 10 are inversely worded, they were reversed and included in the analysis (Polatçı, 2014).

## Data Analysis

The study data were collected online, and the responses obtained were transferred to the SPSS 25.0 statistical package program for analysis. Prior to hypothesis testing, the normality of the data distributions was examined. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov and Shapiro–Wilk tests were applied to assess whether the total scores and subdimension scores met the normal distribution assumption. The results of these tests indicated that not all variables satisfied the assumption of normality. Therefore, non-parametric statistical techniques were preferred in subsequent analyses.

Accordingly, the Spearman–Rho Correlation Coefficient, which is the non-parametric alternative to the Pearson Product–Moment Correlation Coefficient, was used to examine the relationships between continuous variables. For comparisons between two independent groups, the Mann–Whitney U Test was employed, while the Kruskal–Wallis H Test was used for comparisons involving three or more independent groups. When statistically significant differences were identified through the Kruskal–Wallis H Test, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted using the Mann–Whitney U Test. In addition, Bonferroni correction was applied in multiple comparisons to control the risk of Type I error.

## Findings

**Table 1.** Results of Participants' Socio-Demographic Characteristics

<b>Variables</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>(%)</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	168	56,0
Male	132	44,0
<b>Age Ort±Ss= 41,90±13,31 – Medyan= 43,00 – Min= 18,00 – Max= 65,00</b>		
<b>Educational Status</b>		
High School or Below	160	53,3
Front licence	117	39,0
Licence	23	7,7
<b>Length of Employment</b>		
0-1 Yearı	68	22,7
2-3 Years	181	60,3
4-5 Years	34	11,3
6-10 Years	17	5,7
<b>Department</b>		
Customer Service	61	20,3
Technical Support	96	32,0
Sales	143	47,7
<b>Work Schedule Arrangement</b>		
Full-Time	48	16,0
Half-Time	40	13,3
Part-Time	59	19,7
Flexible Working Hours	151	50,3
Other	2	0,7
<b>How Do You Generally Feel About Your Commitment to Your Job?</b>		
Very Committed	106	35,3
Committed	194	64,7
Neither Committed nor Uncommitted	---	---
Uncommitted	---	---
Not Committed at All	---	---
<b>What Do You Think About the Overall Atmosphere and Management Style at Your Workplace?</b>		
Very Positive	114	38,0
Positive	186	62,0
Neither positive Nor negative	---	---
Negative	---	---
Very Negative	---	---
<b>How Often Do You Receive Feedback Regarding Your Work Performance?</b>		
Weekly	199	66,3
Monthly	71	23,7
Quarterly	30	10,0
Annually	---	---
Never Receive Feedback	---	---
<b>How Would You Describe Your Relationship with Your Manager?</b>		
Very Good	277	92,3
Good	6	2,0
Moderate	17	5,7
Poor	---	---
Very Poor	---	---

In summary, as shown in Table 4, 56.0% of the participants were female, with a mean age of  $41.90 \pm 13.31$ . More than half of the participants (53.3%) were high school graduates or below, and the majority (60.3%) had been employed for 2–3 years. Nearly half (47.7%) worked in sales departments, while 50.3% reported having flexible working hours. In addition, 64.7% stated that they were committed to their jobs, 62.0% evaluated the overall workplace atmosphere positively, 66.3% received weekly feedback on their job performance, and a large majority (92.3%) described their relationship with their managers as very good.

**Table 2.** Internal Consistency Coefficient Results of the Measurement Tool Used in the Study

Scales and Subdimensions	Criteria	
	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
<b>Quiet Quitting and Quiet Firing Scale</b>		
Quiet Quitting Subdimension	7	,583
Quiet Firing Subdimension	7	,549
<b>Organizational Commitment Scale (Total)</b>	17	,824
Affective Commitment Subdimension	6	,804
Continuance Commitment Subdimension	6	,827
Normative Commitment Subdimension	5	,753
<b>Job Performance Scale (Total)</b>	25	,905
Contextual Performance Subdimension	16	,915
Task Performance Subdimension	9	,748

As seen in Table 2, the internal consistency coefficients for the overall scales and their sub-dimensions used in the study ranged from .549 to .915. This finding indicates that the scales have moderate to high levels of reliability. In other words, the items on the three measurement tools used in the study measure the same characteristic, demonstrating a homogeneous structure. Consequently, the measurement tools used in the study can be said to be reliable.

**Table 3.** Correlation Results of the Silent Resignation Scale and the Organizational Commitment Scale, and the Job Performance Scale's General and Sub-Dimension Scores

Scales and Subdimensions	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
<b>Quiet Quitting and Quiet Firing Scale</b>									
1. Quiet Quitting Subdimension	1,0								
2. Quiet Firing Subdimension	,520	1,0							
<b>3. Organizational Commitment Scale (Total)</b>	-,487**	-,058	1,0						
4. Affective Commitment Subdimension	-,268**	,047	,393**	1,0					
5. Continuance Commitment Subdimension	,060	-,038	,397**	,470**	1,0				
6. Normative Commitment Subdimension	,000	-,003	,314**	,499**	,472**	1,0			
<b>7. Job Performance Scale (Total)</b>	-,015	-,112*	,156**	,211**	,068	,086	1,0		
8. Contextual Performance Subdimension	-,264**	-,089	,189**	,149**	,026	,000	,614**	1,0	

9.Task Performance Subdimension	-,053	-,038	,055	,096	,106	,091	,436**	,352**	1,0
------------------------------------	-------	-------	------	------	------	------	--------	--------	-----

Technique Used: Spearman rho Correlation Technique - \*\*: significant at  $p < .001$  - \*:  $p < .05$  levels.

According to the research findings, a low-level, negative, and significant correlation was found between individuals' scores on the Silent Resignation Scale - Silent Dismissal Scale and their overall Organizational Commitment Scale scores ( $r = -0.487$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Similarly low-level, negative, linear, and significant correlations were found between the silent resignation subscale and the affective commitment subscale ( $r = -0.268$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and the contextual performance subscale of the job performance scale ( $r = -0.264$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

Furthermore, a low-level, negative, and significant correlation was also found between individuals' scores on the silent dismissal subscale and their overall job performance scale scores ( $r = -0.112$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

On the other hand, a low-level positive and significant correlation was found between individuals' overall scores on the organizational commitment scale and their overall scores on the job performance scale ( $r = 0.156$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and contextual performance subscales ( $r = 0.189$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

Low-level positive and significant correlations were also found between the affective commitment subscale of the organizational commitment scale and the overall scores on the job performance scale ( $r = 0.211$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and contextual performance subscales ( $r = 0.149$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 4.** Comparison Results of Some Introductory Characteristics of Individuals and General and Sub-Dimension Scores of the Silent Resignation Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale

Variables	n	Quiet Quitting Subdimension				Quiet Firing Subdimension				Organizational Commitment Scale General			
		Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.	Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.	Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.
<b>Gender</b>													
Female		18,58	3,31	19,00	157,59	16,06	4,51	16,00	136,81	65,39	8,22	66,00	146,31
Male		17,93	3,30	18,00	141,48	17,70	4,71	18,50	167,93	65,73	9,03	67,00	155,83
Statistical Analysis		U: 9897,0 - p: ,109				U: 8787,5 - p: ,002				U: 10384,0 - p: ,345			
<b>Educational Status</b>													
High School or Below	160	18,33	3,30	18,00	151,13	16,79	4,83	17,50	151,42	64,94	8,39	66,00	143,47
Front licence	117	18,18	3,34	18,00	147,97	17,19	4,21	17,00	156,53	66,39	8,68	67,00	161,09
Licence	23	18,65	3,42	18,00	158,96	14,65	5,28	14,00	113,43	65,35	9,30	65,00	145,54
Statistical Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : ,329 - p: ,848				X <sup>2</sup> : 4,80 - p: ,091				X <sup>2</sup> : 2,87 - p: ,237			
<b>Length of Employment</b>													
a-0-1 Year	68	18,06	3,77	18,50	146,63	17,76	5,06	18,00	168,19	64,91	8,84	66,00	142,29
b-2-3 Years	181	18,27	3,04	18,00	149,39	16,10	4,31	16,00	137,85	65,90	8,61	67,00	155,72
c-4-5 Years	34	19,12	3,85	19,00	168,88	17,47	4,72	18,00	165,40	64,71	7,63	66,00	138,09
d-6-10 Years	17	17,82	3,15	19,00	141,03	18,71	5,46	19,00	184,68	65,94	9,28	62,00	152,59
Statistical Analysis/Difference Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : 1,91 - p: ,591				X <sup>2</sup> : 10,36 - p: ,016				X <sup>2</sup> : 1,97 - p: ,578			
		---				b<a-b<d				---			
<b>Department</b>													
a-Customer Service	61	17,84	3,47	18,00	140,98	18,95	5,03	19,00	188,20	64,95	8,73	65,00	141,72
b-Technical Support	96	18,34	2,99	18,00	151,42	16,32	4,22	17,00	142,23	66,00	7,69	67,00	155,80
c-Sales	143	18,45	3,46	18,00	153,95	16,17	4,55	17,00	139,97	65,48	9,09	67,00	150,69
Statistical Analysis/Difference Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : ,980 - p: ,613				X <sup>2</sup> : 14,56 - p: ,001				X <sup>2</sup> : ,985 - p: ,611			
		---				a>b-a>c				---			
<b>Work Schedule Arrangement</b>													
a-Full-Time	48	18,35	3,46	18,00	153,88	15,19	4,14	15,00	120,73	64,73	9,26	67,00	145,91
b-Half-Time	40	17,75	2,66	18,00	136,05	17,03	4,75	17,00	152,89	66,48	8,12	68,00	159,60
c-Part-Time	59	18,61	3,15	19,00	162,04	17,66	4,53	18,00	166,77	65,15	8,28	67,00	146,83
d-Flexible Working Hours	151	18,30	3,52	18,00	149,08	16,94	4,76	18,00	154,02	65,71	8,55	66,00	150,95
e-Other	2	17,50	2,12	17,50	125,50	12,50	4,95	12,50	71,50	65,00	18,38	65,00	152,75
Statistical Analysis/Difference Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : 2,45 - p: ,653				X <sup>2</sup> : 9,71 - p: ,046				X <sup>2</sup> : ,687 - p: ,953			
		---				a<c-a<d				---			

How Do You Generally Feel About Your Commitment to Your Job?													
Very Committed	106	18,48	3,16	18,50	155,59	17,47	4,87	18,00	162,44	65,31	9,06	66,00	149,39
Committed	194	18,19	3,41	18,00	147,72	16,41	4,52	17,00	143,97	65,66	8,31	67,00	151,11
Statistical Analysis	U: 9742,0 - p: ,450				U: 9016,0 - p: ,077				U: 10164,5 - p: ,870				
What Do You Think About the Overall Atmosphere and Management Style at Your Workplace?													
Very Positive	114	18,43	3,45	18,00	152,62	16,98	4,09	17,00	153,63	65,92	9,05	68,00	158,07
Positive	186	18,21	3,24	18,00	149,20	16,66	4,99	17,00	148,58	65,31	8,28	66,00	145,86
Statistical Analysis	U: 10360,5 - p: ,739				U: 10245,0 - p: ,624				U: 9739,0 - p: ,236				
How Often Do You Receive Feedback Regarding Your Work Performance?													
a-Weekly	199	18,46	3,28	18,00	154,51	16,77	4,80	17,00	149,99	65,62	8,04	67,00	149,38
b-Monthly	71	18,10	3,29	18,00	144,39	16,04	4,01	16,00	137,25	65,77	9,87	67,00	158,28
c-Quarterly	30	17,63	3,62	18,50	138,35	18,60	4,85	19,00	185,22	64,47	8,94	63,00	139,52
Statistical Analysis/Difference Analysis	X <sup>2</sup> : 1,37 - p: ,502				X <sup>2</sup> : 6,49 - p: ,039				X <sup>2</sup> : 7,08 - p: ,025				
	---				c>a-c>b				c<a-c<b				
How Would You Describe Your Relationship with Your Manager?													
a-Very Good	277	18,32	3,30	18,00	151,41	16,69	4,63	17,00	148,38	65,65	8,15	67,00	150,05
b- Good	6	16,50	3,62	16,50	105,42	16,67	5,13	18,00	153,58	66,33	7,92	69,00	161,67
c-Moderate	17	18,41	3,52	19,00	151,65	18,41	5,00	20,00	184,00	63,53	14,27	68,00	153,94
Statistical Analysis	X <sup>2</sup> : 1,66 - p: ,434				X <sup>2</sup> : 2,72 - p: ,257				X <sup>2</sup> : ,134 - p: ,935				

**Table 5.** Comparison Results of Some Introductory Characteristics of Individuals and General and Sub-Dimension Scores of the Silent Resignation Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale (continue)

Means (continued)														
Variables	n	Emotional Commitment Sub-Dimension				Continuity Commitment Sub-Dimension				Normative Commitment Sub-Dimension				
		Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.	Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.	Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.	
Gender														
Female		24,89	3,49	25,00	149,70	23,67	3,77	24,00	152,99	18,30	2,80	18,00	152,82	
Male		24,70	4,33	26,00	151,52	23,17	4,82	24,00	147,33	18,17	2,38	18,00	147,55	
Statistical Analysis		U: 10953,0 - p: ,856				U: 10669,0 - p: ,573				U: 10698,5 - p: ,599				
Educational Status														
High School or Below	160	25,04	3,76	26,00	155,17	23,79	4,39	24,00	158,14	18,02	2,65	18,00	144,22	
Front licence	117	24,71	4,03	26,00	149,98	22,97	4,21	23,00	141,05	18,48	2,63	18,00	156,89	
Licence	23	23,70	3,77	24,00	120,70	23,52	3,57	24,00	145,46	18,57	2,31	19,00	161,67	
Statistical Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : 3,21 - p: ,200				X <sup>2</sup> : 2,72 - p: ,256				X <sup>2</sup> : 1,88 - p: ,390				
Length of Employment														
a-0-1 Year	68	24,65	3,57	25,00	144,79	22,59	4,50	23,00	131,54	17,96	2,29	18,00	140,13	
b-2-3 Years	181	24,97	3,87	26,00	154,58	23,81	4,22	24,00	159,62	18,41	2,74	18,00	156,25	
c-4-5 Years	34	24,53	4,21	25,00	144,09	23,62	4,16	24,00	151,59	18,26	2,12	18,50	151,35	
d-6-10 Years	17	24,29	4,63	24,00	142,76	22,71	3,70	23,00	127,03	17,53	3,41	18,00	129,00	
Statistical Analysis/Difference Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : 1,02 - p: ,795				X <sup>2</sup> : 6,54 - p: ,088				X <sup>2</sup> : 2,86 - p: ,414				
		---				---				---				
Department														
a-Customer Service	61	24,46	4,50	24,00	146,17	22,61	4,48	22,00	128,59	18,00	2,72	18,00	143,02	
b-Technical Support	96	25,19	3,41	26,00	157,03	24,03	3,79	24,00	161,98	18,33	2,67	18,00	154,79	

c-Sales	143	24,70	3,89	25,00	147,97	23,42	4,44	24,00	152,14	18,28	2,55	18,00	150,81
Statistical Analysis/Difference Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : ,826 - p: ,662			X <sup>2</sup> : 5,66 - p: ,049			X <sup>2</sup> : ,701 - p: ,704					
		---			a<b			---					
Work Schedule Arrangement													
a-Full-Time	48	24,35	4,40	25,50	143,50	22,75	5,05	23,50	139,91	18,33	2,81	18,00	150,30
b-Half-Time	40	25,85	3,45	26,00	174,54	24,23	3,94	24,00	163,38	18,65	2,46	18,00	162,28
c-Part-Time	59	24,10	4,44	25,00	136,91	23,78	4,00	24,00	159,08	18,20	2,59	19,00	151,77
d-Flexible Working Hours	151	24,98	3,48	26,00	151,99	23,36	4,18	24,00	147,63	18,08	2,58	18,00	146,38
e-Other	2	22,50	7,78	22,50	126,50	21,50	4,95	21,50	111,25	21,00	5,66	21,00	193,50
Statistical Analysis/Difference Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : 5,08 - p: ,279			X <sup>2</sup> : 2,77 - p: ,597			X <sup>2</sup> : 1,60 - p: ,807					
		---			---			---					
How Do You Generally Feel About Your Commitment to Your Job?													
Very Committed	106	24,70	4,09	26,00	149,74	23,75	4,43	24,00	160,02	18,18	2,56	18,00	149,91
Committed	194	24,87	3,76	25,00	150,91	23,28	4,18	24,00	145,30	18,27	2,66	18,00	150,82
Statistical Analysis		U: 10201,5 - p: ,910			U: 9272,5 - p: ,158			U: 10219,5 - p: ,930					
What Do You Think About the Overall Atmosphere and Management Style at Your Workplace?													
Very Positive	114	25,06	3,87	26,00	157,18	23,23	4,66	24,00	150,61	18,11	2,70	18,00	147,21
Positive	186	24,65	3,88	25,00	146,41	23,59	4,01	24,00	150,43	18,32	2,57	18,00	152,52
Statistical Analysis		U: 9841,0 - p: ,294			U: 10589,0 - p: ,986			U: 10226,5 - p: ,604					
How Often Do You Receive Feedback Regarding Your Work Performance?													
a-Weekly	199	24,87	3,48	25,00	149,08	23,56	4,02	24,00	150,51	18,31	2,57	18,00	153,17
b-Monthly	71	24,90	4,31	26,00	157,00	23,76	4,68	24,00	163,07	18,15	2,54	18,00	144,68
c-Quarterly	30	24,13	5,18	24,00	144,52	22,00	4,68	22,50	120,72	18,00	3,15	18,50	146,53
Statistical Analysis/Difference Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : ,601 - p: ,741			X <sup>2</sup> : 6,06 - p: ,042			X <sup>2</sup> : ,580 - p: ,748					
		---			c<a-c<b			---					
How Would You Describe Your Relationship with Your Manager?													
a-Very Good	277	24,88	3,71	25,00	150,97	23,57	4,08	24,00	152,01	18,25	2,62	18,00	151,48
b- Good	6	26,33	2,07	26,00	183,42	25,67	3,50	26,00	193,83	18,50	1,76	18,00	157,92
c-Moderate	17	23,00	6,06	24,00	131,21	20,65	6,24	21,00	110,56	17,94	3,01	17,00	131,97
Statistical Analysis		X <sup>2</sup> : 1,73 - p: ,421			X <sup>2</sup> : 5,22 - p: ,073			X <sup>2</sup> : ,868 - p: ,648					

According to the research findings, significant differences were found between the silent dismissal subscale scores and some demographic and job variables. Men's scores were found to be higher than women's ( $U = 8787.5$ ,  $p = .002$ ). In terms of tenure, those who had worked for 2–3 years had lower scores than those who had worked for 0–1 year ( $U = 4918.5$ ,  $p = .014$ ) and 6–10 years ( $U = 1079.0$ ,  $p = .010$ ) ( $X^2 = 10.36$ ,  $p = .016$ ). Regarding the department variable, those working in customer service had higher scores than those in technical support

( $U = 2020.0$ ,  $p = .001$ ) and sales ( $U = 2970.0$ ,  $p = .000$ ) ( $X^2 = 14.56$ ,  $p = .001$ ). Full-time employees had lower scores than part-time ( $U = 974.0$ ,  $p = .006$ ) and flexible employees ( $U = 2828.5$ ,  $p = .012$ ) ( $X^2 = 9.71$ ,  $p = .046$ ). Those who received quarterly feedback had higher scores for silent dismissal than those who received weekly ( $U = 2304.5$ ,  $p = .005$ ) and monthly feedback ( $U = 704.0$ ,  $p = .007$ ), whereas their organizational commitment scores were lower ( $X^2 = 7.08$ ,  $p = .025$ ). No significant differences were found in the evaluations regarding education level, job commitment, and management style ( $p > .05$ ). These results indicate that the tendency for silent dismissal is particularly high among males, customer service workers, and individuals with low feedback frequency.

**Table 6.** Comparison Results of Some Introductory Characteristics of Individuals and Job Performance Scale General and Sub-Dimension Scores

Variables	n	Job Performance Scale				Contextual Performance				Task Performance AB			
		General				EU							
		Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.	Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.	Ort.	Ss	Med	S.O.
<b>Gender</b>													
Female	168	93,65	13,73	98,00	148,43	55,84	12,59	57,00	146,12	34,43	4,48	35,00	143,24
Male	132	93,14	16,32	99,00	153,13	56,97	12,90	60,00	156,07	35,02	4,88	36,00	159,75
Statistical Analysis		U: 10740,5 - p: ,035				U: 10352,5 - p: ,025				U: 9867,5- p: ,010			
<b>Educational Status</b>													
a-High School or Below	160	92,74	15,36	97,50	146,80	56,38	12,39	59,50	150,24	34,72	5,00	36,00	152,94
b-Front licence	117	94,35	14,52	99,00	156,71	56,08	13,53	57,00	149,95	34,43	4,43	36,00	143,92
c-Licence	23	93,48	13,96	100,00	144,63	57,35	11,06	62,00	155,09	35,78	3,03	36,00	166,98
Statistical Analysis / Difference Analysis		$X^2$ : ,998 - p: ,607				$X^2$ : ,070 - p: ,965				$X^2$ : 10,64 - p: ,012			
		---				---				c>a-c>b			
<b>Length of Employment</b>													
a-0-1 Year	68	92,54	17,88	99,00	153,73	56,19	12,85	58,50	149,60	34,25	4,52	35,00	140,02
b-2-3 Years	181	93,66	14,38	98,00	150,99	55,96	13,14	59,00	148,86	35,08	4,34	36,00	156,76
c-4-5 Years	34	95,15	11,97	98,00	153,01	57,24	11,18	60,00	154,31	34,53	5,98	36,00	155,29
d-6-10 Years	17	91,00	13,23	93,00	127,38	59,12	11,00	60,00	163,91	32,59	5,26	33,00	116,18
Statistical Analysis		$X^2$ : 1,33- p: ,720				$X^2$ : ,544- p: ,909				$X^2$ : 4,73- p: ,192			
<b>Department</b>													
a-Customer Service	61	93,80	14,67	100,00	151,61	57,33	11,31	60,00	154,43	34,61	4,63	36,00	150,02
b-Technical Support	96	92,07	15,27	95,50	142,36	56,71	12,51	60,00	152,94	34,90	4,30	36,00	152,37
c-Sales	143	94,17	14,79	98,00	155,49	55,66	13,45	58,00	147,18	34,58	4,92	36,00	149,45
Statistical Analysis/ Difference Analysis		$X^2$ : 11,32- p: ,008				$X^2$ : ,411- p: ,814				$X^2$ : 10,06- p: ,005			
		b<a-b<c				---				b>a-b>c			
<b>Work Schedule Arrangement</b>													
a-Full-Time	48	93,38	16,42	97,50	154,61	57,98	12,20	61,00	161,38	34,77	4,56	36,00	152,66
b-Half Time	40	93,38	13,91	98,50	146,35	56,23	11,06	58,00	145,17	34,90	5,60	36,00	159,90
c-Part-Time	59	92,68	14,61	98,00	145,56	55,58	12,93	56,00	146,64	34,59	3,90	35,00	143,83
d-Flexible Working Hours	151	93,84	14,97	99,00	153,13	56,21	13,33	59,00	150,63	34,64	4,76	36,00	150,16
e-Other	2	86,50	6,36	86,50	82,00	51,50	4,95	51,50	100,25	35,00	1,41	35,00	133,25
Statistical Analysis		$X^2$ : 1,77- p: ,776				$X^2$ : 1,69 - p: ,792				$X^2$ : ,937 - p: ,919			
<b>How Do You Generally Feel About Your Commitment to Your Job?</b>													
Very Committed	106	92,55	15,32	97,50	145,90	55,42	12,22	58,00	142,71	34,90	4,47	36,00	152,47
Committed	194	93,91	14,69	98,50	153,01	56,84	12,99	60,00	154,76	34,57	4,76	36,00	149,42
Statistical Analysis		U: 9794,5 - p: ,497				U: 9456,0- p: ,250				U: 10073,0- p: ,770			
<b>What Do You Think About the Overall Atmosphere and Management Style at Your Workplace?</b>													
Very Positive	114	94,39	13,95	99,50	154,64	56,16	13,37	59,50	151,17	34,82	4,35	35,50	150,86
Positive	186	92,83	15,46	97,00	147,96	56,45	12,34	58,00	150,09	34,61	4,85	36,00	150,28
Statistical Analysis		U: 1130,0 - p: ,517				U: 10525,5- p: ,916				U: 10560,5- p: ,954			
<b>How Often Do You Receive Feedback Regarding Your Work Performance?</b>													
a-Weekly	199	92,94	15,27	98,00	147,92	56,41	12,22	59,00	150,18	34,96	4,54	36,00	155,04
b-Monthly	71	94,49	14,01	99,00	156,08	55,54	14,09	57,00	147,43	34,44	4,69	36,00	144,35
c-Quarterly	30	94,13	14,79	99,00	154,37	57,73	12,88	60,00	159,90	33,47	5,28	35,50	134,98
Statistical Analysis		$X^2$ : ,530 - p: ,767				$X^2$ : ,444- p: ,801				$X^2$ : 1,87- p: ,391			
<b>How Would You Describe Your Relationship with Your Manager?</b>													
a-Very Good	277	93,92	14,58	98,00	152,91	56,26	12,58	59,00	149,80	34,73	4,65	36,00	151,11
b-Good	6	96,00	11,24	98,50	159,33	59,17	9,20	61,50	165,17	36,83	2,23	37,00	189,08
c-Moderate	17	84,53	18,84	88,00	108,06	56,65	16,24	63,00	156,76	33,24	5,25	35,00	126,88
Statistical Analysis		$X^2$ : 4,35 - p: ,114				$X^2$ : ,279- p: ,870				$X^2$ : 2,48- p: ,289			

According to the research results, a significant difference was found between the gender groups in terms of overall job performance scale scores ( $U = 10740.5$ ,  $p = .035$ ); according to this, women's overall job performance scores were higher than men's. However, men's scores were higher than women's in the contextual performance ( $U = 10352.5$ ,  $p = .025$ ) and task performance ( $U = 9867.5$ ,  $p = .010$ ) subscales. A significant difference was also found in terms of education level ( $X^2 = 10.64$ ,  $p = .012$ ); task performance scores of individuals with a bachelor's degree or less were higher than those with a high school degree or less ( $U = 1677.0$ ,  $p = .010$ ) and an associate's degree ( $U = 1129.0$ ,  $p = .012$ ). According to the department variable, the overall job performance scores of technical support employees were lower than those of customer service ( $U = 2732.0$ ,  $p = .008$ ) and sales ( $U = 6279.0$ ,  $p = .004$ ) employees ( $X^2 = 11.32$ ,  $p = .008$ ). However, in the same variable, the task performance scores of technical support employees were higher than those of customer service ( $U = 2871.5$ ,  $p = .013$ ) and sales ( $U = 6741.0$ ,  $p = .001$ ) employees ( $X^2 = 10.06$ ,  $p = .005$ ). On the other hand, no statistically significant differences were found in terms of the variables of working time, working hours, commitment to work, workplace atmosphere, frequency of feedback, and relationship with manager ( $p > .05$ ). In general, these findings show that gender, education and department variables have an impact on job performance, while other variables do not have a significant effect.

### **Discussion**

Research findings indicate that the demographic characteristics and working conditions of call center employees play a decisive role in organizational commitment and job performance. The fact that the majority of participants were female (56.0%) and middle-aged (Mean =  $41.90 \pm 13.31$ ) suggests that the call center sector employs a high proportion of women, which may be related to the demand for emotional labor (Keser, 2006). More than half of the participants had a high school education or less (53.3%), indicating that the sector generally employs individuals with a basic education level, is consistent with similar research (Ağyüz, 2013). The fact that the majority of participants had been working for 2–3 years (60.3%) suggests that, despite frequent employee turnover in the call center sector, a certain amount of work experience has been gained. Furthermore, the fact that almost half of the employees work in the sales department (47.7%) and half work in flexible work schedules (50.3%) reveals that performance-based and intensive work schedules are common in call centers (Doellgast & O'Brady, 2020). The fact that 64.7% of employees are committed to their jobs and 62.0% evaluate the general atmosphere in the workplace positively indicates a moderate-to-high level of organizational commitment and is consistent with research emphasizing that employees' affective commitment is positively related to organizational success (Boukari et al., 2025; Warsi, Fatima & Sahibzada, 2019). The fact that 66.3% of participants receive weekly performance feedback and 92.3% rate their relationship with their managers as very good demonstrates that regular feedback and supportive leadership have a strengthening effect on employee motivation and performance, which is parallel to the findings of Harter, Cesário et al., (2023) demonstrating a positive relationship between employee commitment and productivity. Generally speaking, the demographic characteristics, work experience and communication styles of call center employees have a significant impact on their organizational commitment and performance levels.

According to the research results, low-level, negative, and significant relationships were found between the levels of silent resignation and silent dismissal and organizational commitment and job performance. As silent resignation increases, organizational commitment ( $r = -0.487$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), affective commitment ( $r = -0.268$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and contextual performance ( $r = -0.264$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) decrease. A similar negative relationship was found between silent dismissal and overall job performance ( $r = -0.112$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). In contrast, positive and significant relationships were found between organizational commitment and job performance ( $r = 0.156$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and contextual performance ( $r = 0.189$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), as well

as between affective commitment and these variables ( $r = 0.211$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ;  $r = 0.149$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). These findings indicate that silent resignation and silent dismissal negatively affect employees' commitment to their organizations and their performance. Similarly, in the literature, Deniz (2024) stated that silent resignation leads to employees' psychological detachment from their jobs and a decrease in organizational commitment. Avcı (2023) revealed that silent dismissal negatively affects employee motivation and productivity. In contrast, the positive effect of organizational commitment on performance supports Yao et al.'s (2023) organizational commitment model. This is parallel to Alami et al.'s (2024) findings that employee commitment increases performance. Furthermore, the positive relationship between affective commitment and performance is consistent with research by Sitorus & Rachmawati (2024), who argue that employees who identify with the organization exhibit higher productivity. Generally, these results suggest that employee commitment strengthens job performance, while silent resignation and silent dismissal weaken this relationship.

Research results have shown that the tendency to silent dismissal varies depending on variables such as gender, department, work style, and feedback frequency. The higher rate of silent dismissal among male employees compared to female employees suggests that competitive pressure and performance-oriented expectations in the workplace may lead to greater psychological distancing in men. Similarly, the higher tendency to silent dismissal among customer service department employees suggests that the intense workload, emotional labor requirements, and constant performance pressure seen in these units undermine employee commitment. Furthermore, the increased tendency to silent dismissal among employees who do not receive regular feedback suggests that manager support and performance feedback are important elements that strengthen employees' psychological bond with the organization. These findings are supported by studies in the literature by Katircioğlu, (2024) demonstrating that male employees experience more burnout and withdrawal in the face of work pressure; and Kulkolkarn & Chimpalee, (2023). This is consistent with the findings that silent dismissal increases in sectors with high emotional labor and with the results of Belgasm et al. (2025) emphasizing that regular feedback strengthens organizational commitment and motivation. Generally speaking, silent dismissal behaviors are related to organizational support, communication quality, and management style rather than individual factors.

The findings of the study indicate that job performance levels vary significantly according to gender, educational status, and department. The higher overall job performance scores observed among female employees compared to males suggest that women's empathy, patience, and emotional regulation skills contribute positively to performance in communication-intensive sectors such as call centers. In contrast, the higher contextual and task performance scores of male employees are consistent with studies indicating that men tend to adopt more task-oriented and result-focused work approaches (Bulilan, 2023). In terms of educational level, the superior task performance of employees holding a bachelor's degree aligns with literature highlighting the positive impact of education on cognitive abilities, problem-solving skills, and self-efficacy (Casu et al., 2021). Regarding departmental differences, employees working in customer service and sales departments exhibited higher overall performance compared to those in technical support, whereas technical support staff demonstrated higher task performance, reflecting how distinct job roles shape performance perceptions and expectations (Rezai et al., 2022). Overall, these findings suggest that employee performance is influenced not only by individual competencies but also by the characteristics of the job and the organizational role expectations.

### **Conclusions**

This research examined the effects of the tendency toward silent resignations and dismissals among call center employees on organizational commitment and job performance. The findings showed that increasing levels of silent resignations and dismissals negatively impact employees' organizational commitment and performance. Furthermore, variables such

as gender, educational background, department, and feedback frequency were found to significantly influence these relationships. These results demonstrate that organizational commitment and job performance are closely linked to the support provided to employees, the frequency of communication, and management style.

Based on the research results, managers are advised to maintain regular communication with employees, increase performance feedback, and strengthen emotional support mechanisms. To reduce the tendency toward silent resignations and dismissals, organizations should adopt a participatory management approach and encourage employee involvement in decision-making processes. Furthermore, creating flexible and motivating work environments will be effective in increasing employee commitment and productivity, especially in high-stress industries like call centers.

### **Ethical Declaration**

The authors declare that they have adhered to research and publication ethics in this article, that they have complied with the Personal Data Protection Law and copyright regulations applicable to intellectual and artistic works, and that there are no conflicts of interest.

**Author Contributions:** ZŞ - 50%, SHOV - 25%, YS- 25%.

## REFERENCES

- Ağyüz, N. (2013). *Bankacılık sektöründe çağrı merkezi çalışanlarının tükenmişlik ve örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Ahmad, R., Nawaz, M. R., Ishaq, M. I., Khan, M. M., & Ashraf, H. A. (2023). Social exchange theory: Systematic review and future directions. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 101-121. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1015921>.
- Al Zefeiti, S. M. B., & Mohamad, N. A. (2017). The influence of organizational commitment on Omani public employees' work performance. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(2), 151–160.
- Alami, R., Stachowicz-Stanusch, A., Agarwal, S., & Al Masaeid, T. (2024). Predicting quiet quitting: Machine learning insights into silent resignations in the healthcare industry. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, 3(4), 3444–3462. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i4.3864>.
- Altıntaş, M. (2024). Çalışma yaşamındaki negatif dinamiklerin çalışan davranışlarına etkisi: Sessiz istifanın aracılık rolü. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 10(2), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.31592/aeusbed.1465129>.
- Al-Twal, A., Alawamleh, M., & Jarrar, D. M. (2024). An investigation of the role of Wasta social capital in enhancing employee loyalty and innovation in organizations. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 13(1), 12.
- 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>.
- Anderson, K. (2025). *Examining Agent Satisfaction in Call Center Operations: A Quantitative Correlational Study*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix.
- Andreas, D. (2022). Employee performance: The effect of motivation and job satisfaction. *Produktif: Jurnal Kepegawaian dan Organisasi*, 1(1), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.37481/jko.v1i1.10>.
- Atiku, S. O., Jeremiah, A., & Genty, K. I. (2025). Effects of workplace silence, quiet quitting, and quiet firing on employee turnover: Evidence from the service industry. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(3), 89–93. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-04-2025-5389>.
- Avcı, N. (2023). Örgütsel sinizm, örgütsel sessizlik, işte sözde var olma ve sessiz istifa arasındaki ilişkiler: İstanbul Maltepe Belediyesi örneği. *Vizyoner Dergisi*, 14(39), 968–989. <https://doi.org/10.21076/vizyoner.1217165>.
- Belgasm, H., Alzubi, A., Iyiola, K., & Khadem, A. (2025). Interpersonal conflict and employee behavior in the public sector: Investigating the role of workplace ostracism and supervisors' active empathic listening. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(2), 194. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15020194>.
- Bohórquez, E., Caiche, W., Benavides, V., & Benavides, A. (2021). Motivation and job performance: Human capital as a key factor for organizational success. In *International conference of technological research* (pp. 291–302). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11295-9\\_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11295-9_21).
- Boukari, Z. I., Elseesy, N. A. M., Felemban, O., & Alharazi, R. (2025). Between clicks and care: Investigating social media addiction and work engagement among nurses in Saudi Arabia. *Nursing Reports*, 15(3), 84–96. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nursrep15030084>.
- Bulilan, R. S. (2023). Correlates on job performance, job satisfaction, and demographics of state university employees. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 8(3), 183–191. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.83.30>.
- Casey, C., & Delaney, H. (2022). Keeping it quiet? The micro-politics of employee voice in company strategic decision-making. *Work, Employment and Society*, 36(3), 485-502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170211011340>.

- Casu, G., Mariani, M. G., Chiesa, R., Guglielmi, D., & Gremigni, P. (2021). The role of organizational citizenship behavior and gender between job satisfaction and task performance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(18), 9499. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18189499>.
- Cesário, F., & Chambel, M. J. (2017). Linking organizational commitment and work engagement to employee performance. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 24(2), 152–158. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1542>.
- Cesário, F., Rodrigues, A., Castanheira, F., & Sabino, A. (2023). The role of reaction to feedback in the relationship between performance management, job satisfaction and the leader–member exchange (LMX). *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 18(1), 129–144. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EMJB-04-2021-0054>.
- Chaudhary, S., Nasir, N., Ur Rahman, S., & Masood Sheikh, S. (2023). Impact of work load and stress in call center employees: Evidence from call center employees. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(1), 160–171. <https://doi.org/10.52131/pijhs.2023.1101.0338>.
- Çay, D., & Gürbüz, T. (2025). The relationship between the quality of telework and work-life balance in the post-pandemic era: The moderated mediation of self-determination theory. *Work*, 82(1), 264–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10519815251340981>.
- Çitil, E. (2022). The concept of “psychological contract” in organizational communication process and a literature review on psychological contract. *Hatay Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19(50), 119–140.
- Deery, S., Iverson, R., & Walsh, J. (2022). Work relationships in telephone call centres: Understanding emotional exhaustion and employee withdrawal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(4), 471–496. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00300>.
- Deniz, A. (2024). Sessiz istifanın iş tatminine etkisi: Havacılık sektörü çalışanlarına yönelik bir araştırma. *Sosyal, Beşeri ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(2), 134–152.
- Dillard, N., Cavallo, T., & Zhang, P. (2025). A return to humanism: A multi-level analysis exploring the positive effects of quiet quitting. *Human Resource Development Review*, 24(2), 127–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843241305655>.
- Doellgast, V., & O’Brady, S. (2020). Making call center jobs better: The relationship between management practices and worker stress. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 51(3), 23–66.
- 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>.
- Gabelaia, I., & Bagociunaite, R. (2023). The impact of quiet quitting on overall organizational behavior and culture. In *Proceedings of the international conference on reliability and statistics in transportation and communication* (pp. 366–378). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-53598-7\\_33](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-53598-7_33).
- Galanis, P., Katsiroumpa, A., Vraka, I., Siskou, O., Konstantakopoulou, O., Katsoulas, T., ... & Kaitelidou, D. (2025). The influence of job burnout on quiet quitting among nurses: The mediating effect of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 31(5), e700–757. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijn.70057>.
- Ghlichlee, B., & Bayat, F. (2021). Frontline employees' engagement and business performance: The mediating role of customer-oriented behaviors. *Management Research Review*, 44(2), 290–317. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-11-2019-0482>.
- Goodman, S. A., & Svyantek, D. J. (1999). Person–organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55(2), 254–275. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1682>.

- Grant, A. M., & Shandell, M. S. (2022). Social motivation at work: The organizational psychology of effort for, against, and with others. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 73(1), 301–326. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-060321-033406>.
- Haidar, N. (2021). *Customer Incivility from Frequent Customers in the Context of Service Relationships: Critically Exploring Service Employees' Coping Tactics*, Doctoral dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London.
- Hasyim, H., & Bakri, M. (2025). Work-Life Imbalance: Its Impact on Employee Motivation and Well-Being. *Economics and Digital Business Review*, 6(1), 121-149.
- Karrani, M. A., Bani-Melhem, S., Mohd-Shamsudin, F., Usman, M., & Boğan, E. (2025). Quiet quitting behaviours: investigating trigger factors and mitigation strategies through relational job design, work alienation, and inclusive leadership. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 33(8), 2520-2546. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2024-4748>.
- Katircioğlu, E. (2024). Organisations surrounded by silence: Evaluation of tourism and hospitality literature within employee silence, quiet quitting, and quiet firing. *Journal of Tourismology*, 10(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.26650/jot.2024.10.1.1427634>.
- Keser, A. (2006). Çağrı merkezi çalışanlarında iş yükü düzeyi ile iş doyumu ilişkisinin araştırılması. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (11), 100–119.
- Klotz, A. C., & Bolino, M. C. (2016). Saying goodbye: The nature, causes, and consequences of employee resignation styles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(10), 1384–1415. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000135>.
- Kumar, P., & Padhi, N. (2022). Development and validation of multi-factor employee engagement measuring instrument: a formative measurement model. *Personnel Review*, 51(9), 2261-2276. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2021-0014>.
- Lee, M., & Kim, B. (2023). Effect of employee experience on organizational commitment: Case of South Korea. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(7), 521. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13070521>.
- Mahmood Aziz, H., Othman, B. J., Gardi, B., Ahmed, S. A., Sabir, B. Y., Ismael, N. B., & Anwar, G. (2021). Employee commitment: The relationship between employee commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Humanities and Education Development*, 3(3), 54–66. <https://doi.org/10.22161/jhed.3.3.6>.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the side-bet theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 372–385. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.3.372>.
- Murray, W. C., & Holmes, M. R. (2021). Impacts of employee empowerment and organizational commitment on workforce sustainability. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3163. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063163>.
- Nasir, N. S. M. (2023). Exploring employee preferences and organizational strategies for flexibility adapting work arrangements in the post-COVID-19 era: A concept paper. *Journal of Business Innovation*, 8(1), 113–125.
- Oquendo, S., Bell, R., & Kitenge, E. (2024). Which came first, quiet quitting or quiet firing? The paradox of constructive discharge vs employee disengagement. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 21(2), 23–66. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5069849>.
- Oquendo, S., Bell, R., & Kitenge, E. (2024). Which Came First, Quiet Quitting or Quiet Firing? The Paradox of Constructive Discharge vs Employee Disengagement. *The Paradox of Constructive Discharge vs Employee Disengagement* 1(4), 105-122.
- Othman, A. A., Mahran, H. M., & Ali, H. I. (2025). Covering loyalty policy in quiet firing workplace: The association between quiet quitting, intention to leave, and nurses' loyalty. *BMC Nursing*, 24(1), 662–675. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-03301-8>.

- Pelit, E., Boylu, Y., & Güçer, E. (2007). Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi akademisyenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (1), 86–114.
- Polatçı, S. (2014). The effects of psychological capital on task and contextual performance: A research on police organization. *Ege Academic Review*, 14(1), 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.21121/eab.2014118072>.
- Rezai, A., Namaziandost, E., & Çakmak, F. (2022). Job satisfaction of Iranian EFL teachers: Exploring the role of gender, education level, teaching experience and service location. *Teaching English Language*, 15(2), 201–228. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2022.142825>.
- Sarwar, A., Rahman, S. F., Sharif, S. B. M., & Seng, V. O. K. (2024). Quiet quitting: A millennial perspective on workplace dissatisfaction and retention challenges. In *European Conference on Management, Leadership & Governance* (pp. 503–509). Academic Conferences International Limited. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ecmlg.20.1.3083>.
- Shah, D., & Parekh, M. (2023). Understanding work-life balance: An analysis of quiet quitting and age dynamics using deep learning. *International Research Journal of Engineering Technology*, 1(06), 1230-1235.
- Sitorus, M. G., & Rachmawati, R. (2024). Analysis of the quiet quitting phenomenon with work engagement and job satisfaction as mediators: Study of employees in Indonesia banking industry. *Eduvest – Journal of Universal Studies*, 4(11), 10671–10793. <https://doi.org/10.59188/eduvest.v4i11.44765>.
- Şen, H. T., Yurtsever, D., & Polat, Ş. (2024). Sessiz istifa ve sessiz işten çıkarma ölçeklerinin Türkçede geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması: Hemşireler üzerinde bir araştırma. *Sağlık ve Hemşirelik Yönetimi Dergisi*, 11(2), 344–353. <https://doi.org/10.54304/SHYD.2024.9018>.
- Tuffaha, M. (2020). The determinants of employee's performance: A literature review. *Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 3(3), 14–14. <https://doi.org/10.30560/jems.v3n3p14>.
- Vo, T. T. D., Tuliao, K. V., & Chen, C. W. (2022). Work motivation: The roles of individual needs and social conditions. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(2), 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12020049>.
- Warsi, S., Fatima, N., & Sahibzada, S. A. (2019). Study on relationship between organizational commitment and its determinants among private sector employees of Pakistan. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(3), 399–410.
- Xueyun, Z., Al Mamun, A., Masukujjaman, M., Rahman, M. K., Gao, J., & Yang, Q. (2023). Modelling the significance of organizational conditions on quiet quitting intention among Gen Z workforce in an emerging economy. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 15438. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-42591-3>.
- Yao, J. H., Xiang, X. T., & Shen, L. (2024). The impact of teachers' organizational silence on job performance: A serial mediation effect of psychological empowerment and organizational affective commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 44(2), 355–373. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2031869>.
- Zieba, K. (2023). Great resignation and quiet quitting as post-pandemic dangers to knowledge management. In *European Conference on Knowledge Management* (Vol. 2, pp. 1516–1542). Academic Conferences International Limited. <https://doi.org/10.34190/eckm.24.2.1253>.