"Silent Resistance or Strategic Withdrawal? Rethinking Employee Engagement in the Era of Quiet Quitting"

Ashok Kumar

Assistant Professor, Chandigarh Group of Colleges Jhanjeri, Mohali - 140307, Punjab, India, Department of Commerce, Chandigarh School of Business

Abstract

The new phenomenon of quiet quitting where employees intentionally constrain their work effort to their contractual terms without overpromising has emerged as a critical challenge for modern human resource management. This review paper critically analyzes the conceptual underpinnings of employee engagement and disengagement and examines quiet quitting as a quiet resistance or strategic withdrawal in the post-pandemic workplace. Building on prevalent theories like the Job Demands-Resources model and psychological empowerment, the paper integrates empirical and theoretical research to determine antecedents, manifestations, and organizational outcomes of quiet quitting. The paper further describes how conventional HR practices need to transform to deal with the roots of disengagement, such as burnout, work-life conflict, and changing employee aspirations. Integrating findings from recent studies and case studies, this review provides actionable recommendations to HR practitioners to boost authentic engagement, promote well-being, and minimize turnover risks in an evolving work environment. This synthesis contributes timely and relevant knowledge to employee behavior dynamics understanding and responsive HR policy-making.

Keywords

Quiet quitting, employee engagement, disengagement, job demands-resources model, burnout, human resource management, workplace well-being, post-pandemic workplace

Introduction

Employee engagement has been a traditional cornerstone of organizational performance, defined as the extent to which employees are emotionally attached and committed to their job roles (Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006). Engaged employees are characterized by discretionary effort, creativity, and resilience, leading to increased productivity, improved customer service, and reduced turnover (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). Organizations have long sought the means to activate engagement, such as meaningful work design, feedback, and development opportunities (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). In recent years, however, & especially in the aftermath of the COVID 19 pandemic, there have been new challenges that require employee engagement paradigms to be rethought.

One of these challenges is the emergence of the so-called "quiet quitting" phenomenon. It is a broad concept that describes a condition where employees voluntarily restrict their work engagement to the formal tasks described in their job descriptions, not including additional tasks, overtime, or voluntary commitments beyond formal requirements. Quiet quitting is different from overt quitting or absenteeism in that it is more covert ,a silent form of resistance or strategic disengagement from overwork and excessive demands (Pratiwi, Stanislaus, & Pratiwi, 2023). It is not workers quitting their workplaces, but rather a disengagement of engagement while officially being employed. The phenomenon has been extensively reported by popular media and has been a concern for HR practitioners, managers, and researchers (Pevec, 2023).

Quiet quitting is part of a broader employee well-being, work-life balance, and evolving workforce values context. The pandemic accelerated remote and hybrid work patterns, demolishing professional and personal life boundaries, traditionally resulting in heightened stress, burnout, and job dissatisfaction (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The majority of employees, reassessing work priorities, began resisting the underlying "always-on" work culture by deliberately disengaging from over-engagement. Quiet quitting can therefore be viewed as an antidote to burnout and unrealistic job expectations rather than laziness or disengagement (Drela, 2024).

Theoretically, quiet quitting defies traditional employee engagement models. The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model assumes employee well-being and engagement are consequences of a balance between job demands (stressors) and job resources (support, autonomy, recognition) (Demerouti et al., 2001). When demands surpass resources, workers risk burnout and disengagement. Quiet quitting can perhaps be seen as a threshold response where workers self-regulate to maintain psychological health, withdrawing discretionary effort but continuing core commitments (Crawford, LePine, & Rich, 2010). This means HR strategies need to address and engage underlying causes rather than merely treating symptoms like absenteeism or low productivity.

In addition, quiet quitting also poses issues on organizational culture and leadership. Psychological empowerment and perceived organizational support are key considerations in developing engagement (Saks, 2006). Workers who are made to feel worthless, denied opportunities for growth, or sense injustice might turn to quiet quitting as a subtle form of rebellion (Blau, 1964). Leadership that focuses on transformational support and worker well-being has proven to be effective in preventing disengagement and burnout (Zhu, Chew, & Spangler, 2005). Yet today's leadership methods might need reorientation to the new realities of workforce expectations influenced by social, economic, and technological transformations.

Against this background, HR management is confronted with an ambidextrous dilemma. Classical measures to boost motivation, i.e., incentives or working harder—can be useless or even counterproductive if workers' intrinsic needs for autonomy, appreciation, and equilibrium are not satisfied (Van den Broeck et al., 2008). This requires integrated strategies combining mental health care, flexible working conditions, open communication, and career prospects based on different employees' profiles.

This review article proposes integrating current theoretical and empirical work on employee engagement and quiet quitting and offering a broad picture of the new phenomenon. By a consideration of antecedents, behavioral expressions, and organizational consequences, the article aims to provide input to HR policies that respond to the dynamic nature of the working environment. The review ought to be able to address the following questions: What motivates employees to quiet quit? How does quiet quitting affect organizational performance and organizational culture? What are the effective HR practices to engage employees in the post-pandemic period?

The paper follows the following structure. It starts by discussing key concepts and theories that form the basis of employee engagement, such as psychological states, motivational theories, and the JD-R model. It proceeds to discuss empirical studies on quiet quitting, noting its prevalence, causes, and outcomes. The next section is about implications for leadership and HR strategy, with a focus on practices that can roll back disengagement and foster sustainable engagement. The review concludes with suggestions for future research and practice to tackle the complex issues of employee engagement in modern organizations.

By placing quiet quitting in the context of academic research, this review helps further the knowledge and inform HR practitioners in developing adaptive, employee-oriented strategies. In creating strong,

healthy, and resilient organizations in the post-pandemic era, it is crucial to view quiet quitting as more than a skin-deep phenomenon but as a sign of profound workplace dynamics.

Literature Review
Employee Engagement: Conceptual Foundations and Theoretical Perspectives

Employee involvement has become a critical construct in organizational behavior and human resource administration, referring to the emotional, cognitive, and physical participation employees inject into their job roles. Kahn (1990) initially defined engagement as the mobilization of employees' selves for work roles, highlighting the significance of meaningfulness, safety, and availability. Engaged employees demonstrate vigor, dedication, and absorption, which correspond with increased productivity, creativity, and overall firm performance (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011).

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model of Demerouti et al. (2001) has been the most influential model to date in explaining engagement. According to this model, job demands (e.g., workload, emotional demands, role conflict) are stressors that drain energy, while job resources (e.g., autonomy, social support, feedback) engage employees and encourage engagement. When workers feel an imbalance ,high demands with inadequate resources, they tend to suffer from burnout, and as a result, disengagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The JD-R model has been tested empirically in different sectors and cultures, emphasizing the core role of resource availability in maintaining engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Apart from the JD-R model, psychological theories offer additional understanding. Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) posits that intrinsic motivation and motivation result from fulfilling three fundamental psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Workers who are empowered and sense the meaningfulness of their job are likely to exhibit stronger levels of engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Also, Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) posits that workers respond to organizational support and equitable treatment by showing greater commitment and discretionary effort. Therefore, perceived organizational support is a critical antecedent of engagement (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Empirical evidence firmly attests to the benefits of engagement on multiple outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions (Saks, 2006; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). Leadership is also influential, with transformational leaders creating an environment that boosts engagement through inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation (Zhu, Chew, & Spangler, 2005).

Quiet Quitting: Emergence and Conceptualization

Quiet quitting is a term that has recently come into limelight as a means of referring to employees who deliberately limit their work commitment to their job roles without assuming additional-role responsibilities or applying discretionary effort (Pevec, 2023). As opposed to obvious quitting or absenteeism, quiet quitting is covert and goes unnoticed, thus posing a critical challenge to organizations.

Quiet quitting can be thought of as a type of silent protest or calculated exit. Instead of flatly rejecting their jobs, employees opt out of the extra work that is not explicitly compensated or acknowledged (Pratiwi, Stanislaus, & Pratiwi, 2023). This is typically motivated by the need to safeguard psychological well-being and life-work balance, particularly amidst the heightened expectations of the post-pandemic work environment.

The COVID-19 pandemic has restructured workplaces, hastening the implementation of remote and hybrid work models. Though these shifts provide convenience, they also erase the division between work and personal life, resulting in heightened stress and burnout (Drela, 2024). Staff with over-demanding jobs and insufficient support might quietly quit as a survival strategy. This trend is not the result of laziness or lack of motivation on the part of employees, but a reaction to unfairness perceived, insufficient appreciation, and overwork.

Antecedents and Drivers of Quiet Quitting

There are various antecedents that lead to quiet quitting. Burnout is a key driver that involves emotional exhaustion and depersonalization causing reduced motivation to perform above minimum task levels (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Job dissatisfaction and insecurity are also causes that lead to the withdrawal of discretionary effort by employees (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009).

Psychological contract breach—the perception that the organization has failed to fulfill promised obligations—undermines trust and leads to reduced engagement (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Employees who feel undervalued or unfairly treated are more likely to engage in quiet quitting behaviors as a form of passive resistance.

Leadership style has an impact on the occurrence of quiet quitting. Transformational leadership, which motivates and enables employees, is inversely related to disengagement and burnout (Zhu, Chew, & Spangler, 2005). Transactional or autocratic leadership styles, on the other hand, could be a catalyst for disengagement and quiet quitting behaviors (Skogstad et al., 2015).

Younger generations, such as Millennials and Gen Z, tend to value impactful work, autonomy, and work-life balance over past generations (Sonnentag, 2018). Organizational failure to satisfy these demands can raise the odds of quiet quitting as employees quietly step back from over-engagement.

Discussion and Implications

The growing trend of quiet quitting heralds a decisive change in employee sentiment towards work engagement, especially in the post-pandemic period when work expectation and norms have been drastically transformed. The reviewed literature indicates that quiet quitting is not so much an indicator of individual disengagement but rather a group reaction to unfulfilled psychological needs, demands exceeding resources at work, and perceived violations of the psychological contract. It is critical for organizations to know these conditions in order to ensure employee motivation, productivity, and well-being.

Theoretical Implications

This critique highlights the ongoing applicability of core engagement theories to explaining new workplace behaviors like quiet quitting. The Job Demands-Resources model is especially relevant in that it emphasizes the need to have a balance between job demands and accessible resources. In the current setting, with employees being compelled to deliver high performance under pressure, there is minimal support and therefore emotional exhaustion and burnout, making quiet quitting easy. The worker does not leave the organization, but he or she psychologically disengages, doing precisely what

is strictly necessary.

In the same way, Self-Determination Theory (SDT) offers a strong theory to study sources of employees' disengagement motivation. SDT posits that autonomy, competence, and relatedness are inherent psychological needs. Organizational practices that do not facilitate these needs, through micromanaging, inadequate feedback, or poor interpersonal relationships, will reduce the intrinsic motivation of employees to apply discretionary effort.

The theory of psychological contract violation also applies as a major theory concept. When employees perceive their employer has not been meeting implicit or explicit guarantees, e.g., of career development, equity, or gratitude, they will utilize quiet quitting as a form of passive resistance. Unlike active turnover, this withdrawal is less overt and less visible and reversible to management

Lastly, the changing needs of Millennial and Gen Z workers call for a whole rethinking of conventional notions of engagement. These generations are purpose-driven, flexible, open, and concerned with overall well-being, and new frameworks that address the current socio-cultural values and workplace norms are necessary.

Practical Application to HR Management

Quiet quitting in real life demands a change in organizational culture and HR practice. The old practices of relying on productivity measures only without considering the well-being and motivation of employees cannot handle the reality. HR needs to embrace balanced practices that generate good and sustainable engagement.

Job Design and Work Environment: HR professionals should ensure job redesign to achieve the greatest meaningfulness and autonomy. Providing employees with control of their work and creating clearly defined roles eradicates role ambiguity and overload, two major antecedents of disengagement. Flexible work arrangements like remote and hybrid models should be utilized to the maximum to gain the optimal work-life balance and reduce the likelihood of burnout.

Leadership Development: The literature is firm in asserting that transformative leadership decreases quiet quitting. Inspirational leadership, person-centered leadership, and positive work culture can lead to increased psychological safety and trust, reducing withdrawal from commitment. Leadership development initiatives in emotional intelligence and care behaviors are essential investments to make.

Recognition and Career Development: The workers need to be constantly recognized and developed so that they remain stimulated. HR needs to establish formal feedback systems and transparent career opportunities that respect workers and offer opportunities for development. This is directly related to the need for competence as per SDT, with direct implications on the extent of engagement.

Well-being and Mental Health Initiatives: Organizational culture has to include well-being by incorporating mental health initiatives, stress management, and workloads that are manageable. Early warning signs of burnout have to be responded to early and through supportive interventions to avoid progression to quiet quitting. Wellness programs and employee assistance programs have to be available to have healthy employees.

Monitoring and Measurement: As a passive and often unobserved manifestation of disengagement, HR will have to use strong engagement surveys, pulse checks, and open channels of communication to

identify early warning signs. Data-driven methods allow for early intervention, and intervention is aimed at specific segments of the workforce.

Challenges and Limitations

It is not a simple process to implement countermeasures for quiet quitting. Organizations operate in dense cultures of presenteeism, productivity, and effort visibility at the cost of workers' welfare and psychological commitment. Such reverse thinking can create resistance to change, especially if efforts to establish flexibility, mental health, and autonomy go against performance expectations. Moreover, quiet quitting requires more than standard measures for performance; it requires advanced diagnostic tests with the capacity to identify emotional disengagement, decreased motivation, and shift in employees' attitude that may or may not affect output.

Human Resource professionals are required to skillfully navigate these sophistications by building a culture of trust, psychological safety, and openness. Additionally, the fast-paced evolution of work fueled by digitalization, AI integration, and hybrid work paradigms requires HR policy and engagement models to evolve on a regular basis. As these evolutions emerge, routine research and collaborative investigation are necessary to adequately comprehend and address the phenomenon of quiet quitting in contemporary organizations.

Future Research Directions

Literature review confirms that there are large gaps in the form of a shortage of empirical studies that estimate the prevalence of quiet quitting and analyze long-term impacts on organizational performance and employee well-being. Available studies are mostly anecdotal or short-term findings, and this calls for longitudinal studies that will be in a position to monitor employee engagement patterns over time and compare multiple organizational interventions.

Furthermore, cross-cultural research is essential to address questions of how cultural norms, societal expectations, and local workplace politics shape quiet quitting behaviors. The understanding generated from this research could inform the development of culturally appropriate HR strategies that resonate with various employee groups.

Along with this, the increasing use of virtual tools and working-from-home arrangements also questions the role technology plays in employee engagement. Research in the future must explore the interface between virtual communication, surveillance, autonomy, and psychological disengagement in order to better prepare organizations to handle the new, technology-focused workforce.

HR Recommendations

Quiet quitting phenomenon requires active, holistic responses from Human Resource management to coordinate employees and maintain organizational productivity. Based on the literature reviewed and discussion on theoretical and practical implications, the following are recommendations as a guide for HR practitioners to tackle this challenge in a strategic manner.

1. Increase Job Autonomy and Meaningfulness

One of the fundamental drivers of quiet quitting is the perceived absence of meaningfulness and control in work. Organizations need to focus on job redesign efforts that enhance employees' jobs by amplifying autonomy, task variety, and task significance. Based on Morgeson and Humphrey (2006), jobs that include these components promote intrinsic motivation and disengagement reduction. HR can conduct job analyses to identify roles with high monotony or low decision-making power and

collaborate with line managers to re-engineer tasks. Empowering employees to influence their work processes not only enhances engagement but also encourages innovation and ownership.

2. Implement Flexible Work Policies

The COVID-19 pandemic has catalyzed a transformation in work arrangements. Flexible work arrangements, such as telecommuting, flexible time, compressed workweeks, and blended models, have emerged as crucial in maintaining employees' work-life balance (Drela, 2024). HR must institutionalize these practices to avoid burnout, a critical predecessor to quiet quitting. Providing choices about where and when employees work conveys organizational trust and esteem for personal needs, which resonates with Self-Determination Theory's focus on autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Additionally, flexibility minimizes absenteeism and turnover through the accommodation of varied employee situations.

3. Build Transformational Leadership

Quality leadership significantly affects employee engagement. Transformational leaders motivate and encourage employees by articulating a compelling vision, imparting individual attention, and promoting psychological safety (Zhu, Chew, & Spangler, 2005). HR departments must invest in leadership development programs that build managers' emotional intelligence, communication skills, and disengagement signs identification. By fostering an open atmosphere, leaders are able to resolve problems leading to quiet quitting before they become major. Also, fostering open communication will bring up issues around workload, acknowledgment, and growth.

4. Develop Continuous Recognition and Feedback

Recognition is a strong driver that speaks to employees' competence and appreciation needs. HR should establish systematic recognition programs with frequent, substantial feedback aside from annual performance reviews. This could be through peer recognition systems, ad-hoc bonuses, or nodal recognitions in team meetings. Research suggests that employees who are valued show higher levels of engagement and lower withdrawal behaviors (Saks, 2006). Open feedback systems also enable employees to recognize their strengths and areas of improvement, giving them a sense of purpose.

5. Prioritize Mental Health and Well-being

Stress and burnout are top drivers of quiet quitting. Organizations need to integrate mental health and well-being programs into their culture, such as employee assistance programs, counseling services, stress management workshops, and wellness activities (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). HR needs to create a psychologically safe space where employees can talk about mental health without fear of stigma. In addition, chronic overload prevention via workload assessments and equitable task assignments can mitigate disengagement risk.

6. Use Engagement Analytics and Early Warning Systems

Since quiet quitting is so subtle, HR needs to embrace data-driven strategies to pick up on early warning signs of disengagement. Routine engagement surveys, pulse polls, and sentiment analysis through digital channels can yield actionable insights about employee morale and perceived workload (Saks & Gruman, 2014). Merging qualitative feedback channels allows employees to express concerns anonymously while promoting trust and transparency. Advanced analytics enable the segmentation of data by demographics, departments, or roles to personalize interventions effectively.

7. Design Clear Career Growth and Progress Opportunities

Career stagnation erodes motivation and can lead to quiet quitting. HR must enable career development avenues through the provision of upskilling courses, mentorship, and clear promotion standards. Offering learning opportunities affirms employees' intrinsic need for development and competence satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Further, tailored personal development plans that communicate employees' goals increase engagement and retention through investment in their future.

Conclusion

Quiet quitting is a subtle but compelling signal of transforming worker attitudes and underlying organizational issues in the modern changing workplace. As the old conventional views of work continue to erode, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic, workers increasingly seek environments that provide autonomy, sense-driven jobs, and high levels of overall well-being. This development marks not avoidance of accountability but a heightened expectation of workplaces reflecting changing personal values and life aspirations.

This critique emphasizes that quiet quitting must not be interpreted as laziness, disinterest, or low motivation. Instead, it is a complex behavioral response to unfilled psychological needs, over- or inappropriately excessive workload requests, and perceived violations of the psychological contract between the employee and employer. Theoretical frameworks such as the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model and Self-Determination Theory (SDT) offer plausible explanations, for instance, how disengagement occurs when intrinsic autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs are neglected or overpowered by demands that outstrip available resources.

From an employee management viewpoint, quiet quitting can be effectively resolved through a strategic reorientation of traditional, production-oriented models towards fully integrated, employee-centered models. This entails reframing work to improve engagement, embracing flexible and inclusive styles of work, building transformational leadership, and establishing a culture of psychological safety, gratitude, and mental wellness. Additionally, the leveraging of data analytics in HR functions can make possible early prevention of disengagement actions, followed by proactive and specific interventions that facilitate re-engagement and retention.

Lastly, and most positively, those companies that recognize quiet quitting as a call to reflect and transform can leverage this crisis as a catalyst to build more resilient, more agile, more passionate, and more empathetic workforces. By embedding a culture of employee voice, which frames individual and organizational purpose and invests in people-first behaviors, companies can motivate performance and well-being.

In the coming years, researchers should examine quiet quitting with longitudinal studies, cross-country research, and work technology. These studies will have more sophisticated theoretical and practical relevance that will allow researchers and practitioners to better grasp, predict, and react to the complexity of employee disengagement in the post-pandemic world.

References

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

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

3. Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. Personnel Psychology, 64(1), 89–136. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x

4. Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(5), 834–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364

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

6. Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. Journal of Social Issues, 30(1), 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x

7. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(2), 268–279. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268

8. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692–724. https://doi.org/10.5465/256287

9. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1(1), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x

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

11. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1(1), 61–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

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

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

14. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25(3), 293–315. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248

15. Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. Human Resource Development Review, 9(1),

89–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484309353560

16. Sonnentag, S. (2018). The psychology of working life: Theories and applications. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5, 191–213. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104533

17. Tummers, L., Groeneveld, S., & Lankhaar, M. (2015). Why do managers use performance information? Administration & Society, 47(9), 1067–1096. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399714544391

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

19. Wang, Y., & Hsieh, H. H. (2013). The mediating effect of employee engagement between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34, 19–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.02.003

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

21. Zhang, Y., LePine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., & Wei, F. (2014). It's not fair… or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor–job performance relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 57(3), 675–697. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0966

22. Zhu, Y., Chew, I. K. H., & Spangler, W. D. (2005). CEO transformational leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of human–capital-enhancing human resource management. The Leadership Quarterly, 16(1), 39–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.06.001

23. Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25(2), 155–182. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21187

24. Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. Human Relations, 45(4), 321–349. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679204500402

25. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. Journal of School Psychology, 43(6), 495–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001