DIJEMSS: Dinasti International Journal of Education Management and Social Science
E-ISSN: 2686-6331
P-ISSN: 2686-6358
https://dinastipub.org/DIJEMSS dinasti.info@gmail.com +62 811 7404 455
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v6i6


# From Global to Local: Comparative Validation of Quiet Quitting Scales in the Indonesian Workforce

**Anggun Sejati[1], Lussy Dwiutami Wahyuni[2], and Gumgum Gumelar Fajar Rakhman[3]**
[1]Department of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia, anggun.sejati@mhs.unj.ac.id
[2]Department of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia, lussysf@unj.ac.id
[3]Department of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia, ggumelar@unj.ac.id

Corresponding Author: anggun.sejati@mhs.unj.ac.id[1]

**Abstract:** Quiet quitting has become increasingly common in today's work environment and raises serious concerns about declining engagement, reducing productivity, and weakening organizational resilience. In response to this emerging challenge, their validity and cultural applicability outside of their original contexts remain underexamined. This study aimed to evaluate and compare the psychometric properties of three widely cited instruments developed by Karrani et al. (2024), Anand et al. (2023), and Galanis et al. (2023) to determine their conceptual and cultural relevance within the Indonesian workforce. Data were collected from 279 employees across diverse industries in Indonesia. Using both EFA and CFA, alongside internal consistency assessments (Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω), the study found that all three instruments demonstrated acceptable to excellent model fit and high reliability ($\alpha > 0.87$). These findings suggest that, within the Indonesian context, quiet quitting is more prominently expressed through observable behaviors rather than internal psychological states. Among the three instruments, the scale developed by Karrani et al. showed the most robust psychometric performance. The study underscores the importance of culturally grounded validation and encourages future research to examine the predictive utility of these instruments in relation to organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, commitment, and employee well-being.

**Keyword:** Quiet Quitting, QQ, QQS, CFA, EFA.

## INTRODUCTION

Maintaining employee performance remains a critical challenge for organizations aiming for long-term sustainability. In recent years, the emergence of quiet quitting has become a growing concern in the field of organizational behavior, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic (Xueyun et al., 2023; Atalay & Dağıstan, 2023; Galanis et al., 2023). Quiet quitting refers to a form of psychological disengagement in which employees intentionally limit their efforts to only meeting the basic requirements of their job (Xueyun et al., 2023; Atalay & Dağıstan, 2023). They choose not to contribute beyond what is explicitly expected, such as avoiding extra responsibilities or voluntary initiatives. This trend is often associated with factors such as burnout, dissatisfaction with organizational practices, and a perceived lack of support from employers (Zuzelo, 2023; Galanis et al., 2024). These issues have become

increasingly common in today's work environment and raise serious concerns about declining engagement, reduced productivity, and weakened organizational resilience (Schmidt & Baráth, 2023).

Further conceptualizations define quiet quitting as a gradual process of psychological withdrawal, where employees lose interest and emotional investment in their work roles (Atalay & Dağıstan, 2023). According to Serenko (2023), quiet quitting involves limiting one's productivity strictly to the duties outlined in the formal job description, without exceeding those responsibilities. Employees who engage in quiet quitting typically exhibit dissatisfaction with their work but refrain from formally resigning. Specifically, this behavior entails adhering only to core job tasks, avoiding discretionary or extra-role responsibilities, and prioritizing personal well-being (Zieba, 2023). This phenomenon contrasts with traditional resignation, as quiet quitters remain within the organization but demonstrate suboptimal performance. Such behavior is often driven by feelings of underappreciation and diminished motivation to contribute beyond the bare minimum (Serenko, 2023; Boy & Sürmeli, 2023). Consequently, quiet quitting presents a significant challenge for organizations in managing employees' performance.

According to Shaji (2024), the slow recovery of the labor market following the pandemic has resulted in employees choosing quiet quitting instead of formally resigning from their jobs. Amid economic uncertainty, maintaining one's position with minimal engagement is perceived as a safer strategy, as resigning may introduce further stress due to the risks associated with finding new employment (George, 2024). Quiet quitting, in this context, serves as an adaptive strategy that allows employees to avoid potential consequences such as interpersonal conflict or the stigma often linked with formal resignation (George, 2024). Similarly, Klotz and Bolino (2022), in their article for the Harvard Business Review, argue that quiet quitting represents a way for employees to manage their dissatisfaction without incurring the high risks tied to leaving their jobs. It enables them to maintain income and stability while reducing involvement in unsatisfying work (Klotz & Bolino, 2022). Through quiet quitting, employees aim to concentrate on essential tasks while protecting themselves from burnout and stress stemming from a perceived lack of organizational responsiveness to their needs (Joaquim et al., 2023; Klotz & Bolino, 2022).

While the concept of quiet quitting is not entirely new, it reflects a complex phenomenon that overlaps with constructs like organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), extra-role performance, low work engagement, and work-to-rule behavior (Yikilmaz, 2022). To explain the dynamics behind this phenomenon, scholars have drawn on several theoretical frameworks, with Social Exchange Theory (SET) being one of the most widely used (Arar et al., 2023; Atalay & Dağıstan, 2023; Lu et al., 2023). Social Exchange Theory posits that individuals engage in social and professional relationships with the aim of maximizing benefits while minimizing costs. In the workplace context, when employees perceive an imbalance between their contributions and the rewards or recognition they receive, they may respond by withdrawing discretionary effort.

This withdrawal of effort is not merely a reaction to organizational factors but also reflects broader societal and psychological shifts that have emerged in recent years. The pandemic, for example, has triggered a significant career shock, prompting individuals to reconsider their professional paths and redefine the role of work in their lives (Serenko, 2023). The widespread rejection of "hustle culture," a mentality that equates self-worth with productivity, has led many employees to prioritize personal fulfillment and work-life balance over career advancement (Kang et al., 2023). Consequently, employees are increasingly unwilling to sacrifice their personal lives for professional obligations (Karrani et al., 2024; Tsemach & Barth, 2023).

Alarmingly, data from the United States suggests that nearly half of the employees now identify as quiet quitters, indicating a serious decline in employee morale and organizational commitment (Zuzelo, 2023). Empirical studies further reveal that quiet quitting is closely linked

to job dissatisfaction and burnout. For example, Galanis et al. (2023) found that approximately 80% of self-identified quiet quitters report experiencing high levels of burnout, often resulting from prolonged stress and a lack of recognition. Moreover, toxic workplace cultures where performance goes unmeasured and unrewarded exacerbate disengagement, leading to declining individual well-being, reduced team morale, and impaired organizational productivity (Atalay & Dağıstan, 2023).

In Indonesia, quiet quitting presents a serious challenge to employees' resilience. This phenomenon exacerbates issues related to employee engagement, reduces productivity, and undermines overall organizational effectiveness (Sitorus & Rachmawati, 2024). When employee engagement and commitment decline, work performance tends to deteriorate as well, making it difficult for organizations to retain high-quality talent (Gustiawan et al., 2022). This situation is particularly concerning within the context of Indonesian workplace culture, which is characterized by high power distance and strong hierarchical relationships (Pratiwi et al., 2023). In such environments, employees are often reluctant to voice dissatisfaction or request support, allowing quiet quitting to occur silently without addressing the root causes of disengagement (Gustiawan et al., 2022).

The increasing scholarly and public attention to the phenomenon of quiet quitting has underscored the need for the development of valid and reliable measurement instruments. Between 2022 and 2024, at least three studies were identified that sought to construct and validate measurement scales specifically designed to assess quiet quitting in alignment with established conceptual frameworks. For example, the first reference developed a scale of quiet quitting through a rigorous process that involved generating behavioral items reflective of quiet quitting behaviors such as not doing anything beyond what is expected, not volunteering for additional responsibilities, and avoiding taking initiative or leadership roles (Karrani et al., 2024). In contrast, the second reference developed a scale of quiet quitting based on the theoretical concept, which includes dimensions such as detachment, lack of motivation, and lack of initiative (Galanis et al., 2023). Similar to the first reference, the third reference measured quiet quitting using a scale that assessed individual-level work disengagement, low organizational commitment, and the lack of going above and beyond in work (Anand et al., 2023). While these instruments have demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties and cultural fit in India, Greece, and the United Arab Emirates contexts, their relevance and validity for use within the Indonesian employees remain untested. This presents a critical gap, as cultural values, workplace norms, and hierarchical dynamics in Indonesia may influence how quiet quitting is expressed and experienced.

The purpose of this study is to compare three quiet quitting measurement scales in the Indonesian context. Specifically, this study will:

1. Examine the validity and reliability of the three quiet quitting measurement scales in the Indonesian context.
2. Identify the most suitable scale for measuring quiet quitting in Indonesia.

## METHOD

### Participants

Participants were selected using purposive sampling, a method that not only streamlines the selection process but also enhances the validity of the collected data by targeting individuals whose characteristics are directly relevant to the research objectives (Campbell et al., 2020). In this study, the selection criteria referred to the original validation studies of the three quiet quitting measurement instruments, which primarily involved individuals in their early to middle stages of career development (Anand et al., 2023). A total of 279 respondents participated in the study, drawn from diverse sectors of the Indonesian employees, including insurance, distribution, information technology (IT), consulting services, construction, manufacturing, education, retail, educational technology (edutech), and financial technology (fintech).

Participants were grouped into four age categories: 18–25 years (n = 101), >25–30 years (n = 90), >30–35 years (n = 72), and >35–40 years (n = 16), aligning with the early to mid-career range emphasized in the original instruments. The majority of respondents (69%) were aged between 18 and 30 years. Across all age groups, female respondents were more prevalent than male respondents, particularly in the 18–25 age group (n = 91 out of 101). This sample composition supports the alignment between the study's context and the populations targeted in prior validation research, thereby enhancing the relevance and applicability of the psychometric analysis conducted.

**Data Collection**

The data were collected between December 2024 and March 2025 through an online survey platform. All participants completed the questionnaire voluntarily and were informed about the nature and purpose of the study before participation. Respondents were required to provide informed consent prior to beginning the survey.

**Instruments**

Quiet Quitting Scale (QQS), developed by Karrani et al. (2024), comprises 10 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"). The original validation was conducted in the Middle East, specifically among employees in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), with participants drawn from a variety of industries including government, education, healthcare, and banking. The samples primarily consisted of early- to mid-career professionals. This scale is unidimensional, focusing on general quiet quitting behaviors, and has demonstrated good reliability with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding 0.70 across three independent samples. Validity was supported through content review, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and correlations with related constructs such as disengagement and job dissatisfaction.

Quiet Quitting Intention, created by Anand et al. (2023), includes 14 items across two dimensions: Quiet Quitting (QQ) and Quiet Firing (QF). These items were also rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Items were developed through qualitative interviews and literature review, followed by expert judgment. The original study collected data from Indian professionals across sectors such as information technology, consulting, finance, and academia. Statistical analyses confirmed a two-factor structure, with both subscales exhibiting excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha > 0.90). The scale demonstrated strong convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity, making it a robust measure for capturing both employee and employer-driven disengagement.

The third scale, introduced by Galanis et al. (2023), also called Quiet Quitting Scale (QQS), consists of 9 items grouped into three dimensions: detachment, lack of initiative, and lack of motivation. Items were measured using a mix of frequency-based and agreement-based 5-point Likert scales. The original validation was conducted in Greece, with a sample of 461 healthcare workers, including nurses and administrative staff from public hospitals. Following item analysis and expert review, the scale structure was validated using EFA and CFA. The scale showed satisfactory internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.803; McDonald's omega = 0.806) and concurrent validity through significant correlations with established measures such as the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI), the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), and turnover intention.

**Procedures**

Linguistic and conceptual equivalence was ensured through a rigorous multi-stage translation process (Chidlow et al., 2014). Multi-phase translation procedure grounded in established cross-cultural adaptation guidelines (Chidlow et al., 2014). Initially, each instrument was translated independently into Bahasa Indonesia by two certified bilingual

translators. These two forward translations were then synthesized by the primary researcher into a reconciled version, aiming to consolidate a draft that preserved both the conceptual integrity and natural language flow. Following synthesis, the reconciled version was subjected to expert judgment. This process involved two independent reviewers: one holding an MSc in Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and the other a PhD in Human Resource Management. Both experts evaluated the translated items in terms of semantic clarity, cultural relevance, and content validity, ensuring that each item was contextually appropriate and conceptually consistent with the original constructs. To further establish the equivalence of meaning across languages, a back-translation was performed by an independent certified translator who had no prior exposure to the original instrument. The purpose of this step was to verify that the psychological meaning and intended interpretation of each item remained intact following the translation and adaptation process.

**Data Analysis**

In the current study, data were analyzed using JASP software version 19.3 to evaluate the construct validity and internal reliability of each instrument. Construct validity was examined through a two-stage process involving Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). EFA was conducted to identify the underlying factor structures of each scale. This process included the assessment of eigenvalues, interpretation of scree plots, and application of varimax factor rotation to determine the optimal number of factors and the loading of each item. Model fit was evaluated using several goodness-of-fit indices, including the Chi-square/df ratio, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI). Acceptable model fit thresholds followed established guidelines in psychometric literature (Hut et al., 2022). The internal consistency reliability of each instrument was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. Values above 0.70 were considered acceptable, values above 0.80 were deemed good, and values exceeding 0.90 were regarded as excellent (Hut et al., 2022). The findings demonstrated Cronbach's Alpha values above 0.90, indicating excellent internal reliability and suggesting that the items within each scale were highly consistent in measuring the construct of quiet quitting.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section contains data (in brief form), data analysis, and interpretation of the results. Results can be presented in tables or graphs to clarify the results verbally because sometimes the display of an illustration is more complete and informative than the display in narrative form.

The appropriateness of each dataset for factor analysis was assessed using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. The KMO statistic, which ranges from 0 to 1, assesses the extent to which items in a dataset share common variance. Values above 0.90 are considered "excellent," while those between 0.80 and 0.89 are categorized as "meritorious" (Kaiser, 1974). All three quiet quitting instruments yielded high KMO values, supporting the suitability of the datasets for factor analysis.

The Karrani QQS demonstrated an excellent level of sampling adequacy, with an overall KMO value of 0.938. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was highly significant, $\chi^2(45) = 1406.41$, $p < .001$, confirming the factorability of the correlation matrix. For the Anand QQ, the overall KMO was 0.895, also indicating meritorious sampling adequacy. The Bartlett's Test was significant, $\chi^2(21) = 789.49$, $p < .001$. Similarly, the Galanis QQS exhibited an excellent KMO of 0.931, with Bartlett's Test of Sphericity yielding $\chi^2(36) = 1204.81$, $p < .001$. These results provide strong justification for proceeding with exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses for all instruments.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to evaluate the factorial structure of the instruments. Table 1 summarizes the CFA results for the three quiet quitting measurement

instruments: Karrani, 2024; Anand, 2023; and Galanis, 2023. The results demonstrate that each instrument achieved acceptable to excellent model fit indices, though notable differences exist in terms of fit strength and level of model complexity.

Table 1. CFA fit measures and alternative model comparisons

| Models | Chi-Square ($\chi^2$) | df | p-value | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR | ω | α |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Karrani, 2024 | 81.137 | 35 | < .001 | 0.967 | 0.957 | 0.069 | 0.035 | 0.913 | 0.911 |
| Anand, 2023 | 31.872 | 14 | 0.004 | 0.977 | 0.966 | 0.068 | 0.031 | 0.873 | 0.870 |
| Galanis, 2023 | 41.642 | 17 | < .001 | 0.975 | 0.959 | 0.072 | 0.034 | 0.903 | 0.902 |

df = degree of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual, ω = Omega; α = Alpha

**Validity and Reliability**

QQS by Karrani et al. (2024)

The CFA model for the Karrani Quiet Quitting Scale (QQS) demonstrated a very good fit, supporting the unidimensional structure of the instrument in the Indonesian context. The Chi-square test was significant, $\chi^2(35) = 81.137$, $p < .001$, which may suggest some misfit; however, this is common in large models and better interpreted alongside other indices. The RMSEA was 0.069 (90% CI = 0.049–0.088) with a p-close of 0.057, indicating an acceptable level of approximation error. Fit indices such as CFI (0.967) and TLI (0.957) exceeded the conventional cutoff of 0.95, while SRMR was low at 0.035, indicating minimal residuals. These results affirm the scale's structural validity, largely aligning with Karrani et al.'s (2024) original findings in their final sample (n = 157), which reported $\chi^2/df = 1.535$, RMSEA = 0.072, IFI = 0.961, TLI = 0.956, and CFI = 0.961. Internal consistency in the present study was also strong, with omega (ω) = 0.913 and Cronbach's alpha (α) = 0.911, corroborating the original reliability (α = 0.952; CR = 0.952).

Quiet Quitting Intention by Anand et al. (2023)

The CFA model for the Anand Quiet Quitting (QQ) instrument yielded an acceptable model fit in the Indonesian sample. The Chi-square test was significant, $\chi^2(14) = 31.872$, $p = 0.004$, indicating some discrepancy between the model and the data. However, RMSEA was 0.068 (90% CI = 0.036–0.099) with a p-close of 0.158, suggesting an acceptable error of approximation. The CFI (0.977) and TLI (0.966) exceeded the 0.95 threshold, and SRMR was low at 0.031, supporting model adequacy. These indicators confirm that the model is well-specified. Also, the internal consistency was similarly high (ω = 0.873; α = 0.870), supporting the scale's psychometric robustness. While the chi-square value is significant, the overall goodness-of-fit indices confirm that the Anand scale performs well in the Indonesian context. The results align with the initial validation by Anand et al. (2023), where the Quiet Quitting scale (without quiet firing items) demonstrated validity using a sample of 264 Indian professionals, achieving a Cronbach's alpha (α) of 0.829.

QQS by Galanis et al. (2023)

The Galanis Quiet Quitting Scale (QQS) demonstrated excellent factorial validity in the Indonesian context. The Chi-square test yielded a significant result, $\chi^2(17) = 41.642$, $p < .001$, indicating acceptable model fit considering the model complexity and sample size. This was supported by an RMSEA of 0.072 (90% CI = 0.045–0.100) with a non-significant p-close value

of 0.088, suggesting no substantial misfit. Other key fit indices were within recommended thresholds: CFI = 0.975, TLI = 0.959, and SRMR = 0.034. These results support the robustness of the three-factor structure, detachment, lack of initiative, and lack of motivation, as originally conceptualized by Galanis et al. (2023). Their initial validation, conducted on a sample of 461 Greek healthcare workers, yielded comparable results, including $\chi^2/df = 3.184$, RMSEA = 0.069, CFI = 0.957, GFI = 0.964, and NFI = 0.939, with standardized loadings ranging from 0.478 to 0.878. The current study also demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with $\omega = 0.903$ and $\alpha = 0.902$.. These findings suggest that the Galanis QQS is not only valid and reliable but also culturally adaptable.

**Factor Loadings**

QQS by Karrani et al. (2024)

Table 2. Factor Loadings Comparison QQS by Karrani et al. (2024)

| Item | Original Factor Loadings | Current Factor Loadings |
|---|---|---|
| Item 1 | 0.881 | 0.686 |
| Item 2 | 0.870 | 0.777 |
| Item 3 | 0.890 | 0.734 |
| Item 4 | 0.851 | 0.731 |
| Item 5 | 0.863 | 0.809 |
| Item 6 | 0.885 | 0.749 |
| Item 7 | 0.893 | 0.664 |
| Item 8 | 0.885 | 0.664 |
| Item 9 | 0.883 | 0.636 |
| Item 10 | 0.836 | 0.699 |

The comparison between the original and current study shows that while all items in the Karrani QQS retained acceptable loadings, each above 0.60, there were observable differences in the distribution and magnitude of item contributions. In the original study, conducted in a Middle Eastern context, item loadings were consistently high, ranging from 0.836 to 0.893, with particular strength observed in items reflecting refusal to engage in voluntary tasks, avoidant communication, and withdrawal from workplace initiatives.

The current study in the Indonesian context revealed a broader distribution of factor loadings, ranging from 0.636 to 0.809. The highest loading was observed for item 3 ($\lambda = 0.809$), which reflects avoidance of additional responsibilities beyond formal role expectations. In the original study, this item also demonstrated a high loading ($\lambda = 0.890$), indicating consistent importance across cultural contexts. Closely following in the current study was item 1 ($\lambda = 0.777$), which refers to adherence to required duties without extending discretionary effort. Its original loading was similarly strong at 0.881. Although both items exhibited slightly lower values in the Indonesian context, they remained the most prominent indicators of the quiet

quitting construct. These findings suggest that quiet quitting among Indonesian employees is primarily expressed through intentional limitation of work effort and role involvement, emphasizing behavioral withdrawal from non-obligatory contributions as a core dimension of quiet quitting.

In contrast, item 10 (λ = 0.636), item 8 (λ = 0.664), and item 7 (λ = 0.664) showed comparatively lower loadings in the current study. These items represent minimum workplace communication and non-participation in voluntary work activities. By comparison, the original study reported substantially higher loadings for these same items: 0.836 for item 10, 0.885 for item 8, and 0.893 for item 7. The lower values observed in the Indonesian context may indicate that these aspects are perceived as less central to quiet quitting within this cultural setting. This may reflect normative workplace behavior shaped by hierarchical or collective norms.

Quiet Quitting Intention by Anand et al. (2023)

Table 3. Factor Loadings Comparison Quiet Quitting Intention by Anand et al. (2023)

| **Item** | **Original Factor Loadings** | **Current Factor Loadings** |
|---|---|---|
| Item 1 | 0.500 | 0.745 |
| Item 2 | 0.634 | 0.796 |
| Item 3 | 0.753 | 0.654 |
| Item 4 | 0.829 | 0.700 |
| Item 5 | 0.669 | 0.709 |
| Item 6 | 0.858 | 0.555 |
| Item 7 | 0.810 | 0.730 |

The comparison between the original and current study shows that while all items in the Anand QQ scale retained acceptable factor loadings, all exceeding 0.55, the distribution and magnitude of the loadings differed between contexts. In the original study, item loadings ranged from 0.500 to 0.858, with robust contributions from items related to emotional disengagement, lack of intrinsic motivation, and perceived absence of meaning in work. Notably, the highest loadings were observed for items capturing diminished passion (λ = 0.858), lack of perceived employer care (λ = 0.810), and reduced sense of meaning (λ = 0.829), suggesting a construct centered on affective withdrawal.

In the Indonesian context, factor loadings ranged from 0.555 to 0.796, indicating a somewhat narrower and slightly lower distribution overall. The highest loading was found for the item reflecting a tendency to do the bare minimum to avoid termination (λ = 0.796), followed by avoidance of additional work without extra pay (λ = 0.745). These results suggest a shift in the central indicators of quiet quitting, with behavioral and transactional aspects such as effort minimization and strict exchange norms emerging as more salient than emotional disengagement. Meanwhile, items that originally demonstrated the strongest loadings, particularly those related to passion (λ = 0.555 in the current study compared to 0.858 in the original study) and perceived organizational care (λ = 0.730 in the current study compared to 0.810 in the original study), exhibited notable decreases. This change may reflect cultural differences in the interpretation of emotional investment at work. In the Indonesian sample, quiet quitting appears more strongly associated with visible behavioral restraint rather than internal affective states, possibly influenced by socio-cultural norms. QQS by Galanis et al. (2023)

**Table 2. Factor Loadings Comparison QQS by Galanis et al. (2023)**

| Item | Original Loading | Current Loading | Assigned Factor in Current Study |
|---|---|---|---|
| Item 1 | 0.852 | 0.640 | Factor 3 |
| Item 2 | 0.811 | 0.669 | Factor 3 |
| Item 3 | 0.651 | 0.794 | Factor 1 |
| Item 4 | 0.695 | *excluded* | *excluded* |
| Item 5 | 0.780 | 0.717 | Factor 2 |
| Item 6 | 0.834 | 0.627 | Factor 2 |
| Item 7 | 0.741 | 0.811 | Factor 1 |
| Item 8 | 0.679 | 0.746 | Factor 2 |
| Item 9 | 0.731 | 0.732 | Factor 1 |

The comparison between the original and current study shows that while all retained items in the Galanis scale demonstrated acceptable loadings (each above 0.60), there were meaningful differences in how strongly each item contributed to the underlying constructs. In the original study, conducted in a Greek healthcare context, loadings ranged from 0.651 to 0.852, with the highest values assigned to items reflecting motivational engagement at work. Notably, item 1 ($\lambda = 0.852$) and item 2 ($\lambda = 0.811$), which addressed the presence of motivation and inspiration, loaded most strongly onto the third factor, interpreted as "lack of motivation." These items captured affective disengagement and internal detachment from work meaning.

In contrast, the current study in the Indonesian context revealed a modest redistribution of loading strengths, ranging from 0.627 to 0.811. The highest loading was observed for item 7 ($\lambda = 0.811$), an indicator of behavioral withdrawal through excessive breaks, followed closely by item 3 ($\lambda = 0.794$) and item 9 ($\lambda = 0.732$), both reflecting task disengagement through minimum work effort and task avoidance. These items clustered under the first factor, reflecting behavioral detachment. Meanwhile, item 4 was excluded from the final model due to its low contribution. The items related to initiative suppression and passivity in idea-sharing (items 5, 6, and 8) consistently loaded onto a second factor, capturing lack of initiative. In contrast to the original structure, the affective disengagement items (items 1 and 2) were retained but exhibited slightly lower loadings ($\lambda = 0.640$ and $\lambda = 0.669$, respectively), now forming the third factor. These shifts suggest that while motivational detachment remains part of the quiet quitting construct, Indonesian employees may more readily express disengagement through visible behaviors rather than internal affective states. Cultural differences in how passive behavior or assertiveness is perceived may explain why motivational items became relatively less dominant, while behavioral restraint emerged as the most prominent dimension of quiet quitting in this context.

## CONCLUSION

This study investigated the psychometric properties of three established quiet quitting measurement scales within the Indonesian context. The findings revealed notable variations in the performance of these scales compared to their original validations. All three instruments

demonstrated satisfactory validity, reliability, and factor structure based on confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), with internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω) exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70.

A cross-scale comparison of item factor loadings revealed cultural nuances in how quiet quitting is expressed. Items across the three instruments that consistently exhibited high factor loadings in the Indonesian context were those that reflected behavioral withdrawal, such as limiting effort to formal duties (Karrani item 3, $\lambda = 0.809$), avoiding additional work unless compensated (Anand item 2, $\lambda = 0.796$), and taking extended breaks or reducing task engagement (Galanis item 7, $\lambda = 0.811$). These results suggest that Indonesian employees tend to express quiet quitting more through visible behavioral restraint than through internal affective disengagement, a pattern distinct from the affect-laden dimensions emphasized in the original validations. Overall, the findings affirm the cultural adaptability of all three instruments but also indicate that behavioral expressions of disengagement are more diagnostically salient within the Indonesian setting.

**Limitations**

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. First, the sample was limited to early- and mid-career professionals, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings to older or more senior employees whose patterns of disengagement might differ due to varying career motivations and organizational roles. Second, while purposive sampling improved contextual relevance by targeting appropriate participants, it may have introduced selection bias, thereby limiting the external validity of the results. Third, the use of self-report questionnaires is inherently vulnerable to social desirability bias, especially in high-context cultures like Indonesia, where indirect communication and impression management are prevalent. Additionally, the study focused solely on psychometric evaluation and did not assess the predictive validity of the instruments in relation to key organizational outcomes such as turnover intention, job performance, or absenteeism. Future research is encouraged to explore the relationship between quiet quitting and other constructs, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employee well-being, to identify potential antecedents and outcomes. Such investigations could inform the development of evidence-based interventions aimed at reducing disengagement and fostering a more committed and high performance workforce.

## REFERENCE

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

Arar, T., Çetiner, N., & Yurdakul, G. (2023). Quiet Quitting: Building a Comprehensive Theoretical Framework. *Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi (AKAD)*, *15*(28), 122–138. https://doi.org/10.20990/kilisiibfakademik.1245216

Atalay, M., & Dağıstan, U. (2023). Quiet quitting: a new wine in an old bottle? In *Personnel Review*. Emerald Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2023-0122

Aydin, E. (2022). *A new term for an existing concept: quiet quitting a self-determination perspective*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366530514

Boy, Y., & Sürmeli, M. (2023). Quiet quitting: A significant risk for global healthcare. *Journal of Global Health*, *13*, 03014. https://doi.org/10.7189/jogh.13.03014

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., … & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: complex or simple? research case examples. Journal of Research in Nursing, 25(8), 652-661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Chidlow, A., Plakoyiannaki, E. & Welch, C. (2014). Translation in cross-language international business research: Beyond equivalence. J Int Bus Stud 45, 562–582. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2013.67

Galanis, P., Moisoglou, I., Katsiroumpa, A., Vraka, I., Σίσκου, Ό., Konstantakopoulou, O., … & Καϊτελίδου, Δ. (2024). Moral resilience reduces levels of quiet quitting, job burnout, and turnover intention among nurses: evidence in the post covid-19 era. Nursing Reports, 14(1), 254-266. https://doi.org/10.3390/nursrep14010020

Galanis, P., Katsiroumpa, A., Vraka, I., Siskou, O., Konstantakopoulou, O., Moisoglou, I., Gallos, P., & Kaitelidou, D. (2023). The quiet quitting scale: Development and initial validation. *AIMS Public Health*, *10*(4), 828–848. https://doi.org/10.3934/publichealth.2023055

Hamouche, S., Koritos, C., & Papastathopoulos, A. (2023). Quiet quitting: relationship with other concepts and implications for tourism and hospitality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *35*(12), 4297–4312. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-11-2022-1362

Huth, K., Ron, J., Luigjes, J., Goudriaan, A., Mohammadi, R., Holst, R., … & Marsman, M. (2023). Bayesian analysis of cross-sectional networks: a tutorial in r and jasp.. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/ub5tc

Kang, J., Kim, H., & Cho, O. H. (2023). Quiet quitting among healthcare professionals in hospital environments: A concept analysis and scoping review protocol. *BMJ Open*, *13*(11). https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-077811

Karrani, M. A., Bani-Melhem, S., & Mohd-Shamsudin, F. (2024). Employee quiet quitting behaviours: conceptualization, measure development, and validation. *Service Industries Journal*, *44*(3–4), 218–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2023.2286604

Liu-Lastres, B., Karatepe, O. M., & Okumus, F. (2024). Combating quiet quitting: implications for future research and practices for talent management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *36*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-08-2023-1317

Lu, M., Al Mamun, A., Chen, X., Yang, Q., & Masukujjaman, M. (2023). Quiet quitting during COVID-19: the role of psychological empowerment. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02012-2

Schmidt, D. A. and Baráth, M. (2023). The risks of quiet quitting: exploring the impact of telework on employee psychological departure. International Scientific Conference ERAZ - Knowledge Based Sustainable Development, 249-256. https://doi.org/10.31410/eraz.2023.249

Serenko, A. (2023). The human capital management perspective on quiet quitting: recommendations for employees, managers, and national policymakers. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *28*(1), 27–43. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-10-2022-0792

Tsemach, S., & Barth, A. (2023). Authentic leadership as a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour and teachers' burnout: What's 'quiet quitting' got to do with it? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432231212288

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). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-42591-3

Yikilmaz, İ. (2022). Quiet quitting: a conceptual investigation. *Anadolu 10th International Conference on Social Science*, 978–605. www.anadolukongre.org

Zieba, K. (2023). Great Resignation and Quiet Quitting as Post-Pandemic Dangers to Knowledge Management. *European Conference on Knowledge Management*.

Zuzelo, P. R. (2023). Discouraging Quiet Quitting: Potential Strategies for Nurses. *Holistic Nursing Practice*, *37*(3), 174–175. https://doi.org/10.1097/HNP.0000000000000583