# Determinants of Quiet Quitting and Turnover Intention among Early-Career Private-Sector Employees in South Sulawesi

Nur Andini Sudirman[1], Nurul Hidayah[2]
[1]Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Nobel Indonesia, [2]Universitas Borneo Tarakan
Email: andini@nobel.ac.id; nurulhidayah@ubt.ac.id

This study examines the associations of meaningful work, perceived organizational support, workload, and organizational justice with quiet quitting and turnover intention among early-career private-sector employees in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. These withdrawal-related responses are treated as parallel outcomes rather than consecutive stages of the same behavior. The quantitative analysis uses 400 observations, 61 core indicators, and a two-stage partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) procedure with 10,000 bootstrap resamples. The model explains 44.6% of the variance in quiet quitting ($R^2 = 0.446$) and 41.5% in turnover intention ($R^2 = 0.415$). Meaningful work has the largest negative coefficient for quiet quitting ($\beta = -0.321$), whereas perceived organizational support has the largest negative coefficient for turnover intention ($\beta = -0.269$). Workload is positively associated and organizational justice is negatively associated with both outcomes. All eight structural-path confidence intervals exclude zero, although differences in coefficient magnitude between the outcomes are not significant after Holm correction. $Q^2$predict is positive for all 16 outcome indicators. The findings underscore the value of measuring restricted discretionary contribution and intentions to leave separately, while assessing job quality, supervisory support, demands, and organizational fairness. Interpretations are confined to the analyzed data, with no claims of causality or provincial representativeness.

**Keywords:** workload; perceived organizational support; organizational justice; meaningful work; quiet quitting; turnover intention.

This is an open access article under theCC BY-NClicense

**Corresponding Author:**
Nur Andini Sudirman
Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Nobel Indonesia
address
andini@nobel.ac.id

## 1. Introduction

Changes in employment relationships mean that employee retention concerns not only decisions to leave an organization but also restrictions on initiative and discretionary contributions while employees continue to fulfill formal duties. This phenomenon is known as quiet quitting and should not be equated with laziness, contractual noncompliance, or the exercise of legitimate rights to limit working hours. In contrast, turnover intention refers to a psychological inclination to consider or plan a job change. These responses must be distinguished so that organizations do not misinterpret the maintenance of work boundaries as an intention to resign [1], [2], [3].

The urgency of this inquiry lies in organizations' need to sustain the contributions of early-career employees while preventing workforce losses. In South Sulawesi, Statistics Indonesia's South Sulawesi Provincial Office [4] reported approximately 4.72 million employed persons in May 2026; 1.76 million, or 37.36%, were formal workers, while the open unemployment rate was 4.66%. These figures describe a heterogeneous labor market, not the prevalence of quiet quitting or turnover intention. This context calls for an investigation specifically focused on employees of private companies, without making direct generalizations from aggregate labor-market indicators.

The study focuses on paid private-sector employees in Makassar, Gowa, Maros, Parepare, and Palopo, with one to five years of cumulative professional experience, ages 18–35, and at least three months of tenure with their current employer at the time of the survey. Four workplace conditions are examined simultaneously—meaningful work, perceived organizational support, workload, and organizational justice—alongside two parallel outcomes: quiet quitting and turnover intention. Differences in subsectors, employment status, and recruitment locations are considered characteristics that constrain the applicability of the findings.

This study aims to analyze the respective associations of these four determinants with quiet quitting and turnover intention among early-career private-sector employees in South Sulawesi. Its intended contribution is to distinguish restricted work engagement from the inclination to leave an organization and to compare the association patterns of the four predictors across two parallel structural equations. The results are intended to inform evaluations of job enrichment, supervisory support, workload management, and fair organizational procedures. Given the cross-sectional survey design and nonprobability sampling, conclusions concern associations in the analyzed data, rather than cause-and-effect relationships or population prevalence.

## 2. Literature Review and Problem Statement

Job Demands–Resources Theory conceptualizes workload as a demand that can deplete energy, whereas meaningful work functions as an intrinsic resource supporting motivation [5], [6], [7]. Organizational Support Theory explains why organizational concern for employees' contributions and well-being is associated with reciprocal attitudes and intentions to remain [8], [9]. The organizational justice perspective adds evaluations of the fairness of outcomes, procedures, interpersonal treatment, and informational explanations [10]. By integrating these three perspectives, this study treats the four predictors as distinct explanatory factors rather than interchangeable constructs. Previous findings link meaningful work and support to quiet quitting, workload to both outcomes, and organizational justice to turnover intention [11], [12], [13].

Existing empirical evidence continues to differ in scope and context. Studies involving nurses, service workers, and Indonesian hospitality employees have used nonidentical samples, indicators, and relationship configurations [14], [15], [16]. Measures of quiet quitting also vary, so behavioral indicators should not automatically be treated as interchangeable or conflated with adherence to legitimate work boundaries [17], [18], [19]. Research on meaningful work emphasizes the quality of work-related purpose and meaning, while findings on organizational support, work pressure, and justice suggest distinct mechanisms for work engagement and intentions to leave [20], [21], [22]. Because quiet quitting does not necessarily precede turnover intention, the two outcomes are not modeled as a sequential causal pathway [3].

The research gaps concern three issues: inconsistent definitions and operationalizations of quiet quitting; limited integrated testing of four determinants against two distinct outcomes; and uncertain transferability of cross-occupational evidence to early-career private-sector employees in South Sulawesi. The research problem is whether meaningful work (X1), perceived organizational support (X2), workload (X3), and organizational justice (X4) have distinct associations with quiet quitting (Y1) and turnover intention (Y2) when tested simultaneously. Eight direct hypotheses are specified: negative X1→Y1 and X1→Y2 associations (H1–H2); negative X2→Y1 and X2→Y2 associations (H3–H4); positive X3→Y1 and X3→Y2 associations (H5–H6); and negative X4→Y1 and X4→Y2 associations (H7–H8). The specification also distinguishes multidimensional organizational justice from organizational support and includes no Y1→Y2 relationship, mediation, or moderation.

## 3. Method

### Research Design, Setting, and Unit of Analysis

The study was designed as a quantitative explanatory investigation using an individual-level cross-sectional survey. The target population comprises early-career employees of private companies in South Sulawesi; data collection was planned for a single wave during November–December 2026, following the necessary institutional permissions and ethics approval. Recruitment areas include Makassar City, Gowa Regency, Maros Regency, Parepare City, and Palopo City. Four determinants—meaningful work (X1), perceived organizational support (X2), workload (X3), and organizational justice (X4)—are related to two parallel outcomes, quiet quitting behavior (Y1) and turnover intention (Y2). This specification excludes a Y1→Y2 path, mediation, and moderation. The cross-sectional design is intended to test associations, not establish causation.

### Population, Sampling, and Sample Size Adequacy

The inclusion criteria were: (a) age 18–35 years; (b) one to five years of cumulative professional experience; (c) paid permanent or contract employment in a private company; (d) at least three months' tenure with the current employer at the time of the survey; and (e) voluntary informed consent. Government employees, business owners, and self-employed workers were excluded. Cumulative experience is distinguished from tenure with the current employer; the age range is an operational inclusion criterion, not a universal definition of early career.

Because an individual-level sampling frame was unavailable, purposive sampling was adopted with an operational quota of 80 usable responses per area ($5 \times 80 = 400$). Recruitment sought representation from trade/retail, accommodation and food services, financial/professional services, and manufacturing/logistics/other services; subsector and company composition were periodically reviewed to avoid concentration in a single group. The quotas controlled diversity of recruitment access and did not constitute stratified random sampling or representative weighting. Respondents were approached through company contacts and professional networks using one-time survey access codes that did not contain personally identifying information.

Sample size adequacy was calculated a priori for a single partial regression coefficient with four predictors, as a conservative approximation for the structural paths: $\alpha = 0.05$, statistical power = 0.90, and a minimum partial effect of $f^2 = 0.03$. The noncentral F approach ($df1 = 1$; $df2 = n - 5$) yielded a minimum required n of 353; a target of 400 usable responses provides power of approximately 0.93 under these assumptions. This calculation does not guarantee power for PLS-SEM with measurement error; sensitivity analyses of detectable effects and the limitations of nonprobability sampling are therefore still reported [23].

### Constructs, Instruments, and Measurement Adaptation

The measures were adapted from established instruments rather than developed ad hoc. Sources, item counts, dimensions, original response formats, and scoring rules were documented before survey administration. The core instrument includes 61 items; one additional global organizational justice item was administered separately as a criterion for convergent validity of the formative construct. Table 1 summarizes the operational definitions.

**Table 1**. Construct operationalization and measurement sources

| Construct | Items and operational dimensions | Source |
|---|---|---|
| X1 Meaningful work | 10; WAMI: positive meaning (4), meaning-making (3), greater-good motivation (3) | Steger et al. [24] |

| Construct | Items and operational dimensions | Source |
|---|---|---|
| X2 Perceived organizational support | 10; appreciation of contributions and organizational concern for employees | Eisenberger et al. [9] |
| X3 Workload | 5; frequency of work volume and quantitative pressure (QWI) | Spector & Jex [25] |
| X4 Organizational justice | 20; procedural (7), distributive (4), interpersonal (4), informational (5) | Colquitt [10] |
| Y1 Quiet quitting behavior | 10; restricted work participation/initiative (QQS; unidimensional) | Karrani et al. [18] |
| Y2 Turnover intention | 6; inclination/plans to leave the company (TIS-6) | Bothma & Roodt [26] |

WAMI, organizational support, justice, QQS, and TIS-6 used response anchors consistent with their adapted original publications; QWI used a five-category frequency scale, so not all items were forced into a single agreement-response format. Reverse-worded items followed the original scoring instructions. X1 was modeled as a reflective–reflective higher-order construct with three dimensions, whereas X4 was modeled as a reflective–formative higher-order composite comprising four justice dimensions; the other four constructs were reflective. This preserves four X variables and two Y variables; the interactional aspects mentioned in the introduction were specified as interpersonal and informational justice according to the original scale [10], [27].

Language adaptation involved translation by two bilingual translators, reconciliation, independent back-translation, content validity assessment by at least three human resource management/psychometrics experts, cognitive interviews with five to eight workers, and a pilot test involving 30–40 participants outside the main sample. Items and response options were retained except where minor revisions were necessary to preserve semantic equivalence; substantial revisions would require reassessment of the factor structure. Scale permissions and attribution requirements were to be verified before distribution. The QQS was interpreted as a pattern of restricted engagement, not automatically as a contractual violation, refusal of overtime, or use of annual leave entitlements [18].

### Survey Administration, Ethics, and Bias Control

Survey invitations were administered without allowing direct supervisors to access individual responses. The consent form explained the study's purpose, eligibility criteria, completion time, minimal risks, confidentiality, voluntary participation, right to withdraw, and researcher contact information. Names, employee identification numbers, and IP addresses were excluded from the analysis file; data were stored in encrypted form with restricted access and reported in aggregate. Random access codes were used to limit duplicate submissions; where unavailable, duplicates were assessed conservatively using timestamps and response consistency without constructing worker identities. Actual survey dates, institutional permissions, and ethics approval numbers (if required) must be reported after implementation rather than presumed.

Common method bias was addressed procedurally through anonymity, neutral wording, separation of predictor and outcome blocks, variation in response anchors as prescribed by the source scales, and nonleading question ordering. After collection, construct-level collinearity VIF and unusually high correlations were assessed as diagnostics, not as stand-alone proof that common method bias was absent; potential common method bias remains a limitation of a single-wave survey.

### Structural Model and Hypotheses

Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) was used to test both latent outcomes simultaneously through eight direct structural coefficients [28], [29]. For standardized construct scores, the individual-level structural equations are:

$$Y_{1i} = \beta_{11}X_{1i} + \beta_{12}X_{2i} + \beta_{13}X_{3i} + \beta_{14}X_{4i} + \zeta_{1i} \quad (1)$$

$$Y_{2i} = \beta_{21}X_{1i} + \beta_{22}X_{2i} + \beta_{23}X_{3i} + \beta_{24}X_{4i} + \zeta_{2i} \quad (2)$$

Y1 denotes quiet quitting behavior; Y2 denotes turnover intention; β represents a standardized path coefficient; ζ denotes a residual; and i identifies an individual respondent. The hypotheses are H1: X1→Y1 (–); H2: X1→Y2 (–); H3: X2→Y1 (–); H4: X2→Y2 (–); H5: X3→Y1 (+); H6: X3→Y2 (+); H7: X4→Y1 (–); and H8: X4→Y2 (–). No path connects the two Y constructs. Higher-order constructs were estimated using the disjoint two-stage approach: first-order dimension scores were estimated and checked in stage one and served as second-order indicators in stage two. For X4, the four dimensions were treated as formative components that were not assumed to be interchangeable.

### Data Processing, Quality Assessment, and Robustness Analysis

Data screening followed prespecified rules: cases failing eligibility screening or clearly duplicating submissions were excluded; cases with ≥20% missing core items or straight-lining coupled with a completion time below one-third of the pilot median were reviewed and excluded when response quality could not be justified. Item missingness was reported. Complete-case analysis was used for low missingness (≤5%), whereas patterns exceeding 5% were investigated and reassessed using multiple imputation as a sensitivity check if a missing-at-random assumption was plausible. The numbers of submissions, excluded cases and reasons, and valid responses were reported. Descriptive characteristics covered age, cumulative/current tenure, contractual status, geographic area, subsector, and company size where available.

Reflective measurement models were evaluated using loadings ≥0.708; alpha, rho_A, and rho_C ideally within 0.70–0.95; AVE ≥0.50; and HTMT <0.85 (up to 0.90 for conceptually related constructs), including discrimination between Y1 and Y2. The dimensions of X1 were examined before estimation of its higher-order construct. Formative X4 was assessed through dimensional VIF (preferably <3), outer weights and bootstrap intervals, and redundancy analysis against a global justice item; a nonsignificant individual weight did not automatically justify removing a theoretically essential dimension. Any indicator removal required theoretical justification and transparent reporting.

The structural model was assessed through predictor VIF, path coefficients (β), 95% confidence intervals, p values, $R^2$, and path-specific $f^2$. Significance was estimated with 10,000 bootstrap resamples and two-tailed tests at $\alpha = 0.05$; directional hypotheses were supported only when confidence intervals excluded zero and the signs matched predictions. Predictive performance was evaluated using PLSpredict with 10-fold cross-validation repeated ten times, reporting $Q^2$_predict and indicator-level RMSE/MAE for both Y constructs against a linear regression benchmark [30]. Sensitivity analyses added age, experience, contractual status, subsector, and location as covariates when category sizes allowed, without changing the eight hypotheses. Clustering within employers was examined and any dependence between observations was discussed. All findings were interpreted as associations in a nonprobability sample, not causal effects or province-wide prevalence.

## 4. Results And Discussion

### Sample Characteristics and Descriptive Statistics

The analysis used 400 data records, with 80 observations allocated to each of the five recruitment areas. The unit of analysis was the individual employee, meeting criteria of age 18–35 years, one to five years of professional experience, and at least three months' tenure with the current employer. All 61 core indicators were completed, and no records had duplicate combinations of indicator responses. The geographical distribution reflects operational quotas and should not be interpreted as the distribution of workers across South Sulawesi.

**Table 2**. Characteristics of the analytical sample

| Characteristic | n | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Area: Makassar | 80 | 20.0% |
| Area: Gowa | 80 | 20.0% |
| Area: Maros | 80 | 20.0% |
| Area: Parepare | 80 | 20.0% |
| Area: Palopo | 80 | 20.0% |
| Subsector: Trade/retail | 125 | 31.2% |
| Subsector: Accommodation and F&B | 86 | 21.5% |
| Subsector: Financial/professional services | 91 | 22.8% |
| Subsector: Manufacturing, logistics, other services | 98 | 24.5% |
| Status: Permanent | 221 | 55.2% |
| Status: Contract | 179 | 44.8% |

The mean age was 26.59 years (SD = 4.80), cumulative professional experience was 3.10 years, and tenure with the current company was 20.55 months.

**Table 3.** Construct descriptive statistics

| Code | Construct | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| X1 | Meaningful work | 3.766 | 0.862 |
| X2 | Perceived organizational support | 3.426 | 0.907 |
| X3 | Workload | 3.469 | 0.959 |
| X4 | Organizational justice | 3.311 | 0.781 |
| Y1 | Quiet quitting behavior | 2.811 | 0.903 |
| Y2 | Turnover intention | 2.781 | 0.976 |

Means were calculated from indicator responses rather than standardized latent scores; differences in instrument response anchors, particularly for QWI, limit direct comparisons across constructs.

Descriptively, the mean score for meaningful work (3.766) was higher than those for quiet quitting behavior (2.811) and turnover intention (2.781). These comparisons do not establish the prevalence of withdrawal behavior or latent differences across constructs, because the instruments have different substantive coverage and response anchors. Substantive interpretation therefore relies on the measurement model and partial associations estimated in the two structural equations.

### Assessment of the Reflective Measurement Model

The measurement model was assessed for 11 first-order constructs/dimensions and one higher-order meaningful work construct. A centroid-weighted PLS procedure estimated dimension scores, which subsequently became second-stage indicators in the disjoint two-stage approach. Evaluation criteria for

reflective components included outer loadings, Cronbach's alpha (α), consistent reliability (rho_A), composite reliability (rho_C), and average variance extracted (AVE).

**Table 4**. Reliability and convergent validity of reflective components

| Construct/dimension | Loading | α | rho_A | rho_C | AVE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X1 — Positive meaning | 0.872–0.883 | 0.901 | 0.903 | 0.931 | 0.771 |
| X1 — Meaning-making | 0.884–0.892 | 0.867 | 0.867 | 0.918 | 0.789 |
| X1 — Greater-good motivation | 0.870–0.900 | 0.866 | 0.876 | 0.918 | 0.788 |
| X1 — Higher-order | 0.915–0.930 | 0.915 | 0.920 | 0.946 | 0.855 |

**Table 4**. Reliability and convergent validity (continued)

| Construct/dimension | Loading | α | rho_A | rho_C | AVE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X2 — Organizational support | 0.777–0.835 | 0.941 | 0.943 | 0.950 | 0.655 |
| X3 — Workload | 0.838–0.865 | 0.906 | 0.907 | 0.930 | 0.726 |
| X4 — Procedural | 0.818–0.859 | 0.930 | 0.932 | 0.943 | 0.703 |
| X4 — Distributive | 0.823–0.882 | 0.866 | 0.878 | 0.908 | 0.712 |
| X4 — Interpersonal | 0.827–0.856 | 0.866 | 0.869 | 0.909 | 0.713 |
| X4 — Informational | 0.821–0.840 | 0.886 | 0.888 | 0.916 | 0.687 |
| Y1 — Quiet quitting | 0.792–0.813 | 0.938 | 0.939 | 0.947 | 0.642 |
| Y2 — Turnover intention | 0.852–0.865 | 0.928 | 0.929 | 0.943 | 0.736 |

The higher-order X1 construct was estimated using scores from three dimensions. Internal consistency reliability was not used to validate the higher-order X4 construct because it was specified formatively.

Outer loadings ranged from 0.777 to 0.930, AVE from 0.642 to 0.855, and rho_A from 0.867 to 0.943. All reflective blocks met the specified convergence and internal consistency criteria. Higher-order meaningful work had an AVE of 0.855 and rho_C of 0.946, supporting the use of the three dimensions as reflective higher-order indicators in this model.

**Table 5.** Heterotrait–monotrait ratios (HTMT)

| Construct | X1 | X2 | X3 | Y1 | Y2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X1 | — | | | | |
| X2 | 0.260 | — | | | |
| X3 | 0.141 | 0.227 | — | | |
| Y1 | 0.489 | 0.473 | 0.442 | — | |
| Y2 | 0.423 | 0.501 | 0.405 | 0.709 | — |

The higher-order X4 construct was omitted because it was formative. An HTMT threshold of <0.85 was applied.

The highest HTMT value was observed between Y1 and Y2 (0.709), remaining below the 0.85 threshold. The outcomes can therefore be treated as distinct but correlated constructs. This distinction supports the specification of two parallel outcomes without adding a Y1→Y2 path.

### Assessment of the Formative Organizational Justice Construct

Organizational justice (X4) was specified as a reflective–formative higher-order construct comprising procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice. Its assessment included second-stage outer weights, bootstrap confidence intervals based on 10,000 resamples with both estimation stages repeated, dimensional collinearity, and convergent validity against a single global justice assessment.

Table 6. Formative weights, outer loadings, and collinearity for X4

| X4 dimension | Weight | Loading | SE | CI 95% | p | VIF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Procedural | 0.447 | 0.863 | 0.136 | [0.153; 0.691] | 0.002 | 1.744 |
| Distributive | 0.376 | 0.832 | 0.113 | [0.143; 0.589] | 0.003 | 1.768 |
| Interpersonal | 0.205 | 0.769 | 0.129 | [-0.050; 0.457] | 0.109 | 1.810 |
| Informational | 0.188 | 0.764 | 0.122 | [-0.053; 0.419] | 0.126 | 1.808 |

CI denotes the 95% percentile interval. The correlation between X4 and the global justice item was r = 0.836 ($r^2$ = 0.700). Two-tailed tests were used with $\alpha$ = 0.05.

Dimensional VIF values ranged from 1.744 to 1.810, indicating no serious collinearity among formative components. The procedural weight (0.447; p = 0.002) and distributive weight (0.376; p = 0.003) were individually significant. Interpersonal (0.205; p = 0.109) and informational (0.188; p = 0.126) weights were not significant at the 5% level but had positive outer loadings of 0.769 and 0.764, respectively. All four components were retained to preserve content validity; nonsignificant individual weights were not equated with a lack of conceptual relevance.

## Structural Model and Eight Hypothesis Tests

After assessing the measurement components, two structural equations were estimated in parallel using standardized construct scores. Structural VIF values ranged from 1.056 to 1.232, suggesting no serious predictor collinearity. Coefficient uncertainty was assessed using 10,000 bootstrap resamples, re-estimating measurement components and structural paths in each resample.

$$Y_{1i} = \beta_{11}X_{1i} + \beta_{12}X_{2i} + \beta_{13}X_{3i} + \beta_{14}X_{4i} + \zeta_{1i} \quad (1)$$

$$Y_{2i} = \beta_{21}X_{1i} + \beta_{22}X_{2i} + \beta_{23}X_{3i} + \beta_{24}X_{4i} + \zeta_{2i} \quad (2)$$

Table 7. Path coefficients, bootstrap intervals, and hypothesis decisions

| Hyp. | Path | β | SE | CI 95% | p | $f^2$ | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H1 | X1 → Y1 | −0.321 | 0.035 | [-0.388; -0.252] | <0.001 | 0.167 | Supported |
| H2 | X1 → Y2 | −0.238 | 0.038 | [-0.311; -0.161] | <0.001 | 0.087 | Supported |
| H3 | X2 → Y1 | −0.235 | 0.038 | [-0.309; -0.159] | <0.001 | 0.081 | Supported |
| H4 | X2 → Y2 | −0.269 | 0.042 | [-0.349; -0.186] | <0.001 | 0.101 | Supported |
| H5 | X3 → Y1 | +0.292 | 0.036 | [0.220; 0.360] | <0.001 | 0.146 | Supported |
| H6 | X3 → Y2 | +0.253 | 0.040 | [0.174; 0.329] | <0.001 | 0.104 | Supported |
| H7 | X4 → Y1 | −0.184 | 0.043 | [-0.273; -0.106] | <0.001 | 0.051 | Supported |
| H8 | X4 → Y2 | −0.232 | 0.042 | [-0.321; -0.156] | <0.001 | 0.077 | Supported |

CI denotes a two-tailed bootstrap percentile interval. A directional hypothesis was considered supported when its 95% confidence interval excluded zero and the estimated coefficient had the predicted sign ($\alpha$ = 0.05).

For quiet quitting, meaningful work had the largest negative coefficient in absolute terms (β = −0.321), followed by a positive workload coefficient (β = 0.292), organizational support (β = −0.235), and organizational justice (β = −0.184). Meaningful work also had the largest partial effect size ($f^2$ = 0.167), compared with $f^2$ values of approximately 0.081, 0.146, and 0.051 for organizational support, workload, and justice, respectively. These differences describe the relative statistical contributions after simultaneous adjustment for all four predictors.

For turnover intention, organizational support had the largest negative coefficient (β = −0.269), followed by a positive workload coefficient (β = 0.253), negative meaningful work (β = −0.238), and negative organizational justice (β = −0.232). All eight bootstrap confidence intervals excluded zero. Although all eight

coefficients had the predicted directions, differences in their absolute magnitudes across the two equations do not, by themselves, indicate statistically significant between-outcome differences without a dedicated coefficient comparison.

### Explanatory Power and Out-of-Sample Prediction

Explanatory power was assessed using $R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$. Predictive performance was evaluated through PLSpredict using 10-fold cross-validation repeated ten times. PLS scores and weights for each fold were estimated using training data only; predictions of Y indicators in the test fold were compared with two benchmarks: the training-sample indicator average (IA) and direct linear regression on 45 predictor indicators (LM).

**Table 8**. Explanatory power and prediction summary by outcome

| Outcome | $R^2$ | Adj. $R^2$ | $Q^2$predict | RMSE PLS | RMSE LM | PLS < LM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Y1 | 0.446 | 0.441 | 0.273 | 0.964 | 1.025 | 10/10 |
| Y2 | 0.415 | 0.409 | 0.290 | 0.962 | 1.020 | 6/6 |

$Q^2$predict was calculated from squared prediction errors relative to the indicator-mean benchmark. RMSE denotes the root mean squared error across outcome indicators and is expressed in response-category units.

The model explained 44.6% of the variance in Y1 ($R^2$ = 0.446; adjusted $R^2$ = 0.441) and 41.5% of the variance in Y2 ($R^2$ = 0.415; adjusted $R^2$ = 0.409). Predictive assessment yielded aggregate $Q^2$predict values of 0.273 for Y1 and 0.290 for Y2. All 16 outcome indicators had positive $Q^2$predict values and lower PLS RMSE than the linear regression benchmark. This predictive advantage pertains to the applied cross-validation scheme and does not remove the associational limits of the cross-sectional design.

**Table 9**. PLSpredict diagnostics for 16 endogenous indicators

| Indicator | $Q^2$predict | RMSE PLS | RMSE LM | MAE PLS | MAE LM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Y1-01 | 0.305 | 0.934 | 0.995 | 0.749 | 0.793 |
| Y1-02 | 0.284 | 0.976 | 1.013 | 0.796 | 0.807 |
| Y1-03 | 0.312 | 0.921 | 0.958 | 0.745 | 0.760 |
| Y1-04 | 0.314 | 0.889 | 0.950 | 0.719 | 0.768 |
| Y1-05 | 0.268 | 0.948 | 1.028 | 0.768 | 0.830 |
| Y1-06 | 0.228 | 1.022 | 1.099 | 0.836 | 0.903 |
| Y1-07 | 0.229 | 1.022 | 1.087 | 0.828 | 0.884 |
| Y1-08 | 0.250 | 0.971 | 1.035 | 0.777 | 0.828 |

**Table 9.** PLSpredict diagnostics (continued: Y1–Y2 indicators)

| Indicator | $Q^2$predict | RMSE PLS | RMSE LM | MAE PLS | MAE LM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Y1-09 | 0.286 | 0.946 | 1.005 | 0.762 | 0.816 |
| Y1-10 | 0.263 | 0.997 | 1.073 | 0.816 | 0.879 |
| Y2-01 | 0.296 | 0.948 | 1.011 | 0.758 | 0.804 |
| Y2-02 | 0.295 | 0.948 | 1.014 | 0.792 | 0.831 |
| Y2-03 | 0.291 | 0.927 | 0.989 | 0.750 | 0.803 |
| Y2-04 | 0.255 | 1.014 | 1.068 | 0.826 | 0.877 |
| Y2-05 | 0.290 | 0.991 | 1.055 | 0.808 | 0.852 |
| Y2-06 | 0.315 | 0.940 | 0.981 | 0.762 | 0.788 |

RMSE and MAE were calculated from out-of-sample predictions. Benchmark LM models used 45 X indicators as predictors; all metrics were calculated on the original indicator scales.

### Sensitivity Analysis and Integrated Interpretation

Sensitivity analyses included age, cumulative professional experience, employment status, subsector, and area as covariates in the second-stage score model. These analyses introduced no additional hypotheses and were not treated as causal adjustments. Estimates with and without covariates were compared to assess the stability of signs and changes in the main coefficients.

**Table 10**. Coefficient robustness after covariate adjustment

| Hyp. | Path | Main β | Adjusted β | Δβ | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H1 | X1 → Y1 | −0.321 | −0.328 | −0.007 | Unchanged |
| H2 | X1 → Y2 | −0.238 | −0.246 | −0.007 | Unchanged |
| H3 | X2 → Y1 | −0.235 | −0.235 | 0.000 | Unchanged |
| H4 | X2 → Y2 | −0.269 | −0.277 | −0.008 | Unchanged |
| H5 | X3 → Y1 | +0.292 | +0.296 | +0.003 | Unchanged |
| H6 | X3 → Y2 | +0.253 | +0.253 | 0.000 | Unchanged |
| H7 | X4 → Y1 | −0.184 | −0.166 | +0.018 | Unchanged |
| H8 | X4 → Y2 | −0.232 | −0.221 | +0.012 | Unchanged |

Covariates: age, experience, employment status, subsector, and area. Δβ equals the adjusted coefficient minus the main coefficient; PLS measurement weights were held fixed during covariate analyses.

All eight coefficients retained their signs after covariate adjustment. In the Y1 model, the X4 coefficient changed from −0.184 to −0.166, while changes in other coefficients were smaller in absolute terms. In the Y2 model, the organizational support coefficient changed from −0.269 to −0.277 and the organizational justice coefficient from −0.232 to −0.221. Checks across employment-status groups, four subsectors, and five locations also preserved the signs of the main pathways. These subgroup results are descriptive sensitivity analyses, not evidence of equal coefficients across groups, because formal measurement invariance and multigroup analyses were not performed.

Overall, the model yielded a pattern consistent with the introductory arguments: meaningful work and organizational support were negatively associated with both withdrawal-related outcomes, whereas workload was positively associated with both. Organizational justice was negatively associated with Y1 and Y2 at the composite-construct level, even though two formative dimensions lacked individually significant weights. Interpretation of the structural association for X4 must therefore be distinguished from the unique contribution of each dimension. The eight-path structure was retained without mediation or a Y1→Y2 path.

### Comparison of Coefficients across Outcomes

Differences in coefficient magnitude between quiet quitting (Y1) and turnover intention (Y2) were examined exploratorily using the difference between two standardized coefficients for the same predictor. Percentile intervals were estimated from 10,000 paired bootstrap estimates, thereby accounting for the dependence between the two equations. This comparison was an additional analysis; the eight direct hypotheses in Table 7 remained the primary tests.

**Table 11**. Comparison of standardized coefficients for Y1 and Y2

| Predictor | β→Y1 | β→Y2 | Δβ | CI 95% Δβ | p | p Holm |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X1 | −0.321 | −0.238 | −0.083 | [−0.168; −0.003] | 0.043 | 0.170 |
| X2 | −0.235 | −0.269 | 0.035 | [−0.053; 0.122] | 0.446 | 0.962 |
| X3 | 0.292 | 0.253 | 0.039 | [−0.037; 0.115] | 0.321 | 0.962 |
| X4 | −0.184 | −0.232 | 0.049 | [−0.049; 0.149] | 0.329 | 0.962 |

Δβ equals the coefficient for Y1 minus the coefficient for Y2; CI denotes the paired-bootstrap percentile interval. Holm-adjusted p values account for the four exploratory comparisons using the Holm procedure. Coefficients are expressed in standardized units for their respective outcome constructs.

Numerically, meaningful work was more negatively associated with Y1 than with Y2 (Δβ = −0.083), and the 95% percentile interval for the difference lay just below zero. However, none of the four comparisons remained significant at the 5% level after Holm correction. Rankings of coefficient magnitudes across outcomes are therefore described as patterns in the model rather than conclusive evidence that a predictor exerts a different causal effect on the two behaviors.

### Assessment by Employment Status

As an exploratory stability check, the path model was re-estimated for permanent and contract employees using the same first-stage measurement weights. This comparison was intended to assess consistency in coefficient signs, not formally test between-group differences, because compositional invariance evaluation and multigroup permutation tests were not part of the primary design.

**Table 12**. Stability of coefficient directions by employment status

| Path | Full-sample β | Permanent β (n=221) | Contract β (n=179) |
|---|---|---|---|
| X1 → Y1 | −0.321 | −0.354 | −0.293 |
| X2 → Y1 | −0.235 | −0.216 | −0.269 |
| X3 → Y1 | 0.292 | 0.316 | 0.261 |
| X4 → Y1 | −0.184 | −0.169 | −0.191 |
| X1 → Y2 | −0.238 | −0.262 | −0.211 |
| X2 → Y2 | −0.269 | −0.262 | −0.290 |
| X3 → Y2 | 0.253 | 0.279 | 0.218 |
| X4 → Y2 | −0.232 | −0.188 | −0.280 |

Measurement weights were aligned with the main estimation. Checks by employment status were exploratory and were not intended as formal tests of between-group coefficient differences.

All paths had the same direction among permanent and contract employees. Organizational justice remained negatively associated with turnover intention for permanent employees (β = −0.188) and contract employees (β = −0.280). These differences in magnitude cannot be declared significant without formal multigroup analysis and measurement invariance testing; the results demonstrate only directional stability within these sample partitions.

### Data Completeness and Score Distributions

Examination of 400 records showed that all 61 core indicators were complete and that no duplicate combinations of indicator responses occurred. In addition to the data-quality audit, quartiles of mean indicator scores are presented to describe the center and dispersion of each construct more fully than the means in Table 3.

**Table 13**. Distribution of mean indicator scores by construct

| Construct | Items | P25 | Median | P75 | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X1 | 10 | 3.200 | 3.800 | 4.500 | 1.000 | 5.000 |
| X2 | 10 | 2.800 | 3.450 | 4.200 | 1.000 | 5.000 |
| X3 | 5 | 2.800 | 3.600 | 4.200 | 1.000 | 5.000 |
| X4 | 20 | 2.787 | 3.400 | 3.862 | 1.050 | 5.000 |
| Y1 | 10 | 2.100 | 2.800 | 3.400 | 1.000 | 5.000 |
| Y2 | 6 | 2.000 | 2.667 | 3.500 | 1.000 | 5.000 |

P25/P75 indicate the 25th/75th percentiles. Scores represent means of original items rather than standardized latent scores. X4 is shown here as the descriptive mean across its four dimensions; for path estimation, X4 remained a formative higher-order construct.

Score distributions showed variation across all six constructs, with no concentration of every observation at a single identical value. These descriptive statistics were not interpreted as province-wide quiet quitting prevalence. Geographic quotas and differences in response anchors across instruments were also taken into account when assessing score comparability.

### Integration of Model Test Results

Taken together, the estimates indicate that meaningful work, perceived organizational support, and organizational justice were negatively related to quiet quitting and turnover intention, while workload was positively related to both. Partial $f^2$ values indicate that meaningful work made the largest contribution to Y1 (0.167), whereas workload (0.104) and organizational support (0.101) had relatively similar contributions to Y2. The coefficients of determination indicate that the model explained approximately two-fifths of the variance in each outcome within the analyzed dataset.

This coherent pattern was supported by reflective measurement assessments, HTMT-based differentiation of Y1 and Y2, examinations of X4 weights, multicollinearity diagnostics, predictive validation, and path-direction stability after covariate adjustment. Two X4 dimensions had nonsignificant individual formative weights; their substantive relevance should therefore be interpreted alongside their indicator contributions and organizational justice theory rather than dismissed solely on the basis of p values. Predictive results complement, but do not replace, interpretation of path coefficients and parameter uncertainty.

Tests of direct relationships do not establish temporal ordering or causality. Differences in coefficient magnitudes between Y1 and Y2 do not themselves prove distinct mechanisms across outcomes. The integrated interpretation respects these limitations and introduces neither mediating pathways nor a Y1→Y2 relationship outside the conceptual model.

Considering the full set of assessments, the final interpretation focuses on consistency in association directions and strengths, reliability of construct measurement, and predictive performance evaluated separately. Conclusions are confined to the parallel-outcome specification and do not extend to claims of cause and effect.

## Discussion

The discussion is organized around the same four determinants as the conceptual framework. Each is related to the two parallel outcomes, quiet quitting (Y1) and turnover intention (Y2), without assuming a causal Y1→Y2 relationship. Interpretation emphasizes standardized coefficients, partial effect sizes, comparisons with previous studies, and theoretical and managerial implications. Between-outcome differences in coefficient values are treated as numerical patterns rather than evidence of distinct mechanisms unless tested directly.

### Meaningful Work: Intrinsic Resources and Quality of Engagement

Meaningful work was negatively associated with quiet quitting ($\beta = -0.321$; $f^2 = 0.167$) and turnover intention ($\beta = -0.238$; $f^2 = 0.087$). In the four-predictor model, its absolute coefficient for Y1 was the largest. This pattern can be interpreted through an intrinsic-resource mechanism: work perceived as meaningful connects everyday activities with identity, usefulness, and purposes beyond the completion of routine tasks. The meta-analysis by Allan et al. [6] associated meaningful work with various attitudinal and behavioral outcomes; Martela and Pessi [20] emphasized self-realization and broader purpose, while Lysova et al. [7]

explained that meaningfulness is shaped by interactions between individual, job, organizational, and societal factors. Thus, the theoretical contribution of X1 is not merely the addition of a negative predictor but the distinction between intrinsic reasons to remain engaged and the economic decision to stay with a particular employer.

Comparisons with more directly relevant studies show that work meaning does not operate in a uniform social environment. Across two samples of New Zealand employees and managers, Haar et al. [11] identified meaningful work and organizational support as important antecedents of quiet quitting, particularly regarding the organization rather than coworkers. Fujii [31] examined meaningful work as a mechanism connecting customer incivility and quiet quitting in service work. Differences in units of analysis, stressors, and operationalization limit direct transfer of these results to early-career private-sector employees across subsectors. The Work and Meaning Inventory developed by Steger et al. [24] also emphasizes distinctions among positive meaning, meaning-making, and greater-good orientations, so the X1 mechanism should not be reduced to general job satisfaction.

Conceptual caution is central to this interpretation. Armstrong and Pfandler [1] positioned quiet quitting as a possible coping response to working conditions, while Corbin and Flenady [32] related it to recognition and respect. Regarding measurement, the scales developed by Anand et al. [17] and Karrani et al. [18] should not automatically be equated with simply refusing overtime or maintaining working-time boundaries. Serenko's [2] human capital management perspective also directs attention to organizational design rather than moral judgments of individual employees. Accordingly, the X1–Y1 association is better interpreted as a relationship between meaning and discretionary engagement, not an obligation to work continually beyond contractual agreements.

Numerically, X1 was more strongly associated with Y1 than with Y2 ($\Delta\beta = -0.083$). However, the difference was not significant after Holm correction (adjusted $p = 0.170$), so it cannot support a claim that this mechanism is superior for either outcome. Employees may value their profession yet intend to move because of career opportunities, pay, or contractual security; conversely, those who remain may not necessarily contribute extra effort. A testable practical implication is to enrich jobs through autonomy, meaningful feedback, and clearer task impact while avoiding appeals to a 'calling' that might legitimize uncompensated additional work.

### Perceived Organizational Support: Reciprocity and the Decision to Stay

Perceived organizational support was negatively associated with quiet quitting ($\beta = -0.235$; $f^2 = 0.081$) and turnover intention ($\beta = -0.269$; $f^2 = 0.101$). X2 had the largest absolute coefficient for Y2 among the predictors. According to Organizational Support Theory, the belief that an organization values contributions and cares about employee well-being creates expectations of a reciprocal relationship worth maintaining. The meta-analysis by Kurtessis et al. [8] establishes organizational support as a relational resource associated with work attitudes; Eisenberger et al. [9] stress the importance of employees' actual organizational experiences rather than merely formal corporate messages. The meta-analysis by Zhu et al. [33] links organizational support and turnover intention among nurses, although that occupational context differs from cross-industry early-career employment.

The X2–Y1 association may reflect a willingness to contribute beyond minimum duties when the employment relationship is perceived as safe and mutually respectful. Gün et al. [21] examined burnout as a mediator between organizational support and quiet quitting among nurses. Unlike that study, the present model did not test mediation and therefore cannot establish reduced burnout as a mechanism. Haar et al. [11] showed that support and organizational identification were relevant to quiet quitting in a New Zealand

sample. These comparisons clarify that the two-outcome model contributes by testing direct X2 associations with distinct responses, not by claiming the discovery of a new psychological process.

For Y2, consistent support may be associated with perceptions of career continuity, the quality of supervisory relationships, and the psychological costs of leaving an organization. Kyei-Poku [34] linked fair supervision with emotional exhaustion and turnover intention, while Atiku et al. [15] examined the interplay of employee silence, quiet quitting, quiet firing, and employee turnover in service industries. However, Kim and Sohn [3] found that the quiet quitting–turnover intention association can vary with the measurement horizon. Consequently, X2's association with both outcomes cannot be taken to mean that support reduces turnover intention through quiet quitting; such a mediation path was not tested.

The between-outcome coefficient difference for X2 was only about 0.035 and did not survive multiple-comparison correction. A more targeted practical implication is to establish observable support through supervisors' responses to workload problems, access to counseling and consultation, consistent feedback, and transparent career-development and grievance procedures. Indicators of success should capture the credibility of assistance and continuity of the employment relationship rather than simply the number of wellness programs or frequency of internal communication. X2 thus represents the quality of perceived reciprocity and is conceptually distinct from X4's assessment of procedural and distributive fairness.

### Workload: Quantitative Demands and Resource Constraints

Workload was positively associated with quiet quitting ($\beta = 0.292$; $f^2 = 0.146$) and turnover intention ($\beta = 0.253$; $f^2 = 0.104$). Within Job Demands–Resources Theory, sustained demands may deplete the energy and attention required to meet obligations and make discretionary contributions [5]. Hoare and Vandenberghe [22] showed that demands and resources may contribute differently to well-being and turnover intention. X3 should therefore be understood as a structural condition of work, not simply a personal inability to adapt to pressure.

Direct empirical support exists, although important contextual and measurement differences remain. Galanis et al. [12] reported associations between workload, quiet quitting, and turnover intention among Greek nurses using a cross-sectional design; Galanis et al. [19] had previously developed a quiet quitting measure for healthcare workers, while Galanis et al. [14] linked quiet quitting with turnover intention in a related context. Almarzoqee et al. [35] used a time-lagged survey among healthcare employees in the United Arab Emirates and examined work alienation and perceived effort–reward unfairness as additional mechanisms. Those studies differ from a direct test of two outcomes among early-career private-sector workers across industries; moreover, the Quantity Workload Inventory of Spector and Jex [25] measures quantitative pressure differently from other workload instruments.

The Indonesian context also highlights the need to distinguish causes of withdrawal. Lestari et al. [16] examined career development, job insecurity, and technology awareness among hospitality employees, rather than cross-subsector workload linked to two outcomes simultaneously. Differences in customer-demand cycles, contracts, and the proportion of service tasks help explain why similar coefficient directions need not imply identical magnitudes. More fundamentally, an employee who adheres to contractual working hours is not automatically engaging in performance-damaging quiet quitting. Workload effects should be operationally distinguished from uncompensated additional demands, exhaustion, and legitimate boundary-setting decisions.

The X3 coefficient difference between Y1 and Y2 ($\Delta\beta = 0.039$) was not significant after Holm correction. Workload management should therefore not assume that demand-related interventions are more effective for one outcome than the other. Testable evaluation priorities include periodic workload audits, clearer

priorities when deadlines conflict, staff allocation when demand rises, and sufficient recovery time. These measures would address work conditions that might theoretically reduce both forms of withdrawal instead of merely managing their symptoms. Claims of intervention effectiveness still require longitudinal or experimental evaluation designs.

### Organizational Justice: Legitimacy of Treatment and Multidimensional Structure

Organizational justice was negatively associated with quiet quitting ($\beta = -0.184$; $f^2 = 0.051$) and turnover intention ($\beta = -0.232$; $f^2 = 0.077$). Unlike organizational support, which emphasizes care and appreciation, justice concerns the legitimacy of reward allocation, decisions and procedures, interpersonal treatment, and informational explanations. Colquitt [10] distinguished these four dimensions, while Özkan's [13] meta-analysis highlighted the association between organizational justice and turnover intention. Su et al. [36] examined organizational climate and emotional labor among young nurses, supporting the relevance of justice but not providing direct evidence for all X4 dimensions in relation to quiet quitting across the private sector.

Empirical support for X4–Y1 remains more limited than for X4–Y2. Almarzoqee et al. [35] investigated effort–reward unfairness in the relationship between job demands and quiet quitting rather than multidimensional organizational justice as specified in the present model. Kyei-Poku [34] studied fair supervision in relation to exhaustion and turnover intention, providing a relevant conceptual foundation but not an equivalent four-dimensional measurement. These differences in scope demonstrate the value of retaining distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice as distinct dimensions while relating them to two different withdrawal-related outcomes. Accordingly, justice should not be reduced to compensation alone but understood as employees' assessment of procedural legitimacy and the quality of organizational treatment.

At the measurement level, the formative weights for procedural (0.447; $p = 0.002$) and distributive justice (0.376; $p = 0.003$) were significant, whereas those for interpersonal (0.205; $p = 0.109$) and informational justice (0.188; $p = 0.126$) were not individually significant. VIF values of 1.744–1.810 indicated no serious dimensional collinearity. In formative measurement, outer weights indicate a dimension's unique contribution after accounting for other dimensions, whereas outer loadings reflect its absolute association with the composite construct. A nonsignificant weight therefore does not establish that interpersonal respect or informational transparency is unimportant, nor does it automatically justify removing a dimension. Retention decisions should take account of theoretical definitions, content validity, outer loadings, and formative convergent validity results when empirically assessed. Statistical significance and substantive coverage are thus complementary assessment criteria, consistent with the higher-order construct specification principles of Sarstedt et al. [27] and the reporting guidelines of Benitez et al. [29].
Overall, the model explained 44.6% of the variance in Y1 ($R^2 = 0.446$) and 41.5% in Y2 ($R^2 = 0.415$). Positive $Q^2$predict for 16 indicators suggested predictive performance under the applied cross-validation procedure. Between-outcome coefficient differences were not significant after Holm correction. Predictive assessment must be distinguished from causal inference [28], [30], while adequate sample size does not guarantee representativeness [23].

The principal contribution of this model is its integration of four distinct theoretical mechanisms: meaningful work as an intrinsic resource, organizational support as a basis for reciprocity, workload as a quantitative demand, and organizational justice as the legitimacy of decisions and treatment. All four are analyzed against two parallel outcomes without equating restricted discretionary contributions with the desire to leave an organization. This approach connects Job Demands–Resources Theory, Organizational Support Theory, and justice perspectives within one comparative framework while preserving conceptual and

measurement distinctions between Y1 and Y2. The theoretical implication is that withdrawal-related behavior should be understood through the balance among intrinsic resources, social exchange relationships, demand intensity, and the legitimacy of organizational management rather than through any one factor alone. Longitudinal designs and invariance testing across subsectors would be relevant methodological extensions for evaluating stability and temporal ordering.

In South Sulawesi, application of these recommendations should consider heterogeneity in subsectors, employment relationships, and access to organizational resources. Statistics Indonesia's South Sulawesi Provincial Office [4] reported the composition of formal employment, but this indicator does not measure quiet quitting or turnover intention prevalence among early-career employees. Managerial initiatives should therefore begin with an organizational diagnosis: clear incentive criteria, opportunities to appeal decisions, consistent communication, supervisory support, and respect in everyday interactions. The perspectives of Serenko [2] and Atiku et al. [15] reinforce the importance of examining employee experiences in human capital management. Intervention priorities can be set through regular evaluations of job demands, support access, perceived fairness, and the two withdrawal-related outcomes separately.

## 5. Conclusion

First, the parallel-outcome model yielded relationship directions consistent with all eight hypotheses across the 400 analyzed observations. Meaningful work, perceived organizational support, and organizational justice were negatively associated with both quiet quitting and turnover intention, whereas workload was positively associated with both. $R^2$ values of 0.446 for Y1 and 0.415 for Y2 demonstrate the model's explanatory capacity within the analyzed data. Its main analytical contribution is to examine two withdrawal-related responses within one measurable framework without treating them as identical phenomena.

Second, integrating Job Demands–Resources Theory, Organizational Support Theory, and organizational justice perspectives shows that the four predictors represent complementary rather than substitutable mechanisms. Meaningful work captures intrinsic reasons for engagement, organizational support reflects reciprocity, workload represents the intensity of demands, and justice assesses the legitimacy of procedures and treatment. This distinction strengthens the theoretical argument that limiting contributions beyond formal duties does not automatically imply an intention to leave or a breach of contract.

Third, meaningful work had the largest absolute coefficient for quiet quitting, while organizational support had the largest for turnover intention in the tested configuration. Nevertheless, coefficient differences between outcomes were not significant after Holm correction; superiority of one association cannot be inferred from coefficient magnitude alone. Within the organizational justice construct, procedural and distributive weights were significant, while interpersonal and informational weights were individually nonsignificant. All four dimensions remain relevant to the construct's conceptual coverage, and further evaluation should consider outer loadings, content validity, and formative convergent validity.

Fourth, testable managerial implications include job enrichment and meaningful feedback, more responsive supervisors, workload control and adequate recovery time, and greater transparency in reward allocation and procedural consistency. Companies can evaluate these initiatives over time by examining changes in perceived resources, demands, fairness, quiet quitting, and turnover intention. Evaluations must distinguish withdrawal behavior from legitimate professional decisions to maintain work boundaries so that interventions do not undermine employee trust.

Fifth, the methodological implications concern the need for consistency among construct definitions, instruments, and interpretations. Assessments of meaningful work, organizational support, workload,

organizational justice, quiet quitting, and turnover intention should follow clearly documented adaptation and validation procedures using the relevant original instruments [26], [25], [24]. Future studies could extend the framework through longitudinal designs, invariance testing across subsectors and locations, and comparisons by career stage and employment status. Such approaches could separate contextual organizational variation from individual characteristics and improve inferential precision when two withdrawal-related responses are analyzed in parallel. Managerial recommendations should therefore be treated as a measurable evaluation agenda rather than a basis for generalization without accounting for population context.

## 6. References

[1] Armstrong, R., and Pfandler, C., "Taming a wild new term: Exploring the concept of quiet quitting as a coping response," Employee Relations: The International Journal, 46(8), 1805–1825, 2024, doi: 10.1108/ER-03-2024-0172.

[2] Serenko, A., "The human capital management perspective on quiet quitting: Recommendations for employees, managers, and national policymakers," Journal of Knowledge Management, 28(1), 27–43, 2024, doi: 10.1108/JKM-10-2022-0792.

[3] Kim, K. T., and Sohn, Y. W., "The impact of quiet quitting on turnover intentions in the era of digital transformation: The mediating roles of job satisfaction and affective commitment, and the moderating role of psychological safety," Systems, 12(11), Article 460, 2024, doi: 10.3390/systems12110460.

[4] Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan, "Mei 2026: Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka (TPT) Sulawesi Selatan sebesar 4,66 persen," 2026. Available: https://sulsel.bps.go.id/id/pressrelease/2026/08/05/985/mei-2026--tingkat-pengangguran-terbuka--tpt--sulawesi-selatan-sebesar-4-66-persen.html

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

[6] Allan, B. A., Batz-Barbarich, C., Sterling, H. M., and Tay, L., "Outcomes of meaningful work: A meta-analysis," Journal of Management Studies, 56(3), 500–528, 2019, doi: 10.1111/joms.12406.

[7] Lysova, E. I., Allan, B. A., Dik, B. J., Duffy, R. D., and Steger, M. F., "Fostering meaningful work in organizations: A multi-level review and integration," Journal of Vocational Behavior, 110, 374–389, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2018.07.004.

[8] Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., and Adis, C. S., "Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory," Journal of Management, 43(6), 1854–1884, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0149206315575554.

[9] Eisenberger, R., Rhoades Shanock, L., and Wen, X., "Perceived organizational support: Why caring about employees counts," Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7, 101–124, 2020, doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917.

[10] Colquitt, J. A., "On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure," Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386–400, 2001, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386.

[11] Haar, J., Ghafoor, A., and Brougham, D., "Quiet quitting after COVID-19: Antecedents and gender differences," Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 64(2), Article e70065, 2026, doi: 10.1111/1744-7941.70065.

[12] Galanis, P., Moisoglou, I., Katsiroumpa, A., Gallos, P., Kalogeropoulou, M., Meimeti, E., and Vraka, I., "Workload increases nurses' quiet quitting, turnover intention, and job burnout: Evidence from Greece," AIMS Public Health, 12(1), 44–55, 2025, doi: 10.3934/publichealth.2025004.

[13] Özkan, A. H., "Organizational justice perceptions and turnover intention: A meta-analytic review," Kybernetes, 52(8), 2886–2899, 2023, doi: 10.1108/K-01-2022-0119.

[14] Galanis, P., Moisoglou, I., Malliarou, M., Papathanasiou, I. V., Katsiroumpa, A., Vraka, I., Siskou, O., Konstantakopoulou, O., and Kaitelidou, D., "Quiet quitting among nurses increases their turnover intention: Evidence from Greece in the post-COVID-19 era," Healthcare, 12(1), Article 79, 2024, doi: 10.3390/healthcare12010079.

[15] Atiku, S. O., Jeremiah, A., and Genty, K. I., "Effects of workplace silence, quiet quitting, and quiet firing on employee turnover: Evidence from the service industry," International Journal of Organizational Analysis. Advance online publication, 2025, doi: 10.1108/IJOA-04-2025-5389.

[16] Lestari, N. S., Zainal, V. R., Chan, S., and Nawangsari, L. C., "Impact of career development, job insecurity, and tech awareness on the quiet quitting of hospitality employees in Indonesia," Problems and Perspectives in Management, 22(3), 427–439, 2024, doi: 10.21511/ppm.22(3).2024.33.

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

[18] Karrani, M. A., Bani-Melhem, S., and Mohd-Shamsudin, F., "Employee quiet quitting behaviours: Conceptualization, measure development, and validation," The Service Industries Journal, 44(3–4), 218–236, 2024, doi: 10.1080/02642069.2023.2286604.

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

[20] Martela, F., and Pessi, A. B., "Significant work is about self-realization and broader purpose: Defining the key dimensions of meaningful work," Frontiers in Psychology, 9, Article 363, 2018, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00363.

[21] Gün, İ., Balsak, H., and Ayhan, F., "Mediating effect of job burnout on the relationship between organisational support and quiet quitting in nurses," Journal of Advanced Nursing, 81(8), 4644–4652, 2025, doi: 10.1111/jan.16599.

[22] Hoare, C., and Vandenberghe, C., "Are they created equal? A relative weights analysis of the contributions of job demands and resources to well-being and turnover intention," Psychological Reports, 127(1), 392–418, 2024, doi: 10.1177/00332941221103536.

[23] Kock, N., and Hadaya, P., "Minimum sample size estimation in PLS-SEM: The inverse square root and gamma-exponential methods," Information Systems Journal, 28(1), 227–261, 2018, doi: 10.1111/isj.12131.

[24] Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., and Duffy, R. D., "Measuring meaningful work: The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI)," Journal of Career Assessment, 20(3), 322–337, 2012, doi: 10.1177/1069072711436160.

[25] Spector, P. E., and Jex, S. M., "Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory," Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3(4), 356–367, 1998, doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.3.4.356.

[26] Bothma, C. F. C., and Roodt, G., "The validation of the turnover intention scale," SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 11(1), Article 507, 2013, doi: 10.4102/sajhrm.v11i1.507.

[27] Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J.-H., Becker, J.-M., and Ringle, C. M., "How to specify, estimate, and validate higher-order constructs in PLS-SEM," Australasian Marketing Journal, 27(3), 197–211, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ausmj.2019.05.003.

[28] Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., and Ringle, C. M., "When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM," European Business Review, 31(1), 2–24, 2019, doi: 10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203.

[29] Benitez, J., Henseler, J., Castillo, A., and Schuberth, F., "How to perform and report an impactful analysis using partial least squares: Guidelines for confirmatory and explanatory IS research," Information &

Management, 57(2), Article 103168, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.im.2019.05.003.
[30] Shmueli, G., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J.-H., Ting, H., Vaithilingam, S., and Ringle, C. M., "Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: Guidelines for using PLSpredict," European Journal of Marketing, 53(11), 2322–2347, 2019, doi: 10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0189.
[31] Fujii, M., "Linking customer incivility to quiet quitting through meaningful work," The Service Industries Journal. Advance online publication, 2026, doi: 10.1080/02642069.2026.2720238.
[32] Corbin, T. A., and Flenady, G., "Quiet quitting as compensatory respect: Meaningful work, recognition, and the entrepreneurial ethic," Philosophy of Management, 23(4), 461–480, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s40926-024-00320-4.
[33] Zhu, L.-L., Wang, H.-J., Xu, Y.-F., Ma, S.-T., and Luo, Y.-Y., "The effect of work engagement and perceived organizational support on turnover intention among nurses: A meta-analysis based on the Price–Mueller model," Journal of Nursing Management, 2023, Article 3356620, 2023, doi: 10.1155/2023/3356620.
[34] Kyei-Poku, I., "The influence of fair supervision on employees' emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions," Management Research Review, 42(9), 1116–1132, 2019, doi: 10.1108/MRR-12-2018-0494.
[35] Almarzoqee, F. Y., Bani-Melhem, S., Mohd-Shamsudin, F., Usman, M., and Nusairi, A., "Overwhelmed or withdrawn? How job demands and unfairness drive alienation, quiet quitting, knowledge withholding," Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility, 35(3), 2498–2511, 2026, doi: 10.1111/beer.70049.
[36] Su, Y., Jiang, Z., Meng, R., Lu, G., and Chen, C., "The effect of organizational justice on young nurses' turnover intention: The mediating roles of organizational climate and emotional labour," Nurse Education in Practice, 72, Article 103723, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.nepr.2023.103723.