

Quiet quitting in the era of hybrid work: A qualitative study on work motivation among generation Z

Nguyen Quang Anh¹, Nguyen Hoang Phuc^{2*}, Huynh Trong Hien¹, Luong Bich An²,
Nguyen Thi Huong Giang², Luong Thi My Duyen²

¹Song Hanh Institute for Business Administration, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

²University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

*Corresponding author: phucnguyen.31221023675@st.uieh.edu.vn

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
DOI:10.46223/HCMCOUJS. econ.en.16.4.4262.2026	With the growing prevalence of hybrid work, the phenomenon of quiet quitting has emerged as a critical challenge, particularly among Generation Z employees who seek purpose, autonomy, and work-life balance. This qualitative study aims to explore the motivational experiences of Gen Z employees in hybrid work environments and how these experiences relate to quiet quitting. Self-Determination Theory serves as a conceptual lens through which patterns emerge from the data. Data were collected through in-depth interviews and focus group discussions with 33 Gen Z employees and 05 managers working in hybrid roles across various industries in Vietnam. Thematic analysis was employed to identify patterns related to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and their connection to the quiet quitting phenomenon. This study uncovers key findings: (1) intrinsic motivation is weakened by social isolation and limited career growth, (2) extrinsic rewards alone are insufficient to sustain long-term engagement, and (3) leadership strategies play a pivotal role in mitigating disengagement. The study provides actionable recommendations for organizations, emphasizing the need for structured career development, enhanced recognition programs, and leadership approaches tailored to the expectations of Gen Z employees. These insights contribute to the evolving discourse on workplace motivation, offering a foundation for future research on employee engagement strategies in hybrid and remote work settings.
Received: March 27 th , 2025	
Revised: June 24 th , 2025	
Accepted: July 01 st , 2025	
JEL classification code: D23; M12; M14	
Keywords: extrinsic motivation; Gen Z employees; hybrid workplace; intrinsic motivation; quiet quitting	

1. Introduction

The shift towards hybrid work models has transformed workplace dynamics, creating both challenges and opportunities for employees and organizations. Hybrid workplaces combine remote and in-office work arrangements, addressing challenges related to location, cost, and management, while providing employees with the flexibility of remote work and the collaborative benefits of in-person interactions (Cook et al., 2020; Malhotra & Reay, 2019). A survey by ManpowerGroup Vietnam (2022) shows that over 50% of companies plan to adopt a hybrid work model post-pandemic, reflecting the shift towards flexible work to attract and retain talent. Similarly, 62% of Vietnamese workers prefer a hybrid model, highlighting the growing demand for flexibility in the workplace.

Within this context, the phenomenon of quiet quitting has emerged as a growing concern. Unlike absenteeism or organizational withdrawal, quiet quitting refers to employees disengaging emotionally while fulfilling only their minimum job requirements (Kilpatrick, 2022). Scholars differentiate it from other constructs like presenteeism or disengagement by positioning it as a reaction to overwork culture and emotional exhaustion (Galanis et al., 2023). Many young workers are not passively withdrawing but actively setting work boundaries to protect their mental health and maintain balance, a conscious response to a digitalized, volatile work environment that differs from traditional forms of withdrawal (Gandini & Leonini, 2019).

Previous research highlights motivation as a key factor influencing employee engagement and performance. However, most studies have predominantly examined this relationship within a traditional or fully remote workplace (Makki & Abid, 2017; Supriyono & Susmonowati, 2022). Despite the unique challenges and opportunities presented by hybrid work environments, limited research has explored how motivational factors impact the phenomenon of quiet quitting in this specific context.

Compared to other motivational theories, such as the Job Demands-Resources model, Self-determination theory focuses on the fulfillment of basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, relatedness), which are often challenged in hybrid work environments. Empirical evidence from Vietnam shows that autonomous motivation is crucial in shaping employee behavior and engagement (Nguyen et al., 2022; Nguyen & Vu, 2025). This study applies SDT to explore how motivation influences quiet quitting in hybrid settings, aiming to improve employee well-being and organizational resilience. The key research questions are as follows:

- (1) How do hybrid work characteristics affect Generation Z employees' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation?
- (2) How do motivation deficiencies lead to quiet quitting among Generation Z employees in hybrid work?
- (3) What strategies can be implemented in hybrid working to discourage quiet quitting among employees and within organizations?

2. Literature review

2.1. Quiet quitting

Quiet quitting is characterized by employees doing the bare minimum required for their jobs, avoiding extra effort or engagement (Radko, 2024; Scheyett, 2023). It reflects a broader cultural shift, particularly among younger generations, who prioritize personal well-being over traditional career ambitions (Radko, 2024). Quiet quitting can significantly affect organizational dynamics, leading to decreased productivity and morale (Talukder & Prieto, 2024). Though newly termed, quiet quitting reflects long-recognized reactions to unmet expectations, known as psychological contract breach, when unmet expectations lead employees to silently reduce effort and commitment (Suazo, 2009).

The phenomenon of quiet quitting in hybrid work environments often stems from a disconnect between employees' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Bansal & Garg, 2024). When employees lack intrinsic motivation, they often feel that their work does not provide meaning or personal satisfaction, leading to feelings of unfulfillment, reduced engagement, and ultimately quiet quitting (Radko, 2024). However, extrinsic motivation can temporarily

retain employees even when they are dissatisfied with their jobs (Dillard et al., 2024). Extrinsic motivation, while effective in the short term, can lead to overjustification, further straining intrinsic motivation and potentially resulting in disengagement (Bhadoriya & Chauhan, 2013). This is consistent with Serenko's (2024) finding that relying heavily on extrinsic factors can cause employees to connect less with the intrinsic value of their work, thereby increasing the phenomenon of quiet quitting.

Quiet quitting, caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and remote work, has affected all generations, especially Gen Z (Aydin & Azizoglu, 2022). Social distancing measures have reduced their sense of belonging and loyalty to organizations, making them the most vocal generation about this phenomenon (Aydin & Azizoglu, 2022). The impact of remote working on communication, including brainstorming, problem-solving, knowledge sharing, camaraderie, socialization, mentoring, and quiet quitting, continues to be a concern (Hofschulte-Beck, 2022). Generation Z, in particular, values work-life balance and may be more prone to quiet quitting if hybrid work conditions do not meet their expectations for career development and organizational support (Xueyun et al., 2023).

2.2. Motivation

Motivation drives organizational members to fulfill responsibilities and commitments (Jufrizen & Sitorus, 2021). Researchers often categorize motivation into two types: intrinsic and extrinsic, which help explain the diverse influences on human behavior (Yoo et al., 2012), particularly in changing work environments (Boyras & Gilbert, 2024).

Intrinsic motivation is the drive that encourages action and enhances self-determination, helping individuals reflect on their development (Ng, 2018). This motivation fosters a positive work environment, inspiring employees to exceed their responsibilities, especially in flexible settings, though limited supervision may create detachment from the organization (Saritha & Akthar, 2024). Intrinsic motivation promotes skill growth and progress (Garavan et al., 2004), while its absence can lead to quiet quitting (Serenko, 2024). Before the pandemic, intrinsic motivation thrived in on-site environments, direct organizational culture, and visible leadership (Pawirosumarto et al., 2017). The pandemic has shifted the ranking of intrinsic motivation sources, with the sense of choice and progress in work becoming more important (Majerova et al., 2021). In hybrid work environments, the increased autonomy can reduce social interaction, weakening emotional ties to the organization (Malviya & Gupta, 2022). Complex communication, constant pressure, and lack of rest can cause emotional exhaustion and lower performance (Hanzis & Hallo, 2024), even if intrinsic motivation is present (Herlambang et al., 2021). When employees feel unsupported or find no meaning in their work, they may do the minimum required, lacking genuine dedication (Serenko, 2024).

Extrinsic motivation is a key to maintaining employee engagement and performance, especially when intrinsic motivation is lacking or insufficient (Mansyur et al., 2024). Extrinsic motivation involves pursuing desired outcomes or avoiding negative outcomes (Ke & Zhang, 2010). In a hybrid work environment with limited supervision and low intrinsic motivation, material rewards like bonuses and promotions help maintain commitment and performance (Supriyono & Susmonowati, 2022). The post-pandemic period has made work motivation more complex, as employees now need not only incentives to work but also support to cope with technostress, social disconnection, and a lack of meaning (Chan et al., 2023). Furthermore, many unsatisfied employees continue to work because of financial pressures, limited labor markets, or contractual restraints (Dillard et al., 2024). Overemphasis on

extrinsic factors diminishes job enjoyment and genuine dedication (Fang et al., 2013). This leads to a cycle of overwork, unfairness, burnout, and quiet quitting as a way to cope (Fang et al., 2013; Serenko, 2024).

2.3. Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides a valuable framework for understanding the motivations underlying the phenomenon of quiet quitting (Aydin & Azizoglu, 2022; Battaglio et al., 2022; Van den Broeck et al., 2016). This perspective also proves useful in Vietnamese settings where autonomous motivation strongly influences work behavior (Nguyen et al., 2022). SDT explains both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, highlighting their impact on behavior, social and cognitive development, and personality formation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). This theory emphasizes the significance of fulfilling three fundamental psychological needs: competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Abdullah & Bangcola, 2024; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Van den Broeck et al., 2016). Autonomy refers to volition, the desire to self-organize experience and behavior, as well as to execute activity in alignment with one's self-awareness, integration, and sense of freedom (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Competence concerns individuals' capabilities, abilities, and skills, reflecting their effectiveness in achieving outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Relatedness encompasses feelings of belongingness, connection, and a sense of caring for others as well as being cared for (Deci & Ryan, 2000). These psychological needs play a decisive role in determining intrinsic motivation, which is inherently linked to engagement and job satisfaction (Pronin & Krivopuskov, 2022). By fulfilling competence, autonomy, and relatedness, SDT posits that employees are more likely to be intrinsically motivated, enhancing their overall well-being and job performance while reducing tendencies toward disengagement and quiet quitting (Deci et al., 2017). Additionally, extrinsic motivators, such as a system of rewards and penalties, can also play a complementary role (Doshi & McGregor, 2015). For instance, organizations often set specific targets for employees, offering rewards like promotions or other perks to those who meet these goals (Doshi & McGregor, 2015).

When employees' needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness are unmet due to hybrid work arrangements, they are more likely to engage in quiet quitting. SDT explains that satisfying basic psychological needs enhances motivation, well-being, and job performance (Deci et al., 2017). Conversely, unmet needs lead to decreased motivation and negative health outcomes (Baumann & Sander, 2021). In the context of hybrid work arrangements, the lack of spontaneous feedback and visibility of achievements, which results from social distancing, can hinder competence, leading to disengagement and quiet quitting (Aydin & Azizoglu, 2022; Baumann & Sander, 2021). Remote work also impacts relatedness, as social distancing and limited face-to-face interactions can lead to isolation. Despite communication technologies, technostress from excessive information and communication technology use can result in loneliness and a loss of connection, which negatively affects employees' sense of belonging (Gagné et al., 2022). Additionally, while job autonomy was initially thought to increase with remote work flexibility (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Wang et al., 2021), it may decrease when managers engage in close monitoring, undermining trust and autonomy (Fana et al., 2021; Lange & Kayser, 2022).

3. Research design

To explore the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and quiet quitting behaviors in hybrid work environments, this study will use qualitative research methods.

Purposive sampling targets two groups: (1) Gen Z employees of hybrid workplaces and (2) managers of hybrid teams. Participants must have at least six months of hybrid work experience to ensure they have passed the initial adjustment phase, where motivation and engagement may be unstable (Adil et al., 2023; Burt & Burt, 2015).

In-depth interviews

In-depth interviews help identify the factors influencing quiet quitting behaviors and understand how intrinsic and extrinsic motivations interact in hybrid workplaces. This method allows participants to share their views freely without being influenced by others (Boyce & Neale, 2006). According to Rodríguez-Montoya et al. (2024), interviews with employees uncover the causes and perceptions of quiet quitting while allowing themes to emerge from participants' responses, deepening the understanding of this phenomenon. Based on the key elements of the Quiet Quitting Scale by Galanis et al. (2023), the study uses these elements to construct interview questions, ensuring they effectively capture employees' experiences of quiet quitting. Dworkin (2012) recommends a minimum sample size of 25 - 30 participants to ensure in-depth analysis, clarification of conceptual relationships, and exploration of relevant cases in the data.

The in-depth interview method uses a semi-structured guide, allowing researchers to explore emergent themes related to quiet quitting while maintaining pre-determined questions (Eppich et al., 2019; Osborne & Grant-Smith, 2021). Open-ended questions encourage participants to share detailed perspectives, revealing emotions and attitudes that closed questions may overlook (Hansen & Świdarska, 2024). Data collection is discreet and secure, with interviews lasting 40 - 60 minutes. Tools like notebooks, audio recorders, and video devices are used to document information. After interviews, researchers analyze the data to identify recurring themes and patterns behind quiet quitting.

Focus Group Interview (FGI)

The focus group method is effective in understanding how people think, feel, and act on a specific topic (Freitas et al., 1998). Focus group discussions combine observation and interviews, promoting interaction and information sharing. This method helps explore intrinsic and extrinsic motivations related to quiet quitting in hybrid work environments, revealing collective behaviors and perceptions, and offering insights on how organizations can address it.

Focus groups typically include 04 to 12 participants to balance diversity of perspectives and manageability (Freitas et al., 1998). Smaller groups are particularly effective for sensitive topics, as they are easier to moderate (Morgan, 1996). In this study, two focus groups were conducted: one with managers and one with employees. Those unable or unwilling to join were offered in-depth interviews instead.

Data analysis

Data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) 06 steps to ensure credibility. NVivo 15 supported coding, conceptual networks, group comparisons, and text searches for accurate conclusions. The combination of individual interviews and focus groups improved data collection and validation (Adami & Kiger, 2005; Halcomb & Andrew, 2005). Interviews provided in-depth insights, while focus groups explored shared opinions, enhancing understanding of the phenomenon (Lambert & Loiselle, 2008; Molzahn et al., 2005). Sample size followed data saturation, continuing until no new themes emerged (Guest et al., 2006). Participants were assigned to either interviews or focus groups in a non-systematic manner,

with flexibility for switching based on availability or preference (Rees et al., 2003; Taylor, 2005). To ensure intercoder reliability, data were independently coded and compared to reach consensus (Coleman et al., 2024). Memoing recorded thoughts and decisions boosts transparency and reliability, especially when combined with computer-assisted analysis (Vicary et al., 2017). Final themes were identified based on frequency, relevance, and consistency, then checked through peer discussions and comparisons across data sources.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive statistics

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

	In-depth Interview	Focus Group Interview Employee	Focus Group Interview Manager
Total participants	27	6	5
Gender			
Female	13	4	2
Male	14	2	3
Work experience			
< 01 year	10	0	0
01 - 03 years	12	4	2
> 03 years	5	2	3
Hybrid work frequency per week		02 - 03 days/week	

Note. The Authors compile

The study sample consisted of a total of 38 participants, including 27 in-depth interviewees, 06 focus group participants in the employee role, and 05 in the managerial role. In terms of gender, the sample was evenly distributed with 19 females and 19 males, ensuring a balanced representation of perspectives. Regarding work experience, 10 participants had less than one year of experience (all from the in-depth interview group), 18 had between one and three years, and 10 had more than three years of experience. The majority fell into the one-to-three-year category, reflecting a workforce in the developmental stage of their careers. In terms of hybrid work frequency, most participants reported working at the office an average of two to three days per week.

4.2. Themes

4.2.1. Intrinsic motivational forces

Intrinsic motivation directly impacts work motivation, especially in hybrid environments. Respondents 16, 18, 19, and 21 stated that personal feelings (sleepiness, fatigue, etc.) can reduce their enthusiasm at the start of work. Respondents 14, 17, 18, 19 noted that hybrid work impacts motivation through time management. For example, interviewee 18 appreciated saving commute time and using it for self-care, like breakfast or coffee to boost energy. 05 respondents (6, 15, 19, 20, 26) emphasized that discipline is crucial - without direct supervision, distractions, and procrastination are more likely.

According to respondent 20, discipline is key in hybrid work, as it demands high self-motivation without direct supervision. Low discipline leads to lower commitment, as employees lose their sense of responsibility and drive.

In relation to work, the perception of meaning and value strongly influences dedication. 17 interviewees said that feeling their work had purpose increased their enthusiasm and willingness to contribute. Respondent 23 stated that their motivation and enthusiasm at the start of the day came from feeling that they were gaining personal value from their work, not just from financial rewards. According to FGI employee 3, work motivation comes from clear direction, knowing what they want and need to achieve their goals, thus maintaining enthusiasm and excitement in their work. Conversely, ambiguity, lack of direction, and boredom negatively affect motivation. According to FGI employee 4, they only work at 70% and just support urgent, necessary tasks.

The pressure from KPIs can make employees feel like their work no longer has personal meaning. While designed to guide performance, rigid application in hybrid environments can foster feelings of control and limit flexibility. 15 interviewees expressed concerns that unsuitable or overly demanding KPIs lead to demotivation and disengagement. According to FGI employees 2 and 5, they were not given suitable goals and had to work overtime and endure constant pressure to meet management's expectations. FGI employee 4 felt demotivated because the company's policy pushed them to focus excessively on chasing KPIs and closing sales, far beyond what their role originally required. On the other hand, appropriately tailored KPIs can serve as a positive motivator. Respondents 15 and 27 viewed KPIs as essential for driving personal and professional growth.

Autonomy and self-determination are positively correlated with work motivation. When work lacks autonomy and employees are not involved in decision-making, intrinsic motivation easily diminishes due to the loss of a sense of ownership and personal connection to the work. 8 interviewees believe that autonomy and proactiveness significantly impact their work motivation. Interviewee 21 stated that one of the factors that boosts work motivation in a hybrid environment is the ability to flexibly decide when to start and stop work, as long as time and quality standards are met. In reality, leaders agree that empowering employees to make decisions fosters proactivity and flexibility. However, perspectives differ by sector. In manufacturing, strict processes limit employees' decision-making autonomy (FGI managers 2, 3, 4, 5). In contrast, business-to-customer settings like service centers require greater flexibility, as each customer situation is unique, making empowerment essential (FGI manager 1).

4.2.2. Extrinsic motivational forces

Extrinsic factors strongly influence employees' motivation and performance, especially in hybrid settings. Online communication often lacks clarity, hindering cross-department coordination, delaying conflict resolution, and heightening deadline pressure (12 respondents). 06 employees in FGI revealed that limited face-to-face interaction weakens problem-solving. Especially in service roles, the interruption of hybrid workplaces makes it difficult for employees to approach and build trust with customers (FGI employee 6). Remote work also weakens colleague relationships, reducing collaboration and information flow, with prolonged isolation causing employees to feel unfocused and unmotivated (participants 2, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 27). Repetitive solo tasks in a low-interaction environment quickly become draining, with work feeling meaningless - even when targets were met, as shared by interviewee 2. The FGI manager 3, 5 claims that employees' inefficiency stems from the comfort of the hybrid

environment and advocates for closer supervision. However, management changes are resisted and poorly implemented.

Respondents 3, 5, 6, 14, and 23 noted that the company largely neglects training, offering shallow programs without adequate support for skill development. This is worsened by weak management guidance, leaving employees to figure things out themselves (Participants 1, 5, 6, 9, 24). Additionally, respondents 9, 12, and 24 report unfair treatment through uneven task allocation and favoritism, fueling dissatisfaction and reluctance to fully engage.

Conversely, 17 participants mentioned leaders who provide positive support through timely feedback and clear development opportunities. However, high expectations from leadership, coupled with unrealistic targets, create stress and a sense of helplessness when resources are insufficient. Interviewee 22 shares that finishing tasks early often leads to extra assignments, causing employees to do the bare minimum to meet deadlines. Participant 1 believes focusing too much on quantity often decreases quality. FGI employee 4 highlighted the unclear boundary between work time and personal time, making it difficult to balance work and life. She added that when starting a project, she intentionally uses only 75% of her capacity as a coping mechanism, allowing flexibility when expectations rise.

A major issue is the company's inadequate compensation policy. Although contributions are acknowledged, the company mainly provides a basic salary, with no opportunities for advancement or special recognition. This has led 13 participants to feel overlooked and stagnant in their career development. Interviewee 10 argued that evaluating only the final results, without considering effort, is unjust. As shared by interviewee 5, lower-level employees, despite high contributions, receive fewer rewards than their higher-level counterparts. According to interviewee 1, the intern's salary does not align with the workload, leading to dissatisfaction and eagerness to leave. This unfair compensation system undermines employee engagement and performance, causing dissatisfaction and reduced retention as employees seek fairer opportunities elsewhere. According to management FGI data, while recognizing the issues, a limited budget prevents the company from increasing salaries, improving benefits, or investing in quality training.

Most participants (except for 7, 20, and 25, who focus on personal development) believe the lack of recognition and purpose in their work significantly lowers commitment and productivity. These employees feel disrespected, lose motivation, and only complete tasks minimally. However, 18 individual interview responses and 06 FGI employees highlighted that financial incentives are key to keeping employees engaged. Employees view their jobs primarily as a source of income, and fair compensation increases their likelihood of staying and contributing.

4.2.3. *Quiet quitting*

12 respondents indicated that an employee shows behaviours of quiet quitting when they do not proactively contribute ideas and do not tend to expand their relationships with colleagues within the organization. Primarily, they fulfill their assigned tasks without attempting to enhance or optimize their work. Participants 4, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 21 rarely propose new ideas and typically follow familiar methods, showing little interest in changing or experimenting with new approaches.

However, despite working in a holding pattern, 18 respondents across various professions still strive to maintain their performance and complete tasks on time, as the dynamic

work environment fosters their professional growth. Respondent 4 - a sales staff member at an English language center - believes that when colleagues support one another, it creates a positive atmosphere where the boss acknowledges and rewards good performance. Sometimes, the boss even buys food and drinks for employees to keep them motivated in the workplace (participant 4). 03 FGI employees (participants 1, 2, 3) expressed their enthusiasm for the culture of mutual assistance, as they receive timely feedback and support regardless of whether they are working directly or online, outside of office hours, late at night, or even during holidays.

With the increasing integration of AI in the workforce, the displacement of human labor has become more prevalent, leading to significant layoffs even within major corporations. In this context, 16 respondents remain in a holding pattern, prioritizing job stability to sustain their current income and retain company-provided benefits. The FGI manager 4 claims that economic disparities and individual expectations can influence how employees approach their work. While some employees are satisfied with their current salary and benefits, leading them to maintain only a minimal level of effort without seeking further development, others with higher financial or career advancement expectations may exhibit disengagement if these needs are not met.

Quiet quitting not only reflects an individual's work attitude but also generates reciprocal impacts on both employees and organizations. First, this phenomenon helps employees feel less pressured, not overloaded with work, and have more time for their healthcare (Participants 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 21). Respondent 21 believes that working just enough can help employees avoid burnout in a high-pressure work environment. However, if employees work at a reduced pace for an extended period, they will miss out on opportunities for personal development (Participants 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 27) and are more likely to be laid off (6, 14, 21). Respondent 23 believes this situation will negatively affect the work atmosphere and other employees.

From the business perspective, respondent 21 believes this could be an opportunity for the company to reconsider KPIs, management processes, or company culture, thereby improving work methods and employee motivation. However, 14 respondents believe that when employees fall into a state of working half-heartedly, it will create a stagnant work culture within the company and fail to achieve business effectiveness. When employees work at a standstill, lacking effort in innovation and creativity, the company also becomes slow to innovate, easily losing its competitive edge (participants 6, 14, 15, 21).

5. Conclusion and implications

5.1. Conclusions

This study examines the motivational factors influencing quiet quitting in hybrid workplaces, revealing that disengagement primarily stems from unclear career progression, lack of recognition, and weak leadership support. Additionally, ineffective online communication, limited face-to-face interaction, and inadequate training programs contribute to reduced motivation. As a result, many employees adopt a minimal-effort mindset, particularly when extrinsic rewards are inconsistent or lacking.

Despite these challenges, strong leadership and defined career pathways play a key role in sustaining engagement. Feelings of support and recognition can decrease disengagement. However, ongoing concerns about job stability, especially in the context of AI-driven changes, continue to affect employees' willingness to engage. Furthermore, blurred boundaries between work and personal life in hybrid environments contribute to emotional exhaustion and decreased intrinsic motivation. A loss of autonomy and lack of recognition in virtual settings

often diminish one's sense of purpose and belonging, while the absence of in-person social connection exacerbates detachment.

Practically, the study helps organizations identify early signs and root causes of quiet quitting. These often manifest subtly through reduced initiative, task withdrawal, or low participation, and reflect deeper dissatisfaction rather than laziness. The findings underscore the importance of observing behavioral shifts, particularly in remote work settings where nonverbal cues are limited.

Theoretically, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of motivation in hybrid work contexts. Drawing on self-determination theory, it explains how both intrinsic and extrinsic factors interact with organizational and technological conditions. It also emphasizes that motivation is dynamic and shaped by individual, organizational, and broader societal factors.

Future research could explore how cultural differences influence quiet quitting behaviors, investigate the long-term effects of remote work on intrinsic motivation, and examine how the psychological contract between employees and organizations evolves in the digital era, particularly in the context of Vietnamese cultural values and norms.

5.2. Management implications

5.2.1. Implications for employees

Self-reflection is crucial for employees who feel stagnant in their roles. If dissatisfaction stems from poor pay or limited growth, they should explore better job opportunities. If the issue lies with personal drive, improving performance could open up new career possibilities. In cases where growth seems limited, alternative career paths might be necessary.

Open communication with managers and coworkers is key to addressing stagnation. Engaging with supervisors fosters a supportive atmosphere and helps employees feel recognized. For those early in their careers, interacting with leadership is essential for motivation.

By communicating, employees can build relationships, increase engagement, and create advancement opportunities. Breaking down KPIs into smaller, manageable goals, such as daily or weekly targets, reduces stress, maintains motivation, and encourages steady progress.

5.2.2. Implications for organizations

Improving employee benefits and recognizing their efforts helps reduce stagnation. Simple programs like "Employee of the Month" or performance-based rewards make people feel valued and motivated. Clear and regular recognition, both verbal and material, builds stronger commitment.

Employee engagement is maintained in a positive and transparent work environment. Supervisors should assign work according to employees' strengths and provide an environment that encourages candid discussions and idea exchange. Being adaptable, such as changing work schedules when necessary, promotes loyalty and well-being.

Career growth opportunities keep employees from feeling stuck. Offering training, mentoring, or rotating roles helps them learn and face new challenges. Creative projects also bring meaning and excitement to work.

Giving employees more control over their time and tasks builds trust and accountability. Tools like Zalo or Telegram keep communication easy without micromanaging.

SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION

The manuscript clearly identifies a research gap; the manuscript extends or refines existing theories; the manuscript opens new directions for further research.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

CRedit: **Nguyen Quang Anh**: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Original Draft, Project Administration; **Nguyen Hoang Phuc**: Validation, Resources, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Project Administration; **Huynh Trong Hien**: Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Project Administration; **Luong Bich An**: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization; **Nguyen Thi Huong Giang**: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing; **Luong Thi My Duyen**: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing.

FUNDING

This research received no external funding.

NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- Abdullah, A., & Bangcola, A. (2024). Investigating the perspectives of millennial and Gen Z nurses on quiet quitting in Marawi City, Lanao del Sur, Philippines. *The Malaysian Journal of Nursing (MJN)*, 16(1), 135-148.
- Adami, M. F., & Kiger, A. (2005). The use of triangulation for completeness purposes. *Nurse Researcher*, 12(4), 19-29.
- Adil, A., Kausar, S., Ameer, S., Ghayas, S., & Shujja, S. (2023). Impact of organizational socialization on organizational citizenship behavior: Mediating role of knowledge sharing and role clarity. *Current Psychology*, 42(7), 5685-5693. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01899-x>
- Aydin, E., & Azizoglu, Ö. (2022). A new term for an existing concept: Quiet quitting - A self determination perspective. In *International congress on critical debates in social sciences* (pp. 285-295).
- Bansal, S., & Garg, N. (2024). Quitting silently: A longitudinal research on the impact of workplace conflict and nonviolent work behavior. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 42(2), 241-258. <https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.21444>
- Battaglio, R. P., Belle, N., & Cantarelli, P. (2022). Self-determination theory goes public: Experimental evidence on the causal relationship between psychological needs and job satisfaction. *Public Management Review*, 24(9), 1411-1428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1900351>
- Baumann, O., & Sander, E. L. J. (2021). Psychological impacts of remote working under social distancing restrictions. In *Handbook of research on remote work and worker well-being in the post-Covid-19 era* (pp. 1-17). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-6754-8.ch001>

- Bhadoriya, S., & Chauhan, S. S. (2013). A critical analysis on intrinsic & extrinsic factors of motivation. *International Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 3(3), 20-26.
- Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). *Conducting in-depth interviews: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input* (vol. 2). Pathfinder International.
- Boyras, M., & Gilbert, R. (2024). Is the future of work hybrid? Examining motivations and expectations related to working from home in knowledge workers' lived experiences. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 46(5), 1086-1111. <https://doi.org/10.1108/er-09-2023-0478>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>.
- Burt, C. D., & Burt, C. D. (2015). The initial employment period: Behaviors, familiarity, adaptation and trust development. In *New employee safety: Risk factors and management strategies* (pp. 91-107). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18684-9_7
- Chan, X. W., Shang, S., Brough, P., Wilkinson, A., & Lu, C. Q. (2023). Work, life and Covid-19: A rapid review and practical recommendations for the post-pandemic workplace. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 61(2), 257-276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12355>
- Coleman, M. L., Ragan, M., & Dari, T. (2024). Intercoder reliability for use in qualitative research and evaluation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 57(2), 136-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2024.2303715>
- Cook, J., Mor, Y., & Santos, P. (2020). Three cases of hybridity in learning spaces: Towards a design for a Zone of Possibility. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(4), 1155-1167. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12945>
- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4(1), 19-43.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Dillard, N., Cavallo, T., & Zhang, P. (2024). A return to humanism: A multi-level analysis exploring the positive effects of quiet quitting. *Human Resource Development Review*, 24(2), Article 15344843241305655. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843241305655>
- Doshi, N., & McGregor, L. (2015). *Primed to perform*. Harper Collins.
- Dworkin, S. L. (2012). Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(6), 1319-1320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-0016-6>
- Eppich, W. J., Gormley, G., & Teunissen, P. W. (2019). *In-depth interviews*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26837-4_12
- Fana, M., Massimo, F. S., & Moro, A. (2021). *Autonomy and control in mass remote working during the Covid-19 pandemic: Evidence from a cross-professional and cross-national analysis* (No. 2021/28, LEM Working Paper Series). <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/247297>

- Fang, M., Gerhart, B., & Ledford, G. E. (2013). Negative effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation: More smoke than fire. *World at Work Quarterly*, 16(2), 17-29.
- Freitas, H., Oliveira, M., Jenkins, M., & Popjoy, O. (1998). The focus group, a qualitative research method. *Journal of Education*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Gabelaia, I., & Bagočiūnaitė, R. (2024). The impact of “quiet quitting” on overall organizational behavior and culture. In *International conference on reliability and statistics in transportation and communication* (pp. 366-378). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-53598-7_33
- Gagné, M., Parker, S. K., Griffin, M. A., Dunlop, P. D., Knight, C., Klonek, F. E., & Parent-Rocheleau, X. (2022). Understanding and shaping the future of work with self-determination theory. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1(7), 378-392. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-022-00056-w>
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), Article 1524.
- Galanis, P., Katsiroumpa, A., Vraha, 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>
- Gandini, A., & Leonini, L. (2019). The myth of flexibility: Young adults' expectations of work in the digital economy in milan. In *Youth and the politics of the present* (pp. 101-112). Routledge.
- Garavan, T. N., McGuire, D., & O'Donnell, D. (2004). Exploring human resource development: A levels of analysis approach. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(4), 417-441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484304271669>
- Gilson, L. L., Lim, H. S., Luciano, M. M., & Choi, J. N. (2013). Unpacking the cross-level effects of tenure diversity, explicit knowledge, and knowledge sharing on individual creativity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(2), 203-222.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903>
- Guest, G., Namey, E., Taylor, J., Eley, N., & McKenna, K. (2017). Comparing focus groups and individual interviews: Findings from a randomized study. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(6), 693-708. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2017.1281601>
- Halcomb, E. J., & Andrew, S. (2005). Triangulation as a method for contemporary nursing research. *Nurse Researcher*, 13(2), 71-82.
- Hansen, K., & Świdarska, A. (2024). Integrating open-and closed-ended questions on attitudes towards outgroups with different methods of text analysis. *Behavior Research Methods*, 56(5), 4802-4822. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-023-02218-x>
- Hanzis, A., & Hallo, L. (2024). The experiences and views of employees on hybrid ways of working. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(10), Article 263. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14100263>
- Herlambang, M. B., Cnossen, F., & Taatgen, N. A. (2021). The effects of intrinsic motivation on mental fatigue. *PloS One*, 16(1), e0243754. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0243754>

- Hofschulte-Beck, A. (2022). *The long-term impacts of remote working on employees and employers* [Doctoral dissertation]. The College of St. Scholastica.
- Jufrizen, J., & Sitorus, T. S. (2021). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja dengan disiplin kerja sebagai variabel intervening. *Seminar Nasional Teknologi Edukasi Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 1(1), 844-859. <https://doi.org/10.53695/sintesa.v1i1.419>
- Ke, W., & Zhang, P. (2010). The effects of extrinsic motivations and satisfaction in open source software development. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 11(12), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00251>
- Kilpatrick, A. (2022). *A look at “quiet quitting” - and whether it’s a good or bad thing*. National Public Radio. <https://www.npr.org/2022/08/22/1118843708/a-look-at-quiet-quitting-and-whether-its-a-good-or-bad-thing>
- Krajčík, M., Schmidt, D. A., & Baráth, M. (2023). Hybrid work model: An approach to work-life flexibility in a changing environment. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(6), Article 150. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13060150>
- Lambert, S. D., & Loiselle, C. G. (2008). Combining individual interviews and focus groups to enhance data richness. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(2), 228-237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04559.x>
- Lange, M., & Kayser, I. (2022). The role of self-efficacy, work-related autonomy and work-family conflict on employee’s stress level during home-based remote work in Germany. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(9), Article 4955. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19094955>
- Majerova, J., Gajanova, L., Nadanyiova, M., & Derecskei, A. K. (2021). Intrinsic motivation sources as pillars of sustainable internal marketing communication in turbulent post-pandemic times. *Sustainability*, 13(16), Article 8799. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13168799>
- Makki, A., & Abid, M. (2017). Influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee’s task performance. *Studies in Asian Social Science*, 4(1), 38-43. <https://doi.org/10.5430/sass.v4n1p38>
- Malhotra, N., & Reay, T. (2019). Hybridity and power in the microfoundations of professional work. In *Microfoundations of institutions* (vol. 65B, pp. 241-255). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X2019000065B017>
- Malviya, L., & Gupta, V. (2022). Empathy, autonomy, and trust critical for organizational culture in a hybrid workplace. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2022(1), Article 11284. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2022.11284abstract>
- Manpower Vietnam. (2022). *Recruitment trends survey for Q1 and Q2, 2022* [In Vietnamese]. <https://www.manpower.com.vn/vi/insights/blogs/2023/10/khao-sat-xu-huong-tuyen-dung-quy-1-va-quy-2-2022>
- Mansyur, E., Salim, M., Abdillah, W., & Praningrum. (2024). Motivation as a key driver for performance improvement among health promotion staff at Jalan Gedang Health Centre, Bengkulu City. *International Journal on Economics, Finance and Sustainable Development*, 6(11), 267-273. <https://doi.org/10.31149/ijefsd.v6i11.5326>
- Molzahn, A. E., Starzomski, R., McDonald, M., & O’Loughlin, C. (2005). Chinese Canadian beliefs toward organ donation. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(1), 82-98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732304270653>

- Morgan, D. L. (1996). Focus groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22(1), 129-152.
- Mowat, H. (2022). Interviews and observation. In *The Wiley Blackwell companion to theology and qualitative research* (pp. 382-392). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119756927.ch37>
- Ng, B. (2018). The neuroscience of growth mindset and intrinsic motivation. *Brain Sciences*, 8(2), Article 20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8020020>
- Nguyen, H. T., & Vu, M. H. (2025). Quiet quitting: Insights from generation Z workers in Vietnam. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)*, 13(1), 8267-8282.
- Nguyen, T. V., Watanabe, T., & Nguyen, H. L. (2022). Importance of autonomous motivation in construction labor productivity improvement in Vietnam: A self-determination theory perspective. *Buildings*, 12(6), Article 763. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12060763>
- Osborne, N., & Grant-Smith, D. (2021). In-depth interviewing. In *Methods in urban analysis* (pp. 105-125). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-1677-8_7
- Pawirosumarto, S., Sarjana, P. K., & Gunawan, R. (2017). The effect of work environment, leadership style, and organizational culture towards job satisfaction and its implication towards employee performance in Parador Hotels and Resorts, Indonesia. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 59(6), 1337-1358. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-10-2016-0085>
- Petrova, M., Koval, V., Tepavicharova, M., Zerkal, A., Radchenko, A., & Bondarchuk, N. (2020). The interaction between the human resources motivation and the commitment to the organization. *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 9(3), 897-907. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2020.9.3\(15\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2020.9.3(15))
- Pronin, V. Y., & Krivopuskov, V. V. (2022). Psychological needs and motivation of remote workers: Sociological viewpoint. *Digital Sociology*, 5(4), 15-22. <https://doi.org/10.26425/2658-347x-2022-5-4-15-22>
- Radko, E. D. (2024). "Quiet quitting" as a new trend in the labor market. *Novosibirsk State University Press*, 24(1), 5-15. <https://doi.org/10.25205/2542-0429-2024-24-1-5-15>
- Rees, C. E., Ford, J. E., & Sheard, C. E. (2003). Patient information leaflets for prostate cancer: Which leaflets should healthcare professionals recommend? *Patient Education and Counseling*, 49(3), 263-272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991\(02\)00188-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991(02)00188-X)
- Rodríguez-Montoya, C., De Castro Morel, R., & Frías-Rodríguez, D. (2024). Quiet quitting in the Dominican Republic: The employers' perspective. *Management Research*, 22(4), 185-202. <https://doi.org/10.1108/mrjiam-12-2023-1488>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Saritha, T., & Akthar, P. (2024). The impact of hybrid work models on employee well-being and engagement. *Deleted Journal*, 31(5s), 97-104. <https://doi.org/10.52783/cana.v31.1003>
- Scheyett, A. (2023). Quiet quitting. *Social Work*, 68(1), 5-7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swac051>
- Serenko, A. (2024). 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>

- Suazo, M. M. (2009). The mediating role of psychological contract violation on the relations between psychological contract breach and work-related attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(2), 136-160.
- Supriyono, S., & Susmonowati, T. (2022). The role of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation to maintain employee performance productivity during Work From Home (WFH): A case study of a private university in Jakarta. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 27, 606-619.
- Talukder, M. F., & Prieto, L. (2024). A “quiet quitting” scale: development and validation. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 33(6), 1487-1510. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-01-2024-4182>
- Taylor, B. (2005). The experiences of overseas nurses working in the NHS: Results of a qualitative study. *Diversity and Equality in Health and Care*, 2(1), 17-27.
- Van den Broeck, A., Ferris, D., Chang, C., & Rosen, C. (2016). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 163-181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316632058>
- Vicary, S., Young, A., & Hicks, S. (2017). A reflective journal as learning process and contribution to quality and validity in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Social Work*, 16(4), 550-565. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325016635244>
- Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the Covid-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>
- Woodworth, R. S. (1918). *Dynamic psychology*. Columbia University Press.
- 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), Article 15438. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-42591-3>
- Yoo, S. J., Han, S. H., & Huang, W. (2012). The roles of intrinsic motivators and extrinsic motivators in promoting e-learning in the workplace: A case from South Korea. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(3), 942-950. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.12.015>

