

The Rise of Quiet Quitting: Work Ethic, Alienation, and Resistance in Modern Employment

*Parhlad Singh Ahluwalia, School of Management and Business Studies, Jamia Hamdard,
New Delhi, India*

Email : editor@shodhprakashan.in

Abstract

The phenomenon of "quiet quitting"—employees performing only their basic job requirements while avoiding additional unpaid labor—has emerged as a significant workplace trend reflecting broader changes in employee attitudes toward work, compensation, and work-life balance. This study examines quiet quitting as both a response to workplace alienation and a form of resistance to exploitative employment practices. Through analysis of survey data from 1,847 employees across various industries, interviews with 62 workers who identify as quiet quitters, and organizational case studies from 15 companies, we investigate the psychological, social, and economic factors driving this phenomenon. Drawing on Marxist theories of alienation, Hirschman's exit-voice-loyalty framework, and contemporary research on employee engagement, we analyze three key dimensions: (1) the relationship between quiet quitting and workplace alienation, (2) the role of generational differences in work attitudes and expectations, and (3) the implications of quiet quitting for organizational productivity and employee well-being. Findings reveal that quiet quitting represents a rational response to perceived workplace inequities, with employees strategically withdrawing effort when organizations fail to provide adequate compensation, recognition, or advancement opportunities. The study identifies quiet quitting as a form of "everyday resistance" that challenges traditional assumptions about employee loyalty and the Protestant work ethic while highlighting structural problems in contemporary employment relationships.

Keywords: quiet quitting, workplace alienation, employee resistance, work ethic, generational differences, employee engagement, labor relations, organizational psychology

Introduction

The term "quiet quitting" gained widespread attention in 2022 when TikTok videos describing the practice of doing only the minimum required work went viral, sparking debates about work ethic, employee loyalty, and the changing nature of employment relationships. While the terminology is new, the underlying phenomenon—employees strategically limiting their work effort in response to perceived workplace inequities—reflects

longstanding tensions between employers and workers over the terms and conditions of employment.

This paper argues that quiet quitting represents more than individual disengagement or generational laziness, as some critics have suggested. Instead, it constitutes a form of workplace resistance that emerges from structural contradictions in contemporary employment relationships, particularly the expectation that employees provide unlimited availability and effort in exchange for increasingly precarious compensation and benefits. Quiet quitting reflects what we term "strategic disengagement"—a conscious decision to establish boundaries around work effort and availability in response to perceived exploitation or unfairness.

The theoretical framework for this analysis draws primarily from Marx's (1844) theory of alienated labor, Hirschman's (1970) exit-voice-loyalty model, and Scott's (1985) concept of everyday resistance. We examine how quiet quitting functions as a form of "voice" that employees use when "exit" is not feasible and "loyalty" is no longer rewarded. This analysis is supplemented by contemporary research on employee engagement (Kahn, 1990), generational differences in work attitudes (Twenge, 2010), and the psychological contract between employers and employees (Rousseau, 1995).

The significance of understanding quiet quitting extends beyond workplace management to broader questions about the future of work, the social contract between employers and employees, and the sustainability of current employment models. As economic inequality increases and traditional career advancement paths become less reliable, quiet quitting may represent an early indicator of more fundamental changes in how workers relate to their employment.

Literature Review

Theories of Work Alienation

Marx's (1844) analysis of alienated labor provides a foundational framework for understanding quiet quitting as a response to workplace conditions. Marx identified four dimensions of alienation: workers' separation from the products of their labor, from the act of production itself, from their human essence, and from other workers. Contemporary research has extended this analysis to examine how modern employment relationships create conditions for alienation through deskilling, bureaucratization, and the commodification of human capabilities (Braverman, 1974).

Seeman (1959) operationalized Marx's concept of alienation through five psychological dimensions: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement.

These dimensions remain relevant for understanding contemporary workplace experiences, particularly among knowledge workers who may feel disconnected from the ultimate purpose of their labor or powerless to influence organizational decisions that affect their work lives.

Blauner (1964) demonstrated how different forms of work organization create varying levels of worker alienation, with assembly-line production creating the highest levels of alienation while craft work allows for greater autonomy and meaning. This analysis has been extended to contemporary service and knowledge work, where similar patterns of alienation emerge through standardization, surveillance, and the separation of conception from execution (Ritzer, 2018).

Employee Engagement and Disengagement

The concept of employee engagement, introduced by Kahn (1990), describes the psychological conditions under which employees invest their cognitive, emotional, and physical energies in work performance. Engaged employees demonstrate high levels of involvement, satisfaction, and enthusiasm for their work, while disengaged employees withdraw these investments. Quiet quitting can be understood as a specific form of disengagement characterized by strategic rather than passive withdrawal.

Gallup's research on employee engagement has consistently found that the majority of employees are either not engaged or actively disengaged from their work, with significant costs for organizational productivity and individual well-being (Harter et al., 2020). However, this research typically treats disengagement as a problem to be solved through better management practices rather than examining the structural conditions that create disengagement.

The concept of "job crafting" (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) suggests that employees actively shape their work experiences through physical, cognitive, and relational crafting. Quiet quitting can be understood as a form of job crafting where employees reduce their work involvement to create better alignment between their effort and perceived rewards.

Generational Differences in Work Attitudes

Research on generational differences in work attitudes has identified significant variations in how different age cohorts approach employment relationships. Twenge's (2010) analysis of generational data suggests that younger workers (Millennials and Generation Z) place greater emphasis on work-life balance, meaningful work, and fair compensation compared to older generations who may prioritize job security and organizational loyalty.

These generational differences reflect broader social and economic changes, including increased educational attainment, delayed homeownership and family formation, and reduced

expectations for traditional career advancement (Arnett, 2014). Younger workers have also experienced multiple economic recessions, reduced pension benefits, and increased job insecurity, creating different expectations about the employment relationship.

However, some researchers argue that apparent generational differences may actually reflect life course effects or period effects rather than true generational differences (Costanza et al., 2012). The challenge is distinguishing between age-related changes in work attitudes and genuine cohort effects that reflect different socialization experiences.

Workplace Resistance and Exit-Voice-Loyalty

Hirschman's (1970) exit-voice-loyalty framework provides a useful lens for understanding quiet quitting as a form of workplace resistance. When employees are dissatisfied with their work situation, they can choose to exit (leave the organization), voice their concerns (attempt to change conditions), or remain loyal (accept conditions while hoping for improvement).

Quiet quitting represents a fourth option that Hirschman did not explicitly consider: strategic disengagement that allows employees to remain in their positions while withdrawing their full effort and commitment. This strategy may be particularly attractive when exit is costly (due to limited job alternatives) and voice is ineffective (due to unresponsive management).

Scott's (1985) concept of "everyday resistance" describes how subordinated groups resist domination through subtle, informal practices that avoid direct confrontation with authority. Quiet quitting can be understood as a form of everyday resistance that allows employees to assert some control over their work experience without risking termination or explicit conflict with supervisors.

The Psychological Contract

Rousseau's (1995) research on psychological contracts examines the unwritten expectations and obligations that employees and employers have toward each other. These contracts include both transactional elements (pay for performance) and relational elements (loyalty, support, and development opportunities). When organizations violate these psychological contracts, employees may respond with reduced commitment and performance.

The rise of quiet quitting may reflect a broader erosion of the traditional psychological contract between employers and employees. As organizations have reduced job security, benefits, and advancement opportunities while increasing performance expectations, employees may be adjusting their own contributions to restore perceived balance in the employment relationship.

Research on psychological contract breach has found that violations of relational contracts (involving trust and mutual obligation) have stronger negative effects on employee attitudes

and behaviors than violations of transactional contracts (involving specific exchanges; Robinson & Morrison, 2000). This suggests that quiet quitting may be particularly likely when employees feel that organizations have violated relational expectations.

Methodology

This research employed a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative survey research with qualitative interviews and organizational case studies to examine the quiet quitting phenomenon from multiple perspectives. The study was conducted between 2023 and 2024 across three phases designed to capture both individual experiences and organizational responses to quiet quitting.

Survey Research

An online survey was distributed to 1,847 employed individuals across the United States and Canada through professional networks, social media platforms, and research participation services. The sample included employees from various industries, job levels, and demographic backgrounds. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 67 years ($M = 38.4$, $SD = 11.7$) and included 58% women, 40% men, and 2% non-binary individuals.

The survey instrument included validated measures of work alienation (Seeman, 1959), employee engagement (Utrecht Work Engagement Scale; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003), psychological contract fulfillment (Rousseau, 1995), and job satisfaction (Job Descriptive Index; Smith et al., 1969). Additional questions assessed quiet quitting behaviors, motivations for disengagement, generational attitudes toward work, and organizational responses to reduced employee effort.

Qualitative Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 62 participants who self-identified as engaging in quiet quitting behaviors. Participants were recruited through social media posts about the research and snowball sampling. The sample included representation across different industries (technology, healthcare, education, retail, finance), job levels (entry-level to senior management), and demographic characteristics.

Interviews lasted 45-90 minutes and explored participants' experiences with quiet quitting, including their motivations, strategies, and consequences. Topics included: definitions of quiet quitting, triggers for disengagement, boundary-setting practices, interactions with supervisors and colleagues, and reflections on work-life balance and career goals.

Organizational Case Studies

Case studies were conducted with 15 organizations that had experienced significant quiet quitting among their employees. Organizations were selected to represent different industries

and sizes, with data collected through interviews with HR professionals, managers, and employees. The case studies examined organizational responses to quiet quitting, including policy changes, management training, and employee retention strategies.

Results

Survey Findings

Survey results revealed that 34.7% of participants reported engaging in quiet quitting behaviors, defined as deliberately limiting work effort to basic job requirements while avoiding additional unpaid labor. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for key variables.

Table 1 : *Descriptive Statistics: Work Attitudes and Behaviors*

Variable	Mean	SD	Range	Cronbach's α
Work Alienation Scale	3.42	1.28	1-5	.89
Employee Engagement	3.67	1.45	1-6	.92
Psychological Contract Fulfillment	3.89	1.33	1-6	.87
Job Satisfaction	3.56	1.52	1-6	.91
Quiet Quitting Behaviors	2.89	1.67	1-6	.84
Work-Life Balance	3.23	1.44	1-6	.88
Career Advancement Expectations	3.78	1.56	1-6	.85

Correlation analyses revealed significant relationships between work alienation and quiet quitting behaviors ($r = .67, p < .001$), psychological contract fulfillment and employee engagement ($r = .71, p < .001$), and job satisfaction and work-life balance ($r = .58, p < .001$).

Table 2 examines the relationship between quiet quitting and various organizational and individual factors.

Table 2 : *Predictors of Quiet Quitting Behaviors*

Predictor	β	SE	t	p	R ²
Work Alienation	.45	.08	5.67	< .001	.31
Age	-.23	.06	-3.89	< .001	
Psychological Contract Breach	.32	.07	4.55	< .001	
Supervisor Support	-.28	.09	-3.12	< .01	
Compensation Satisfaction	-.19	.05	-3.78	< .001	
Advancement Opportunities	-.15	.06	-2.45	< .05	

Note: Model $F(6, 1840) = 137.8, p < .001$

The regression analysis shows that work alienation is the strongest predictor of quiet quitting behaviors, followed by age (younger employees more likely to quiet quit) and psychological contract breach.

Table 3 presents generational differences in work attitudes and quiet quitting behaviors.

Table 3 : *Generational Differences in Work Attitudes and Quiet Quitting*

Generation	n	Quiet Quitting (%)	Work Alienation	Employee Engagement	Work-Life Balance Priority
Gen Z (22-27)	387	52.7	3.89	3.12	4.67
Millennials (28-43)	654	41.3	3.56	3.45	4.23
Gen X (44-59)	589	28.2	3.21	3.89	3.78
Boomers (60-67)	217	15.2	2.98	4.12	3.34

Note: All generational differences significant at $p < .001$

The data reveals clear generational patterns, with younger employees significantly more likely to engage in quiet quitting and report higher work alienation while prioritizing work-life balance.

Organizational Factors and Quiet Quitting

Analysis of organizational factors associated with quiet quitting revealed significant variations across industries and company characteristics. Table 4 presents quiet quitting rates by industry and organizational factors.

Table 4 : *Quiet Quitting by Industry and Organizational Characteristics*

Factor	Quiet Quitting Rate (%)	Work Alienation Score	Employee Turnover (%)
Industry			
Technology	47.8	3.67	18.4
Healthcare	31.2	3.21	12.7
Education	29.6	3.08	8.9
Retail	42.3	3.78	24.6
Finance	38.9	3.45	15.2
Manufacturing	25.7	2.89	11.3
Company Size			
< 50 employees	28.4	3.12	19.7
50-500 employees	35.7	3.38	16.8
500+ employees	39.2	3.56	14.2
Remote Work Policy			
Fully remote	31.8	3.18	13.5
Hybrid	33.2	3.31	15.7
Fully in-office	41.7	3.72	18.9

The data shows that technology and retail industries have the highest quiet quitting rates, while organizations requiring full in-office presence report higher rates of both quiet quitting and work alienation.

Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis of interview data revealed five primary themes related to the quiet quitting phenomenon and its relationship to work alienation and resistance.

Theme 1: Boundary Setting and Work-Life Balance

Participants consistently described quiet quitting as a strategy for establishing boundaries between work and personal life after experiencing burnout or exploitation. Many reported previously going "above and beyond" their job requirements without receiving proportional recognition or compensation. As one participant explained: "I used to work 60-hour weeks and take on extra projects thinking it would lead to promotion or raises. When I realized that extra effort just became the new expectation without any additional reward, I decided to stick to my actual job description."

This boundary-setting was often triggered by specific incidents of perceived unfairness, such as being passed over for promotion despite exceptional performance, having additional responsibilities added without compensation, or receiving criticism despite consistently exceeding expectations.

Theme 2: Response to Organizational Inequity

Many participants described quiet quitting as a rational response to perceived inequities in their employment relationship. This included disparities between their contributions and rewards, as well as observations of how their organizations treated different employees. A manager in the technology sector noted: "When I saw new hires getting hired at salaries 20% higher than mine after five years with the company, and when my requests for raises were denied, I decided to adjust my effort to match what I'm actually being paid for."

Participants frequently mentioned feeling taken advantage of by employers who expected unlimited availability and effort while providing minimal job security, benefits, or advancement opportunities. Quiet quitting represented a way to restore balance in what they perceived as an unfair exchange relationship.

Theme 3: Disillusionment with Career Advancement

A significant number of participants described losing faith in traditional career advancement paths, leading them to reduce their investment in work-based achievement. This disillusionment often resulted from observing that hard work and exceptional performance did not reliably lead to promotion or increased compensation. One participant in healthcare

administration explained: "I watched colleagues who played politics get promoted over people who actually did excellent work. I realized that working harder wasn't going to change my career trajectory, so I decided to work smarter by protecting my time and energy."

This theme was particularly prominent among Millennial and Gen Z participants who had entered the workforce with high expectations for career growth but found limited opportunities for advancement in their organizations.

Theme 4: Resistance to Exploitative Practices

Participants described quiet quitting as a form of resistance to what they perceived as exploitative employment practices. This included expectations for unpaid overtime, constant availability outside work hours, and taking on responsibilities significantly beyond their job descriptions without additional compensation. A retail manager explained: "My company expected me to be available 24/7 for employee issues and to work through my days off during busy periods. Quiet quitting was my way of saying 'no' to being exploited without having to quit and lose my income."

This resistance was often subtle and strategic, designed to avoid direct confrontation while asserting some control over working conditions. Participants described carefully managing their availability and effort to meet basic job requirements while avoiding the additional labor that organizations had come to expect.

Theme 5: Preservation of Mental Health and Well-being

Many participants described quiet quitting as necessary for protecting their mental health and overall well-being. Previous experiences of burnout, anxiety, and work-related stress had motivated them to establish clearer boundaries around their work involvement. A marketing professional noted: "I was having panic attacks from work stress and my relationships were suffering because I was always thinking about work. Quiet quitting helped me reclaim my mental health and remember that I have a life outside of my job."

This theme highlighted the psychological costs of contemporary work expectations and the ways that employees use disengagement strategies to protect their well-being when organizational support is insufficient.

Organizational Responses to Quiet Quitting

The organizational case studies revealed varied responses to quiet quitting, ranging from punitive measures to genuine efforts to address underlying workplace issues. Table 5 summarizes the different response strategies observed.

Table 5 : *Organizational Responses to Quiet Quitting*

Response Strategy	Organizations (n=15)	Effectiveness Rating	Employee Satisfaction Change
Increased monitoring/surveillance	6	2.1/5	-0.34
Performance improvement plans	5	2.3/5	-0.28
Compensation adjustments	8	4.2/5	+0.67
Workload redistribution	7	3.8/5	+0.45
Management training	9	3.9/5	+0.52
Flexible work arrangements	11	4.5/5	+0.71
Career development programs	6	4.1/5	+0.58
Culture change initiatives	4	3.7/5	+0.39

Note: Effectiveness rating based on manager and HR assessments; satisfaction change measured over 6-month period

Organizations that responded to quiet quitting with punitive measures or increased surveillance generally saw decreased employee satisfaction and continued disengagement. In contrast, organizations that addressed underlying workplace issues through compensation adjustments, flexible work arrangements, and improved management practices saw improvements in employee satisfaction and engagement.

Discussion

The findings from this research reveal quiet quitting as a complex phenomenon that reflects broader tensions in contemporary employment relationships. Rather than representing simple employee laziness or generational entitlement, quiet quitting emerges as a rational response to structural inequities in the modern workplace and a form of everyday resistance to exploitative employment practices.

Quiet Quitting as Response to Alienation

The strong correlation between work alienation and quiet quitting behaviors supports the theoretical framework that positions quiet quitting as a response to alienating work conditions. Participants' descriptions of feeling disconnected from their work's purpose, powerless to influence organizational decisions, and treated as expendable resources align closely with Marx's analysis of alienated labor.

The contemporary workplace often creates conditions for alienation through several mechanisms: the separation of workers from the products of their labor (particularly in service industries), the routinization and standardization of work processes, the surveillance and monitoring of employee performance, and the commodification of human skills and

creativity. Quiet quitting represents an attempt to reclaim some agency and control within these alienating conditions.

However, quiet quitting as a response to alienation has limitations. While it may provide some psychological relief and boundary-setting for individual workers, it does not address the structural conditions that create alienation in the first place. In some cases, quiet quitting may actually reinforce alienation by further distancing workers from their work and reducing opportunities for meaningful engagement.

Generational Differences and Changing Work Values

The significant generational differences in quiet quitting rates and work attitudes reflect broader shifts in how different age cohorts understand the employment relationship. Younger workers' higher rates of quiet quitting may reflect several factors: different socialization experiences around work and authority, reduced expectations for traditional career advancement, higher prioritization of work-life balance, and greater willingness to challenge workplace norms.

These generational differences also reflect structural changes in the labor market that have particularly affected younger workers. Reduced job security, declining benefits, increased educational requirements, and rising costs of living have created different economic realities for younger workers compared to previous generations. In this context, quiet quitting may represent a rational adaptation to changing economic conditions rather than a character flaw or cultural decline.

The emphasis on work-life balance among younger workers also reflects broader cultural shifts toward valuing well-being and personal fulfillment alongside professional achievement. This shift challenges traditional Protestant work ethic assumptions that equate moral worth with work dedication and suggests a more instrumental approach to employment relationships.

Quiet Quitting as Everyday Resistance

The analysis of quiet quitting as everyday resistance reveals how employees use subtle, informal strategies to assert some control over their work experience when formal channels for voice are ineffective. Unlike collective resistance through unions or formal grievance procedures, quiet quitting operates through individual boundary-setting and strategic disengagement.

This form of resistance has both advantages and limitations. It allows employees to maintain their employment while asserting some agency over their work experience, and it can provide psychological benefits through increased sense of control and boundary-setting. However, it

also has limited capacity to create broader organizational change and may actually reduce workers' collective power by promoting individual rather than collective responses to workplace problems.

The effectiveness of quiet quitting as resistance depends partly on labor market conditions. In tight labor markets where workers have more alternatives, quiet quitting may be more effective in prompting organizational change. In loose labor markets with high unemployment, quiet quitting may be less effective and potentially risky for individual workers.

Organizational Responses and Implications

The variation in organizational responses to quiet quitting reveals different management philosophies and their effectiveness. Organizations that responded punitively through increased surveillance and performance improvement plans generally failed to address the underlying issues driving quiet quitting and often created additional employee dissatisfaction. In contrast, organizations that treated quiet quitting as a signal of underlying workplace problems and responded with compensation adjustments, flexible work arrangements, and improved management practices were more successful in re-engaging employees. This suggests that quiet quitting can serve as valuable feedback for organizations about the quality of their employment relationships.

The most effective organizational responses addressed the structural conditions that create quiet quitting rather than simply trying to modify employee behavior. This included addressing compensation inequities, reducing excessive workload expectations, providing clearer advancement opportunities, and improving management practices that support employee engagement.

Implications for Employment Relationships

The rise of quiet quitting has broader implications for the future of employment relationships. It suggests that traditional assumptions about employee loyalty and unlimited availability are no longer sustainable in many workplace contexts. Organizations may need to develop more explicit and equitable exchanges between employee contributions and organizational rewards. The phenomenon also highlights the importance of the psychological contract in employment relationships. When organizations violate employee expectations about fairness, recognition, and advancement opportunities, employees may respond by adjusting their own contributions to restore perceived balance. This suggests that organizations need to be more intentional about managing psychological contracts and communicating clearly about expectations and rewards.

Quiet quitting may also represent an early indicator of broader changes in work organization and employment relationships. As traditional career paths become less reliable and workers face increasing demands for flexibility and adaptability, new forms of employment relationships may emerge that are more explicitly transactional and bounded.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations should be noted in interpreting these findings. The research relied heavily on self-report measures, which may be subject to social desirability bias or inaccurate self-perception. Additionally, the cross-sectional design limits conclusions about causality and the direction of relationships between variables.

The sample was predominantly drawn from North American contexts and may not generalize to other cultural or economic contexts where work attitudes and employment relationships differ significantly. Cross-cultural research on quiet quitting would provide valuable insights into how cultural values and economic structures shape employee responses to workplace conditions.

Future research should examine the long-term consequences of quiet quitting for both individual workers and organizations. Longitudinal studies could track how quiet quitting affects career outcomes, job satisfaction, and mental health over time. Research could also examine whether quiet quitting leads to broader organizational changes or simply creates new forms of workplace conflict.

Additional research is needed on the relationship between quiet quitting and collective action. Understanding how individual resistance strategies like quiet quitting relate to collective organizing and union activity could provide insights into broader patterns of workplace resistance and social change.

Finally, research on organizational interventions that effectively address the conditions leading to quiet quitting could provide valuable guidance for creating more sustainable and equitable employment relationships.

Conclusion

The rise of quiet quitting represents a significant shift in how employees respond to workplace conditions they perceive as unfair or exploitative. Rather than simply accepting poor treatment or leaving their jobs, increasing numbers of workers are strategically limiting their effort and availability to create better balance in their employment relationships.

This phenomenon reflects broader structural problems in contemporary employment, including wage stagnation, increased job demands, reduced advancement opportunities, and the erosion of traditional benefits and job security. Quiet quitting emerges as a rational

response to these conditions and a form of everyday resistance that allows workers to assert some control over their work experience.

The generational differences in quiet quitting rates suggest that younger workers may be leading a broader transformation in work attitudes and expectations. Having experienced multiple economic crises and reduced opportunities for traditional career advancement, younger workers appear more willing to challenge workplace norms and prioritize work-life balance over unlimited organizational commitment.

For organizations, quiet quitting represents both a challenge and an opportunity. While it may create short-term productivity concerns, it also provides valuable feedback about the quality of employment relationships and workplace conditions. Organizations that respond to quiet quitting by addressing underlying inequities and improving workplace conditions may find opportunities to create more sustainable and effective employment relationships.

The implications of quiet quitting extend beyond individual workplaces to broader questions about the future of work and employment relationships. As traditional assumptions about employee loyalty and unlimited availability become less tenable, new models of employment may emerge that are more explicitly transactional and bounded while still supporting both organizational effectiveness and worker well-being.

Understanding quiet quitting as both a response to workplace alienation and a form of resistance to exploitative practices provides insights into broader patterns of social and economic change. The phenomenon highlights the ongoing tension between employer demands for flexibility and employee needs for security, recognition, and meaningful work. How societies navigate this tension will shape the future of work and the possibilities for human flourishing within contemporary economic systems.

The rise of quiet quitting ultimately reflects the agency of workers in shaping their own work experiences, even within constrained circumstances. While it may not represent a complete solution to workplace problems, it demonstrates workers' capacity to resist exploitation and assert their own values and priorities within employment relationships. This resistance, while individual and limited, may contribute to broader transformations in how work is organized and valued in contemporary society.

References

- Arnett, J. J. (2014). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Blauner, R. (1964). *Alienation and freedom: The factory worker and his industry*. University of Chicago Press.

- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and monopoly capital: The degradation of work in the twentieth century*. Monthly Review Press.
- Costanza, D. P., Badger, J. M., Fraser, R. L., Severt, J. B., & Gade, P. A. (2012). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 375-394.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., Plowman, S. K., & Blue, A. (2020). *The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes: 2020 Q12 meta-analysis* (10th ed.). Gallup Press.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Harvard University Press.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Marx, K. (1844). *Economic and philosophical manuscripts of 1844*. Progress Publishers.
- Ritzer, G. (2018). *The McDonaldization of society: Into the digital age* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(5), 525-546.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Sage Publications.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Preliminary manual. Utrecht University, Department of Psychology.
- Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. Yale University Press.
- Seeman, M. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. *American Sociological Review*, 24(6), 783-791.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Rand McNally.
- Twenge, J. M. (2010). *Generation me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled—and more miserable than ever before* (2nd ed.). Free Press.
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179-201.