

Factors Influencing Quiet Quitting and Employee Commitment in Casino Gaming Workplaces: Implications for Employee Retention Strategies

Pusha M. Paraiso

Colegio de San Juan de Letran, Manila Philippines

Author Email: pusha.paraiso@letran.edu.ph

Date received: May 18, 2024

Date revised: May 28, 2024

Date accepted: May 29, 2024

Originality: 97%

Grammarly Score: 90%

Similarity: 3%

Recommended citation:

Paraiso, P. (2024). Factors influencing quiet quitting and employee commitment in casino gaming workplaces: implications for employee retention strategies. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(7), 500-509. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0223>

Abstract. Employee turnover, particularly through "quiet quitting," presents significant challenges for the casino gaming industry, impacting operational efficiency and profitability. This study examined the factors influencing quiet quitting and employee commitment within casino gaming workplaces, providing insights into effective employee retention strategies. The researcher employs One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Chi-Square Test to examine and interpret data. This discussion elucidates the methodologies of these tests, focusing on their applications, assumptions, and interpretations. The findings indicate respondents exhibit low levels of quiet quitting related to psychological empowerment. However, most participants expressed that their job retention is driven by necessity, indicating a high dependence on their current employment. Additionally, the study revealed low levels of employee commitment across affective, continuance, and normative dimensions. Notably, many respondents expressed a tendency toward considering leaving their current jobs. These findings suggest that addressing quiet quitting behaviors is crucial for enhancing employee commitment and retention in the casino gaming industry.

Keywords: Quiet quitting; Employee commitment; Employee retention; Casino gaming industry; Psychological empowerment.

1.0 Introduction

The traditional management slogans such as "We can find someone who'll replace you" and "If you cannot adapt to our style, the door is open" reflect an outdated mindset that many employees have long dreaded. These attitudes, emphasizing relentless hustle and grinding, are increasingly being rejected by a more progressive workforce, particularly among Generation Z and Millennials. According to TJ Ramos-Guzman, vice president of Guthrie-Jensen Consultants, modern companies must now practice empathy as conventional management approaches are becoming ineffective. A prevalent sentiment among employees, captured in the phrase "whether you work excessively or just enough, you'll still earn the same," has contributed to the phenomenon known as "quiet quitting."

In the summer of 2022, the concept of quiet quitting gained significant public attention. Employees expressed frustration with companies and managers who continually demanded increased productivity without showing reciprocal care. As noted by Salvucci (2023), there are typically three ways to approach work: as outlined in job descriptions, as executed by the employee, and as expected by employers. Quiet quitters often choose to perform only the bare minimum required, reflecting their disengagement and dissatisfaction with their work conditions, as described by Richard (2023).

This trend differs from the Great Resignation, where individuals actively sought new employment opportunities offering better compensation, flexibility, and fewer hours (Klotz & Bolino, 2022). Quiet quitters, however, do not leave their jobs but rather disengage, seeking a better work-life balance and minimizing their professional responsibilities. This passive form of withdrawal often goes unrecognized by employers, complicating efforts to address the underlying issues. Due to a lack of scholarly literature on the subject, there is an evident empty space on "quiet quitting" in the context of the casino gaming workplace. This study fills the gap in the literature by investigating what contributes to employee quiet quitting and employee commitment in the casino gaming industry. It could be beneficial for academics and business to investigate its effects on organizational dynamics, employee happiness, and possible treatments. In particular, there is still an absence of research on the frequency, causes, and effects of quiet quitting in the setting of casinos.

This research investigated the causes of quiet quitting within the Philippine casino gaming industry and its effects on both employees and organizations. The study sought to identify the factors contributing to quiet quitting behavior among casino gaming employees and assess their level of commitment to their employers. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for developing effective employee retention strategies. By addressing the specific needs and challenges of this sector, companies can foster a healthier and more satisfying work environment, ultimately retaining valuable human resources.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

A descriptive survey design was selected for this study. Sirisilla (2023) affirms that the descriptive correlational study design is an effective tool used by researchers to gather data on specific groups or phenomena. This type of study provides a comprehensive and accurate depiction of the characteristics and behaviors of a particular group or subject. Descriptive research yields critical insights that can inform future investigations and enhance researchers' understanding of specific issues through observation and data collection on a defined topic. This design is appropriate since the goal is to assess the perceptions and views of employees in the casino gaming workplace regarding quiet quitting and job commitment, aligning with the study's objectives. This approach accurately describes the characteristics, thoughts, and experiences of the employees concerning these issues.

2.2 Research Participants

This study was conducted at a major resort and casino located in Pasay, National Capital Region (NCR), Philippines. The casino's table games department, which employs approximately 600 individuals, including croupiers and supervisors aged 25 to 45, served as the primary focus. Both male and female employees work full-time in this department. The pandemic has notably impacted employee loyalty and commitment within the industry. This observation is based on the author's firsthand experience and interactions with coworkers. Additionally, the issue of "quiet quitting" has been identified as a global phenomenon affecting various sectors. To ensure a focused and manageable scope for data collection and analysis, the study is confined to a specific area in Pasay, Metro Manila, encompassing one of the leading resorts and casinos. The research covered two years from 2023 to 2024, enabling the examination of trends and changes over time.

The company employs a total of 4,700 individuals, with 600 employees specifically in the table games department. From this department, 240 participants will be selected to participate in the study. This sample size was determined using the Yamane formula, balancing the need for comprehensive data collection with practical constraints such as time and financial resources. A random or stratified sampling technique was employed to select the participants, ensuring a representative sample across various positions, workloads, and demographics. This approach enhances the accuracy and reliability of the data collected.

2.3 Research Instrument

The data collection instrument employed in this study is a structured questionnaire. It consisted of thirty-four (34) adopted questions designed to gather data on employee perspectives regarding factors contributing to quitting and their commitment to their employer.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The questionnaire was administered via a Google Form, allowing participants to provide written responses. The questionnaire was distributed to participants to assess their knowledge and views on these topics.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

To ensure the study's ethical standards, the rights to self-determination, anonymity, informed consent, and confidentiality were strictly observed. Informed consent was obtained from participants before they completed the questionnaires. Participants were informed of their right to refuse participation voluntarily and to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences. The study's objectives, data collection methods, and assurances of no associated risks or costs were thoroughly explained to the participants. Additionally, participants were assured that their responses would be kept confidential and used exclusively for academic research purposes.

2.6 Data Analysis

The data gathered were cleansed, tabulated, and analyzed descriptively and inferentially.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Demographic Profile: Sex, Job Position, Service Length, and Age

Table 1. Demographic profile of participants in terms of sex, job position, length of service, and age

	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Sex		
Male	99	41.3
Female	141	58.7
Job Position		
Supervisor	152	63.3
Dealer	88	36.7
Length of Service		
1-5 years	65	27.1
6-10 years	78	32.5
11-15 year	97	40.4
Age		
23-28 years	63	26.3
29-34 years	73	30.4
35-39 years	67	27.9
40-45 years	37	15.4

The demographic profile of the participants is presented in Table 1. The majority of participants fall within the age range of 29 to 34 years (73 or 30.40%), followed closely by those aged 35 to 39 (67 or 27.90%). Additionally, a significant portion of participants are aged between 23 and 28 years (63 or 26.30%). This distribution aligns with the age demographics typically found among workers in the casino industry, where employees are commonly at least 23 years old. Regarding sex, the findings indicate that a majority of participants are female (141 or 58.80%), while the minority are male (99 or 41.30%). This suggests a higher representation of female workers in resorts and casinos in Pasay compared to males. This trend is consistent with the observation that casinos frequently employ women as casino dealers, as reported by Female First (2022).

In terms of job position, the demographic profile reveals that the largest proportion of participants hold supervisory roles (152 or 63.30%), while the fewest are dealers (88 or 36.70%). This suggests that the majority of participants who voluntarily engaged in the study are supervisors. Regarding length of service, the data indicates that the majority of participants have been employed as casino workers for 11 to 15 years (97 or 40.40%), followed by those with 6 to 10 years of experience (78 or 32.50%). Conversely, the smallest proportion of participants have recently entered the industry, with 1 to 5 years of experience (65 or 27.10%).

3.2 Quiet-Quitting Among Employees

The analysis of quiet quitting among workers in resorts and casinos covers various aspects, including workload, perceived career development opportunities, perceived pay for performance, affective organizational

commitment, work conditions, job satisfaction, employee well-being, psychological empowerment, and quiet quitting intentions.

Table 2. Summary of quiet-quitting behaviors among participants

VARIABLES	MEAN	SD	INTERPRETATION
Workload	1.79	0.53	Strongly Agree
Perceived Career Development Opportunities	2.09	0.61	Agree
Perceived Pay for Performance	2.10	0.68	Agree
Affective Organizational Commitment	2.27	0.63	Agree
Work Condition	2.25	0.69	Agree
Job Satisfaction	2.30	0.58	Agree
Employee Wellbeing	2.06	0.82	Agree
Psychological Empowerment	2.31	0.64	Agree
Quiet Quitting Intention	2.06	0.57	Agree
Overall	2.13	0.64	Agree

The participants have not reported experiencing quiet quitting in their jobs, particularly concerning work overload (Mean = 1.79, SD = 0.53). This suggests that, on average, employees do not feel overwhelmed by their workload to the extent that it would lead to quiet quitting behavior. Regarding perceived career development opportunities, the majority of participants agreed that their organization offers attractive career opportunities (Mean = 2.09, SD = 0.61). This suggests that the organization provides avenues for career growth, potentially reducing the likelihood of quitting due to a perceived lack of advancement prospects.

In terms of perceived pay for performance, most participants indicated that the incentives provided encourage them to perform better at work (Mean = 2.10, SD = 0.68). This implies that participants do not perceive their pay as a reason for quitting, as they feel adequately rewarded for their efforts. Affective organizational commitment was also assessed, with the majority of participants expressing a strong sense of belonging to the organization (Mean = 2.27, SD = 0.63). However, this also suggests a slight level of quiet quitting in terms of affective organizational commitment, indicating potential areas for improvement in fostering emotional attachment among employees.

Regarding work conditions, most participants agreed that the workplace climate is comfortable (Mean = 2.25, SD = 0.69). However, it's noteworthy to mention that previous incidents, such as the 2017 attack on a resort casino in Pasay, may trigger fears among employees and impact their perception of safety and well-being at work. Employee well-being was also assessed, with participants indicating competence and capability in activities important to them (Mean = 2.06, SD = 0.82). However, neglecting employee well-being may lead to low morale and minimum work performance, contributing to quiet quitting behaviors.

In terms of psychological empowerment, participants generally agreed that their jobs hold great significance to them (Mean = 2.31, SD = 0.64). Regarding quiet quitting intentions, participants generally reported slight levels of quiet quitting intentions (Mean = 2.06, SD = 0.57), various factors such as stress and poor work-life balance, as identified by Hamilton (2023), may contribute to quiet quitting behaviors among employees.

3.3 Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Among Employees

Table 3 summarizes employee commitment among the participants across all variables, including normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment.

Table 3. Summary of employee commitment assessment

VARIABLES	MEAN	SD	INTERPRETATION
Affective	2.27	0.79	Agree
Continuance	2.17	0.58	Agree
Normative	2.09	0.52	Agree
Overall	2.18	0.63	Agree

Participants' affective commitment towards their organization is moderate, as indicated by their agreement that they would be satisfied to work for the company for the remainder of their careers (Mean = 2.27, SD = 0.79). However, this also suggests that as time progresses, employees may experience changes in their attachment to the

company, potentially leading to quiet quitting behaviors. Regarding continuance commitment, the result (Mean = 2.17, SD = 0.58) indicates only slight levels of continuance commitment. This implies that while participants feel a need to remain in their current organization, it may not necessarily reflect a strong commitment to the company itself. Furthermore, the findings reveal that normative commitment is the most prominent form of commitment among participants towards their organization (Mean = 2.09, SD = 0.52). This suggests that participants feel a sense of responsibility and obligation towards their company, motivating them to remain committed. In summary, the participants exhibit varying levels of commitment to their organization across different dimensions. While normative commitment appears to be the most prevalent, affective commitment is moderate, and continuance commitment is relatively slight. These findings suggest that while participants may feel a sense of obligation towards their company and some satisfaction with their work, they may not necessarily feel deeply attached or committed to remaining with the organization in the long term.

3.4 Correlation of Quiet Quitting and Employee Commitment

Table 4. Pearson correlation: quiet quitting and employee commitment

		AFFECTIVE	CONTINUANCE	NORMATIVE
Work Overload	Pearson Correlation	.180	.256	.205
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.001
Perceived Career Development Opportunities	Pearson Correlation	.382	.330	.330
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Perceived Pay Performance	Pearson Correlation	.289	.330	.208
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.001
Affective Organization Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.296	.287	.203
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002
Work Condition	Pearson Correlation	.319	.251	.304
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Job Burnout	Pearson Correlation	.404	.398	.339
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Employee Well Being	Pearson Correlation	.221	.184	.218
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.004	.001
Psychological Empowerment	Pearson Correlation	.370	.467	.320
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Quiet Quitting Intention	Pearson Correlation	.241	.286	.148
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.022

Table 4 presents the outcomes of the Pearson Correlation Analysis conducted to explore the relationship between quiet quitting and employee commitment. The analysis revealed a notable association between quiet quitting and employee commitment across all measured variables, as evidenced by the significance values falling below the standard threshold of 0.05. The table showcases the significant relationships between various dimensions of quiet quitting and employee commitment. The highlighted significance values underscore that these correlations are statistically meaningful, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Consequently, it can be inferred that a significant relationship exists between quiet quitting and employee commitment factors among the participants.

These findings indicate a reciprocal influence between quiet quitting behavior and employee commitment. Specifically, a casino worker who quietly quits demonstrates a diminished commitment to the organization. Likewise, employees exhibiting lower levels of commitment are more prone to engaging in quiet quitting behaviors. In summary, the results suggest that quiet quitting significantly impacts employee commitment, and conversely, employee commitment influences quiet quitting tendencies among participants in the casino industry.

3.5 Variation on Quiet Quitting According to Profile

Age Group

Table 5 presents the outcomes of the conducted One-Way ANOVA analysis, examining the potential variations in causes of quiet quitting among participants based on age-based groupings. The study accepts the null hypothesis, as indicated by computed significance values exceeding the predetermined alpha value of 0.05.

Table 5. One-Way ANOVA: quiet quitting across age group

		SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIG.
Work Overload	Between Groups	.282	3	.094	.324	.808
	Within Groups	68.440	236	.290		
	Total	68.722	239			
Perceived Career Development Opportunities	Between Groups	.291	3	.097	.261	.854
	Within Groups	87.914	236	.373		
	Total	88.206	239			
Perceived Pay Performance	Between Groups	1.308	3	.436	.938	.423
	Within Groups	109.757	236	.465		
	Total	111.065	239			
Affective Organization Commitment	Between Groups	.351	3	.117	.293	.830
	Within Groups	94.237	236	.399		
	Total	94.588	239			
Work Condition	Between Groups	3.918	3	1.306	2.839	.059
	Within Groups	108.577	236	.460		
	Total	112.496	239			
Job Burnout	Between Groups	.267	3	.089	.259	.855
	Within Groups	81.279	236	.344		
	Total	81.546	239			
Employee Well Being	Between Groups	5.144	3	1.715	2.593	.053
	Within Groups	156.039	236	.661		
	Total	161.183	239			
Psychological Empowerment	Between Groups	.570	3	.190	.463	.708
	Within Groups	96.835	236	.410		
	Total	97.406	239			
Quiet Quitting Intention	Between Groups	1.076	3	.359	1.119	.342
	Within Groups	75.627	236	.320		

These results suggest that there is no statistically significant variation in causes of quiet quitting across different age groups among participants. Regardless of age, participants do not exhibit significantly different tendencies toward quitting. In essence, age does not appear to be a determining factor influencing the propensity for quiet quitting among participants in this study.

Job Position

As observed in Table 6, there is no statistically significant difference in quiet quitting among participants when grouped according to their job positions, as evidenced by computed significance values exceeding the alpha threshold of 0.05. Consequently, the study accepts the null hypothesis. This indicates that participants job positions do not significantly influence their tendencies toward quitting. Regardless of their specific roles within the organization, participants exhibit similar patterns of quiet quitting behavior.

Length of Service

Based on the analysis depicted in Table 7, the findings indicate that there is no significant difference in quiet quitting among participants when categorized based on their duration of service. This conclusion is drawn from the computed significance values, all of which exceed the alpha threshold of 0.05, leading the researcher to accept the null hypothesis.

This suggests that the duration of service, whether short or long, does not contribute significantly to the quiet quitting tendencies of participants. In other words, regardless of the length of time a casino employee has been with their company, it does not appear to influence their likelihood of engaging in quiet quitting behavior.

Table 6. One-Way ANOVA: quiet quitting across job position

		SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIG.
Work Overload	Between Groups	.149	1	.149	.516	.473
	Within Groups	68.573	238	.288		
	Total	68.722	239			
Perceived Career Development Opportunities	Between Groups	.035	1	.035	.095	.758
	Within Groups	88.170	238	.370		
	Total	88.206	239			
Perceived Pay Performance	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.983
	Within Groups	111.065	238	.467		
	Total	111.065	239			
Affective Organization Commitment	Between Groups	.190	1	.190	.479	.489
	Within Groups	94.398	238	.397		
	Total	94.588	239			
Work Condition	Between Groups	1.411	1	1.411	3.022	.083
	Within Groups	111.085	238	.467		
	Total	112.496	239			
Job Burnout	Between Groups	.041	1	.041	.121	.729
	Within Groups	81.505	238	.342		
	Total	81.546	239			
Employee Well Being	Between Groups	.023	1	.023	.034	.854
	Within Groups	161.160	238	.677		
	Total	161.183	239			
Psychological Empowerment	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.002	.967
	Within Groups	97.405	238	.409		
	Total	97.406	239			
Quiet Quitting Intention	Between Groups	.022	1	.022	.067	.795
	Within Groups	76.681	238	.322		

Table 7. One-Way ANOVA: quiet quitting across service length

		SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIG.
Work Overload	Between Groups	.327	3	.109	.376	.770
	Within Groups	68.395	236	.290		
	Total	68.722	239			
Perceived Career Development Opportunities	Between Groups	.961	3	.320	.866	.459
	Within Groups	87.245	236	.370		
	Total	88.206	239			
Perceived Pay Performance	Between Groups	.199	3	.066	.141	.935
	Within Groups	110.866	236	.470		
	Total	111.065	239			
Affective Organization Commitment	Between Groups	1.343	3	.448	1.133	.336
	Within Groups	93.245	236	.395		
	Total	94.588	239			
Work Condition	Between Groups	7.262	3	2.421	5.429	.001
	Within Groups	105.234	236	.446		
	Total	112.496	239			
Job Burnout	Between Groups	.606	3	.202	.589	.623
	Within Groups	80.940	236	.343		
	Total	81.546	239			
Employee Well Being	Between Groups	1.248	3	.416	.614	.607
	Within Groups	159.936	236	.678		
	Total	161.183	239			
Psychological Empowerment	Between Groups	.539	3	.180	.438	.726
	Within Groups	96.867	236	.410		
	Total	97.406	239			
Quiet Quitting Intention	Between Groups	.735	3	.245	.761	.517
	Within Groups	75.968	236	.322		

Sex

Based on the calculated significance values obtained from the unpaired t-test (Table 8), all values surpass the alpha threshold of 0.05. Consequently, the decision is made to accept the null hypothesis. This suggests that there is no significant difference among participants in their factors of quitting when grouped according to their sex. In essence, sex does not appear to be a significant factor influencing the various aspects related to quiet quitting behaviors observed in the study.

Table 8. T-test for Equality of Means

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Work Overload	Equal variances assumed	.178	.673	-.451	238	.653	-.03174	.07043	-.17048	.10701
	Equal variances not assumed			-.451	212.313	.652	-.03174	.07031	-.17034	.10687
Perceived Career Development Opportunities	Equal variances assumed	.345	.557	.199	238	.842	.01590	.07982	-.14134	.17314
	Equal variances not assumed			.202	220.271	.840	.01590	.07879	-.13938	.17119
Perceived Pay Performance	Equal variances assumed	2.541	.112	.200	238	.842	.01791	.08957	-.15853	.19435
	Equal variances not assumed			.196	196.546	.845	.01791	.09124	-.16203	.19785
Affective organization Commitment	Equal variances assumed	1.095	.296	1.094	238	.275	.09019	.08246	-.07224	.25263
	Equal variances not assumed			1.068	192.238	.287	.09019	.08445	-.07638	.25676
Work Condition	Equal variances assumed	.859	.355	-1.565	238	.119	-.14034	.08969	-.31702	.03634
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.592	223.206	.113	-.14034	.08814	-.31402	.03334
Job Burnout	Equal variances assumed	2.967	.086	-.305	238	.760	-.02343	.07674	-.17460	.12775
	Equal variances not assumed			-.297	188.744	.767	-.02343	.07893	-.17913	.13228
Employee Well being	Equal variances assumed	.944	.332	-.602	238	.548	-.06490	.10783	-.27732	.14751
	Equal variances not assumed			-.592	197.777	.555	-.06490	.10968	-.28119	.15138
Psychological Empowerment	Equal variances assumed	.031	.860	-.586	238	.558	-.04914	.08382	-.21428	.11599
	Equal variances not assumed			-.589	215.077	.556	-.04914	.08337	-.21347	.11518
Quiet Quitting Intention	Equal variances assumed	.582	.446	.789	238	.431	.05867	.07434	-.08778	.20512
	Equal variances not assumed			.792	214.012	.429	.05867	.07405	-.08728	.20463

4.0 Conclusion

The phenomenon of quiet quitting, where employees disengage from their work without overtly expressing dissatisfaction, presents notable hurdles to maintaining optimal levels of employee engagement within organizations. This disengagement can result in diminished productivity, morale, and retention rates, a subdued kind of disengagement known as "quiet quitting" is frequently the result of employee discontent with their employer, Hong (2023). Recognizing and addressing quitting is imperative for sustaining robust employee engagement and retaining key talent.

The findings of this study reveal several pertinent insights. The majority of participants fall within the 29-34 age bracket, identify as female, hold supervisory roles, and have tenures ranging from 11 to 15 years within their respective organizations. While participants generally report limited experiences of quiet quitting due to work overload, subtle instances were identified stemming from perceptions of limited professional growth prospects,

inadequate performance compensation, emotional organization, working conditions, employee well-being, and psychological empowerment. Moreover, a notable proportion of participants express intentions indicative of quitting, such as seeking opportunities to relax, prioritizing minimal effort, and avoiding overtime.

The study underscores that participants exhibit modest levels of commitment across affective, continuance, and normative dimensions toward their organizations. Quiet quitting behaviors, even at subtle levels, may signify underlying issues within organizational culture and leadership, particularly concerning emotional attachment and normative obligations. Normative commitment pertains to a sense of duty to remain with the organization, while affective commitment denotes emotional allegiance to the workplace.

Quiet disengagement among employees may manifest when there is perceived incongruence between personal values and organizational culture, or when employees feel unsupported by leadership. This can manifest as diminished enthusiasm, reluctance to exceed expectations, or reduced participation in organizational activities. Importantly, the study reveals no significant disparities in quitting concerning demographic variables such as age, gender, position, or tenure. However, a notable correlation exists between quiet quitting and employee commitment.

Moreover, delving into the psychological factors underlying "quiet quitting" behavior could provide valuable insights. Research could explore employees' attitudes, perceptions of organizational support, and the psychological contract between employees and employers in the casino gaming industry. Understanding how factors such as job satisfaction, perceived fairness, and psychological well-being influence the decision to silently disengage can inform interventions aimed at enhancing employee commitment and retention.

Additionally, investigating the impact of workplace stressors, such as irregular schedules, high-pressure environments, and exposure to gambling-related issues, on employee commitment is essential. Examining how these stressors contribute to burnout, turnover intentions, and "quiet quitting" behavior can guide the development of targeted interventions to mitigate their negative effects and promote employee well-being in the casino gaming workplace.

Furthermore, exploring the role of social networks and peer relationships in influencing employee commitment and turnover behavior is an area ripe for exploration. Research could examine the impact of social support, organizational citizenship behaviors, and informal communication channels on employees' decisions to quietly quit or remain committed to their roles. Understanding the dynamics of social interactions within the workplace can provide valuable insights into strategies for fostering a supportive and cohesive work environment that encourages employee engagement and retention.

In summary, this study sheds light on the dynamics of quiet quitting and its impact on employee engagement within the unique context of the casino gaming industry. By examining employee behaviors, organizational culture, and management practices, valuable insights into the prevalence and ramifications of quitting have been gleaned.

The study advocates for proactive measures to mitigate quiet quitting within the casino gaming sector, emphasizing the importance of fostering a supportive work environment, facilitating avenues for professional advancement, and enhancing communication between management and employees. These strategies are essential for safeguarding employee engagement and organizational success in the face of quiet quitting tendencies.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

As the sole author of the thesis, I have contributed significantly to every aspect of the research and writing process. My dedication, creativity, and perseverance have driven the project forward from conceptualization to completion.

6.0 Funding

As the author, I solely funded the entire research paper, my investment not only demonstrates my dedication to this project but also highlights my commitment to advancing knowledge within my field. By funding every aspect of the research process, from acquiring materials to covering data analysis expenses, I've shown my determination to see this project through to completion.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflicts of interest about the publication of this paper.

8.0 Acknowledgment

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge the privilege offered to me by Almighty God for allowing me to pursue my Master's degree in Business Administration. My heartfelt gratitude goes out to Dr. Maria Victoria Rosas, my thesis adviser, for her essential advice, steadfast support, and never-ending encouragement during the research process. Her knowledge and commitment were crucial in developing this idea. I am also grateful to my husband, daughter, and family for their constant love, support, and understanding. My motivation was maintained by their support and confidence in my talents. I would like to express my gratitude to my fellow classmates at Colegio de San Juan de Letran for their insightful remarks and helpful conversation, which significantly improved this work. Without the assistance and support of each of these people and groups, this thesis would not have been feasible, I'm grateful.

9.0 References

- Almazan, M. (2023). Disbursement and utilization of maintenance and other operating expenses (MOOE) funds of public schools in the Philippines. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(5), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i05.6689>
- Ancho, I., & Bongco, R. (2019). Exploring Filipino teachers' professional workload. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, 9(2), 19-29. <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol9.no2.2.2019>
- Aquino, C. J., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 10(4), 1325-1337. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518>
- Atalay, M., & Dagustan, U. (2023). Quiet quitting: A new wine in an old bottle? *Personnel Review*, 52(3), 845-860. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-02-2023-0122>
- De Smet, A., Dowling, B., Mugayar-Baldocchi, M., & Schaninger, B. (2021). 'Great Attrition' or 'Great Attraction'? The choice is yours. McKinsey & Company.
- Frye, W. D., Kang, S., Huh, C. H., & Lee, M. J. (2020). What factors influence Generation Y's employee retention in the hospitality industry?: An internal marketing approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 85, 102352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102352>
- Female First. (2022). The rising dominance of female dealers in casinos. Retrieved from <https://www.femalefirst.co.uk/games/rising-dominance-female-dealers-casinos-1341744.html>
- Gardner, H. K., & Mortensen, M. (2022). Managers are trapped in a performance-compassion dilemma. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2022/04/managers-are-trapped-in-a-performance-compassion-dilemma>
- Gafner, J. (2023). The unifying philosophy behind quiet quitting, Tangping, and overemployed. *Indeed*. <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/news/quiet-quitting-tangping-overemployed>
- Guzman, T. J. (2023) Guthrie-Jensen Consultant, 6 Most Effective Ways to Keep Your Millennial and Gen Z Employees Productive. <https://guthriejensen.com/blog/category/from-the-editors/>
- Herway, B. J. (2022). Need an answer to quiet quitting? Start with your culture. *Gallup.com*. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/403598/need-answer-quiet-quitting-start-culture.aspx>
- Hamilton, O. S. (2023). Why people quiet quit: Motivations and provocations. *Psychology Today*. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/thebridge/202310/motivations-and-provocations-why-people-quiet-quit>
- Hong, A. (2023). Silent disengagement: A case study on 'quiet quitting' among professors in Metro Manila's private higher education institutions amidst remote/hybrid work environments. Horowitz, J. M. (2021). The great resignation: Why workers say they quit jobs in 2023. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2022/03/09/majority-of-workers-who-quit-a-job-in-2021-cite-low-pay-no-opportunities-for-advancement-feeling-disrespected/>
- Kelly, J. (2019). More than half of U.S. workers are unhappy in their jobs: Here's why and what needs to be done now. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackkelly/2019/10/25/more-than-half-of-us-workers-are-unhappy-in-their-jobs-heres-why-and-what-needs-to-be-done-now/?sh=57ee6eb82024>
- Klotz, A., & Bolino, M. (2022). When quiet quitting is worse than the real thing. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2022/09/when-quiet-quitting-is-worse-than-the-real-thing>
- Lee, A. (2020). When empowering employees works, and when it doesn't. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2018/03/when-empowering-employees-works-and-when-it-doesnt>
- Lee, D., Park, J., & Shin, Y. (2023). Where are the workers? From great resignation to quiet quitting. *National Bureau of Economic Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w30833>
- Obeid, J. (2022). The impact of knowledge sharing on employee retention - Succession planning as a moderator. *Lebanese American University*. Retrieved from https://laur.lau.edu.lb:8443/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10725/13891/Joe_Obeid_Thesis_Redacted.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y
- Parker, K., & Horowitz, J. M. (2021). The great resignation: Why workers say they quit jobs in 2021. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2022/03/09/majority-of-workers-who-quit-a-job-in-2021-cite-low-pay-no-opportunities-for-advancement-feeling-disrespected/>
- Salvucci, J. (2023). What is quiet quitting? The viral misnomer explained. *TheStreet*. <https://www.thestreet.com/dictionary/q/quietquitting#:~:text=%E2%80%9CQuiet%20quitting%E2%80%9D%20first%20hit%20the,employees%20%E2%80%9Ccoasting%E2%80%9D%20at%20wo>
- Smith, R. A. (2022). Why is your boss asking about your feelings? Inside the empathy management trend. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Schaap, P., & Olckers, C. (2023). Relationships between employee retention factors and attitudinal antecedents of voluntary turnover: An extended structural equation modeling approach. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v18i0.1358>
- Sturt, D., & Nordstrom, T. (2018). Performance management: One simple secret for doing it right. *Scientific Research Publishing*. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2910496>
- Robinson, B. (2022). 6 signs that a 'quiet quitter' is among your employees and what to do about it. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/bryanrobinson/2022/08/19/6-signs-that-a-quiet-quitter-is-among-your-employees-and-what-to-do-about-it/?sh=35c1c1b66619>