

ORIGINAL PAPER ΕΡΕΥΝΗΤΙΚΗ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ

The role of resilience in mitigating workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting and enhancing work engagement Evidence from a cross-sectional study in Greece

OBJECTIVE To investigate the role of resilience in mitigating the effects of workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting, while simultaneously exploring its potential to enhance work engagement among employees in Greece. **METHOD** We carried out a cross-sectional study in Greece in January 2025, using an online questionnaire that was disseminated through social media and professional networks. A convenience sample that met eligibility criteria, including subordinate level with at least one year of professional experience and voluntary participation, was recruited in this study. Resilience was assessed using the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS). Workplace gaslighting, quiet quitting and work engagement were evaluated using the Gaslighting at Work Scale (GWS), the Quiet Quitting Scale (QQS) and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale-3 (UWES-3), respectively. Associations were examined using multivariable linear regression analyses after adjusting for gender, educational level, and work experience. **RESULTS** A total of 291 workers were included in the study, and they were predominately female (77%) with an average age of 42.15 years (standard deviation [SD]=10.28) and with an average of 16.69 years of work experience (SD=9.48). Resilience was negatively correlated with workplace gaslighting, such as GWS total score ($b=-0.354$, 95% confidence interval [CI]=-0.501 to -0.206, $p<0.001$), loss of self-trust ($b=-0.410$, 95% CI=-0.558 to -0.263, $p<0.001$), and abuse of power ($b=-0.306$, 95% CI=-0.468 to -0.145, $p<0.001$). The relationship between resilience and quiet quitting was consistently negative ($b=-0.345$, 95% CI=-0.458 to -0.232, $p<0.001$) as was the association between resilience and its subscales of detachment ($b=-0.284$, 95% CI=-0.411 to -0.157, $p<0.001$), lack of initiative ($b=-0.365$, 95% CI=-0.501 to -0.228, $p<0.001$) and lack of motivation ($b=-0.438$, 95% CI=-0.585 to -0.291, $p<0.001$). On the other hand, work engagement was positively related with resilience ($b=0.650$, 95% CI=0.422 to 0.879, $p<0.001$). **CONCLUSIONS** Resilience protects workers from workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting and enhances their work engagement. Strengthening resilience at work may potentially contribute to the protection of workers' well-being and the improvement of workforce performance.

The contemporary workplace is characterized by intense pressures, including increased work pace, complexity of daily demands, and the constant need to adapt to emerging technologies and ongoing organizational changes.¹ The current organizational landscape is characterized by dynamic shifts, including increased demands for competence and enhanced informal communication, which necessitate a deeper understanding of individual and organizational

responses to evolving workplace phenomena.¹ This includes the subtle yet pervasive issues of workplace gaslighting, the emerging trend of quiet quitting, and the perennial challenge of sustaining high levels of work engagement.² These conditions affect not only productivity but also employees' psychological well-being. The steadily rising prevalence of occupational burnout across diverse professional sectors reflects the mental state of a substantial proportion of the

ARCHIVES OF HELLENIC MEDICINE 2026, 43(5):653–661
ΑΡΧΕΙΑ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΙΑΤΡΙΚΗΣ 2026, 43(5):653–661

O. Konstantakopoulou,¹
G.M. Kyriakatis,¹
A. Katsiroumpa,¹
I. Moisoglou,²
P. Mangoulia,¹
O. Galani,³
M. Tsiachri,¹
P. Galanis¹

¹Faculty of Nursing, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens

²Faculty of Nursing, University of Thessaly, Larissa

³Faculty of Nursing, University of West Attica, Athens, Attica, Greece

Ο ρόλος της ανθεκτικότητας στη μείωση της ψυχολογικής χειραγώγησης και της σιωπηρής αποχώρησης και στην ενίσχυση της εργασιακής δέσμευσης: Μια συγχρονική μελέτη στην Ελλάδα

Περίληψη στο τέλος του άρθρου

Key words

Greece
Quiet quitting
Resilience
Work engagement
Workplace gaslighting

Submitted 10.6.2025

Accepted 4.7.2025

global workforce and underscores the need for creating healthier and more sustainable work environments.^{3–6}

Specifically, workplace gaslighting, an insidious form of psychological manipulation, undermines an employee's perception of reality, leading to diminished self-efficacy and increased stress.⁷ Gaslighting has been associated with elevated levels of anxiety, depression, and reduced self-efficacy.⁸ In the Greek context, recent evidence indicates that nursing staff exposed to gaslighting report lower levels of work engagement, poorer mental health and an increased likelihood of quiet quitting and turnover intention.^{9,10} Its impact is not only individual but also organizational, as such behaviors undermine trust, erode a culture of collaboration, and reinforce employees' turnover intention.¹¹ Gaslighting, therefore, constitutes an "invisible" yet profoundly corrosive factor within the workplace environment.

Similarly, quiet quitting, a phenomenon where employees fulfill only the minimum requirements of their job without engaging in extra-role behaviors, signals a detachment from organizational objectives often stemming from burnout or perceived injustices.² Quiet quitting has significant implications for organizational effectiveness. These consequences are particularly evident in high-demand sectors such as healthcare and education, where employee disengagement contributes to heightened occupational stress and a perceived sense of injustice among colleagues who remain actively engaged.¹² In Greece, empirical evidence indicates elevated rates (60.9%) of quiet quitting among nursing professionals, primarily associated with excessive workload, job burnout, and unfavorable working conditions.^{13,14} These findings underscore that quiet quitting should not be viewed merely as an individual choice, but rather as a social and organizational phenomenon that reflects the fatigue and disillusionment of the workforce.

These behaviors collectively pose significant threats to organizational productivity, innovation, and employee well-being.¹² In response to these challenges, the concept of resilience has gained prominence as a critical individual resource enabling employees to navigate adversity, adapt to change, and maintain positive functioning despite experiencing work-related stressors.¹⁵ The intricate and volatile nature of contemporary organizational environments significantly influences how employees perceive, structure, and execute their work, often leading to considerable pressure that can diminish motivation and culminate in emotional exhaustion and job burnout.¹⁶ Consequently, individual resilience becomes a pivotal factor, enabling employees to not only withstand these pressures but also to transform challenging experiences into opportunities for personal and professional growth.¹⁷ This capacity

for adaptation and recovery is fundamental in fostering sustained work engagement and mitigating the adverse impacts of workplace stressors such as gaslighting and quiet quitting.¹⁸ Research data from Greek nursing professionals highlight the protective role of resilience against workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting, while also demonstrating its positive association with enhanced work engagement.¹⁹ Indeed, resilience allows individuals to actively cope with abusive supervision and its effects on their work attitudes.^{20,21} Moreover, organizational resilience, intrinsically linked with employee resilience, plays a crucial role in buffering external threats and fostering sustained employee engagement.²² Individuals exhibiting high levels of resilience often demonstrate optimism, confidence, and energy, facilitating their ability to self-regulate effectively when confronting job-related stressors.¹⁶ This inherent ability helps them to maintain perspective and continue daily tasks despite adversity, which is critical for thriving in demanding work environments.²³ Furthermore, given that resilience is a dynamic and malleable trait, it can be cultivated through targeted interventions and supportive organizational practices, including sustainable human resource management and high-performance work systems, thereby contributing to enhanced psychological capital and organizational performance.^{16,24}

This study aimed to investigate the multifaceted role of resilience in mitigating the detrimental effects of workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting, while simultaneously exploring its potential to enhance work engagement among employees in Greece. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study ever examining the association between these factors.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

Study design

A cross-sectional study was conducted in Greece, utilizing online data collection in January 2025. The questionnaire was created in Google Forms and disseminated via Facebook and Instagram professional groups and LinkedIn messages to obtain a convenience sample. Eligibility criteria included having a subordinate (and not supervisory) position, possessing a minimum of one year of professional experience, and providing written informed consent. Our research followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines.²⁵

Sample size was estimated using G*Power v. 3. 1. 9. 2. The models included resilience as the predictor and four potential confounders (gender, age, educational level, work experience). According to the anticipated effect size of 0.05 for the association between resilience and outcomes (workplace gaslighting, quiet

quitting, and work engagement), a statistical power of 95% and a margin of error of 5%, the required sample size was estimated at 262 employees.

Measurements

We collected the following demographic information: Gender (male or female), age (measured as a continuous variable), educational attainment (high school diploma, university degree, or Master of Science [MSc]/Doctor of Philosophy [PhD]), and years of professional experience (treated as a continuous variable).

Resilience was measured using the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS), a six-item scale scored on a 5-point Likert scale: 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree.²⁶ The overall score ranges from 1 to 5, with higher values reflecting greater resilience. The validated Greek version of the BRS was used, which exhibited very good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.839$).²⁷

Workplace gaslighting was assessed by the Gaslighting at Work Scale (GWS) that contains 11 items.²⁸ Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert-scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always). Responses to the total scale and subscales ("loss of self-trust" – five items– and "abuse of power" – six items) were averaged with higher scores suggesting greater exposure to gaslighting behaviors. The validated version of the GWS in the Greek language was used; and its internal consistency was excellent (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.945$ for the total scale, 0.918 for loss of self-trust, and 0.909 for abuse of power).^{28,29}

Quiet quitting was assessed using the Quiet Quitting Scale (QQS), which included 9 items.³⁰ Responses ranged on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree/never) to 5 (strongly agree/always). The scale consists of three factors: "Detachment" (four items), "lack of initiative" (three items), and "lack of motivation" (two items). Each factor's score was calculated as the mean value of its items, with higher scores denoting greater levels of quiet quitting. For the purpose of our study we used the QQS in its validated Greek version, which showed good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.851$ total; 0.791, detachment; 0.786, lack of initiative; 0.848, lack of motivation).^{30,31}

Work engagement was assessed using the three-item version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-3).³² All items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). The overall score ranges from 0 to 6, with higher scores reflecting greater work engagement. We used the validated Greek UWES-3 version in this study (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.825$).³³

Ethical issues

The study was conducted in compliance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.³⁴ The study was ethically approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Nursing of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (approval no 15, December 9, 2024). Participation was voluntary and anonymous. All participants were informed about the aim and methods of the study and provided written informed consent.

Statistical analysis

Categorical variables are expressed as frequencies (n) and percentages (%) and continuous variables as mean ($\pm$ standard deviation, SD), median and interquartile range. Normality of continuous variables was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Q-Q-plots. Resilience was deemed as the independent variable, and workplace gaslighting, quiet quitting, and work engagement were considered dependent variables. Demographic variables (gender, age, education level, and working experience) were entered within the stepwise model as potential confounders.

Simple and multivariable linear regression analyses were performed to investigate associations between resilience and the dependent variables. We initially employed univariate linear regression and then subsequently a multivariable model adjusted for confounders to determine the independent effect of resilience. As age and work experience were significantly inter-correlated (Pearson's $r=0.883$, $p<0.001$), only work experience was retained in the multivariable models so as to prevent multicollinearity. Unadjusted and adjusted beta coefficients with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and p-values are presented. P-value<0.05 was considered statistically significant. Statistical analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 28.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY, 2021).

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the study sample. A total of 291 workers agreed to participate, with most being female (77%). The mean age was 42.15 years (SD=10.28), with a median of 43 years (interquartile range=14). The majority of respondents had a postgraduate diploma (MSc or PhD) (55.3%). The mean (SD) duration of work experience was 16.69 (9.48) years, with a median (interquartile range) of 17 (14) years.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of workers (n=291).

Characteristics	n	%
<i>Gender</i>		
Males	67	23.0
Females	224	77.0
<i>Age (years)*</i>	42.15	10.28
<i>Educational level</i>		
High school graduate	25	8.6
University graduate	105	36.1
MSc/PhD diploma	161	55.3
Work experience (years)*	16.69	9.48

* Mean, standard deviation

MSc: Master of Sciences, PhD: Doctor of Philosophy

Study scales

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of the study scales. The mean resilience score was 3.29 (SD=0.77), suggesting moderate levels of workers' resilience. The average score on the GWS was 2.66 (SD=1.08), indicating moderate levels of gaslighting behaviors from the supervisors, while "abuse of power" (mean=2.66) was reported more frequently than "loss of self-trust" (mean=2.09). The average score for quiet quitting was 2.41, reflecting a moderate level of quiet quitting. "Lack of motivation" was the most often reported issue (mean value=2.70), followed by "lack of initiative" (mean value=2.39) and "detachment" (mean value=2.28).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the study scales (n=291).

Scale	Mean	Standard deviation	Median	Interquartile range
<i>Resilience (Brief Resilience Scale, BRS)</i>	3.29	0.77	3.33	0.83
<i>Gaslighting at Work Scale</i>	2.66	1.08	2.50	1.83
Loss of self-trust	2.09	1.00	2.00	1.40
Abuse of power	2.66	1.08	2.50	1.83
<i>Quiet Quitting Scale</i>	2.41	0.79	2.33	0.89
Detachment	2.28	0.87	2.25	1.00
Lack of initiative	2.39	0.94	2.33	1.33
Lack of motivation	2.70	1.02	2.50	1.00
<i>Utrecht Work Engagement Scale-3</i>	3.62	1.60	3.67	2.67

SD: Standard deviation

Moderate levels of work engagement were also found, as measured by the UWES-3 (mean value=3.62, SD=1.60).

Association between resilience and workplace gaslighting

Table 3 shows that resilience had a protective effect against gaslighting in the workplace. Higher levels of resilience (both in univariate and in multivariable models, adjusted for gender, educational level, and work experience) were significantly associated with lower gaslighting scores. More specifically, resilience was negatively associated with loss of self-trust (adjusted $b=-0.410$, 95% CI=-0.558 to -0.263, $p<0.001$), abuse of power (adjusted $b=-0.306$, 95% CI=-0.468 to -0.145, $p<0.001$), and the overall workplace gaslighting score (adjusted $b=-0.354$, 95% CI=-0.501 to -0.206, $p<0.001$). These findings suggest that workers with greater resilience reported substantially lower levels of gaslighting behaviors from their supervisors.

Association between resilience and quiet quitting

The results of linear regression analyses on quiet quitting and resilience are presented in table 4. After adjustment for gender, education level, and work experience, resilience showed a negative association with silence quitting. Specifically, resilience was negatively associated with the total score of the QQ scale (adjusted $b=-0.345$, 95% CI=-0.458 to -0.232, $p<0.001$) and its subscales, i.e., detachment (adjusted $b=-0.284$, 95% CI=-0.411 to -0.157, $p<0.001$); lack of initiative (adjusted $b=-0.365$, 95% CI=-0.501 to -0.228, $p<0.001$); and lack of motivation (adjusted $b=-0.438$, 95% CI=-0.585 to -0.291, $p<0.001$). These results

Table 3. Linear regression models with workplace gaslighting as the dependent variable and resilience as the independent variable (n=291).

Dependent variable Independent variable	Univariate models			Multivariable model*		
	Unadjusted coefficient beta	95% CI for beta	p-value	Adjusted coefficient beta	95% CI for beta	p-value
<i>Loss of self-trust**</i>						
Resilience	-0.405	-0.548 to -0.261	<0.001	-0.410	-0.558 to -0.263	<0.001
<i>Abuse of power***</i>						
Resilience	-0.317	-0.475 to -0.159	<0.001	-0.306	-0.468 to -0.145	<0.001
<i>Workplace gaslighting†</i>						
Resilience	-0.357	-0.501 to -0.213	<0.001	-0.354	-0.501 to -0.206	<0.001

* Adjusted for gender, educational level, and work experience

** R² for the multivariable model=10.1%; p-value for ANOVA <0.001

*** R² for the multivariable model=6.2%; p-value for ANOVA=0.001

† R² for the multivariable model=8.4%; p-value for ANOVA <0.001

CI: Confidence interval

Table 4. Linear regression models with quiet quitting as the dependent variable and resilience as the independent variable (n=291).

Dependent variable Independent variable	Univariate models			Multivariable model*		
	Unadjusted coefficient beta	95% CI for beta	p-value	Adjusted coefficient beta	95% CI for beta	p-value
<i>Detachment**</i>						
Resilience	-0.242	-0.370 to -0.115	<0.001	-0.284	-0.411 to -0.157	<0.001
<i>Lack of initiative***</i>						
Resilience	-0.362	-0.496 to -0.227	<0.001	-0.365	-0.501 to -0.228	<0.001
<i>Lack of motivation†</i>						
Resilience	-0.445	-0.590 to -0.300	<0.001	-0.438	-0.585 to -0.291	<0.001
<i>Quiet Quitting Scale‡</i>						
Resilience	-0.327	-0.440 to -0.215	<0.001	-0.345	-0.458 to -0.232	<0.001

* Adjusted for gender, educational level, and work experience

** R² for the multivariable model=10.5%; p-value for ANOVA <0.001

*** R² for the multivariable model=11.5%; p-value for ANOVA <0.001

† R² for the multivariable model=13.5%; p-value for ANOVA <0.001

‡ R² for the multivariable model=14.3%; p-value for ANOVA <0.001

CI: Confidence interval

illustrate the protective nature of resilience against quiet quitting behaviors among workers.

Association between resilience and work engagement

In our multivariable analysis (tab. 5), resilience was significantly positively correlated with work engagement. Even after controlling for gender, educational level, and work experience, resilience was still positively associated with work engagement (adjusted $b=0.650$, 95% CI=0.422 to 0.879, $p<0.001$). This suggests that higher levels of resilience enhance workers' engagement in their job roles.

DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to investigate the multifaceted role of resilience in mitigating the detrimental effects of workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting, while simultane-

ously exploring its potential to enhance work engagement among employees in Greece. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the interplay of these factors within the international context. Our findings provide compelling evidence for the significant role of individual resilience in shaping employees' experiences of psychological manipulation, disengagement behaviors, and overall job commitment.

A primary finding of this study was the protective effect of resilience against workplace gaslighting. Higher levels of resilience were significantly associated with lower scores on the GWS, including its subcomponents of "loss of self-trust" and "abuse of power". These results suggest that individuals with greater resilience are less susceptible to the negative impacts of manipulative behaviors from their supervisors, potentially due to an enhanced capacity to maintain their perception of reality and self-efficacy amidst challenging interpersonal dynamics. This aligns with the concept that resilience enables individuals to effectively cope with

Table 5. Linear regression models with work engagement as the dependent variable and resilience as the independent variable (n=291).

Dependent variable Independent variable	Univariate models			Multivariable model**		
	Unadjusted coefficient beta	95% CI for beta	p-value	Adjusted coefficient beta	95% CI for beta	p-value
<i>Work engagement**</i>						
Resilience	0.659	0.431 to 0.887	<0.001	0.650	0.422 to 0.879	<0.001

* Adjusted for gender, age, educational level, and work experience, ** R² for the multivariable model=14.6%; p-value for ANOVA <0.001

CI: Confidence interval

abusive supervision and its effects on work attitudes.^{19,35}

Furthermore, our analysis revealed a significant negative association between resilience and quiet quitting behaviors. Higher resilience scores were consistently linked to lower levels of quiet quitting, encompassing “detachment”, “lack of initiative”, and “lack of motivation”. This underscores resilience as a critical factor in preventing employee disengagement, which often stems from burnout or perceived injustices. The protective nature of resilience against quiet quitting emphasizes its role in fostering continued commitment and proactive engagement, even in the face of workplace stressors that might otherwise lead to withdrawal.^{36,37}

In addition, the study confirms a robust positive correlation between resilience and work engagement. Our multivariable analysis indicated that higher levels of resilience significantly enhance workers’ engagement in their job roles, even after controlling for demographic factors. This finding is consistent with the notion that resilient individuals, characterized by optimism, confidence, and energy, are better equipped to self-regulate when confronting job-related stressors, thereby maintaining perspective and enthusiasm for their daily tasks.¹⁷ The capacity for adaptation and recovery inherent in resilience appears fundamental in fostering sustained work engagement.³⁸

The moderate levels of worker resilience, gaslighting behaviors, quiet quitting, and work engagement observed in our sample underscore the relevance of these findings within the Greek workplace landscape. The average resilience score, coupled with moderate levels of gaslighting and quiet quitting, suggests that while employees experience these challenges, there is also a discernible capacity for resilience. The finding that “lack of motivation” was the most frequently reported aspect of quiet quitting, and “abuse of power” for gaslighting, provides specific insights into the nature of these phenomena within the studied population. These specific manifestations highlight areas where targeted support and intervention could be most effective in fostering a healthier and more productive work environment.

There is robust evidence about the aforementioned for nursing professionals. The prevalence of quiet quitting among nurses, particularly in the healthcare sector, further underscores the urgent need for interventions that bolster resilience and address underlying issues such as burnout and inadequate management practices.^{13,39} Indeed, strengthening resilience is crucial in nursing, as it has been shown to positively influence work engagement and mitigate burnout.⁴⁰ This is particularly relevant given

the increased psychological and work-related issues nurses have faced, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, where resilience served as a protective factor against burnout.⁴¹ Moreover, personal resources like self-efficacy, which is often enhanced by resilience, are key mediators between stress and work engagement, thereby strengthening a nurse’s ability to remain committed and effective in their demanding roles.³⁸ Healthcare organizations, therefore, must prioritize strategies to cultivate resilience among their nursing staff to improve overall service quality and patient care outcomes.³⁸ This focus on resilience is critical, as previous research consistently demonstrates a strong association between work engagement, which resilience fosters, and improved job performance among healthcare professionals.^{38,42} Moreover, fostering resilience among healthcare workers, particularly nurses, has been shown to be directly linked to reduced quiet quitting, lower turnover intentions, and decreased job burnout, highlighting its crucial role in maintaining a stable and committed workforce.⁴³

The findings of this study significantly advance the theoretical understanding of resilience as a critical individual resource in the modern workplace. By demonstrating resilience’s protective role against workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting, and its positive association with work engagement, this research offers a nuanced perspective on how personal attributes mediate the impact of adverse workplace phenomena. Theoretically, it reinforces the notion that resilience is not merely an adaptive mechanism but an active psychological capital that empowers individuals to navigate and even thrive amidst challenging environments. Furthermore, by linking these concepts in the Greek context, the study contributes to the cross-cultural understanding of these dynamics, highlighting both universal aspects and potentially unique manifestations within specific cultural and economic landscapes. From a practical standpoint, these results underscore the imperative for organizations to actively cultivate and support resilience among their professionals. Implementing resilience-building programs, fostering transparent and ethical leadership, and addressing systemic issues that contribute to gaslighting and quiet quitting are not just beneficial but essential for organizational health and sustained employee well-being. By investing in resilience, organizations can mitigate costly employee disengagement, reduce turnover intentions, and create a more engaged, productive, and psychologically safer work environment for all professionals.

During our study we dealt with several limitations. First, the cross-sectional design could infer no causal relationships in resilience, workplace gaslighting, quiet quitting,

and work engagement. The required sample was reached, but the sample was not a representative one, due to the use of convenience sampling which implies a selection bias. For example, the sample was predominately female so that would call for future research with prospective random sampling and other employee populations. Also, as the research was performed within a European setting, research in other cultural contexts is needed to clarify these relationships further. Although multivariable models were used to control for important confounders, analyses did not consider the type of employment (public versus private sector), type of work setting, and the personalities of leadership or supervisees. Future studies would be strengthened by addressing these variables. Lastly, even though the use of standardized measurement instruments (BRS, GWS, QQS, and UWES-3), self-reported measures likely resulted in information bias.

Building upon the foundational insights of this study, future research endeavors could expand into several key areas. Firstly, given the cross-sectional design employed here, longitudinal studies are warranted to establish causal relationships between resilience, workplace gaslighting, quiet quitting, and work engagement. Secondly, while this study explored these phenomena in Greece, cross-cultural comparative research could reveal how cultural nuances and different organizational contexts influence these relationships, enhancing the generalizability of findings beyond a single national context. Thirdly, future investigations

could delve deeper into specific interventions aimed at fostering resilience within organizations and empirically evaluate their effectiveness in mitigating gaslighting and quiet quitting, while boosting work engagement. This could involve exploring the efficacy of various training programs, leadership styles, or human resources practices. Finally, qualitative research, such as in-depth interviews with professionals experiencing gaslighting or quiet quitting, could offer richer contextual understanding and personal narratives, complementing the quantitative data and providing deeper insights into the lived experiences of employees.

In conclusion, our findings revealed that resilience acts as a protective factor for workers against experiencing workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting behaviors, while boosting work engagement. Examination of the buffering effect of such resilience reveals it is an important personal resource, which reduces the adverse impact of hostile supervisory practices and disengagement and enhances workforce motivational and productive efforts. Practically, interventions seeking to enhance workers' resilience, for example through training, mentoring, and support structures at an organizational level, might serve to protect against workplace adversities and facilitate work engagement. Future research should use multi-centered and longitudinal designs involving representative samples to confirm causality and investigate cultural, organizational, and contextual factors. By addressing these factors, employers may better support their staff and improve their performance.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Ο ρόλος της ανθεκτικότητας στη μείωση της ψυχολογικής χειραγώγησης και της σιωπηρής αποχώρησης και στην ενίσχυση της εργασιακής δέσμευσης: Μια συγχρονική μελέτη στην Ελλάδα

Ο. ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ,¹ Γ.Μ. ΚΥΡΙΑΚΑΤΗΣ,¹ Α. ΚΑΤΣΙΡΟΥΜΠΑ,¹ Ι. ΜΩΥΣΟΓΛΟΥ,²
Π. ΜΑΓΓΟΥΛΙΑ,¹ Ο. ΓΑΛΑΝΗ,³ Μ. ΤΣΙΑΧΡΗ,¹ Π. ΓΑΛΑΝΗΣ¹

¹Τμήμα Νοσηλευτικής, Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών, Αθήνα, ²Τμήμα Νοσηλευτικής, Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλίας, Λάρισα, ³Τμήμα Νοσηλευτικής, Πανεπιστήμιο Δυτικής Αττικής, Αθήνα, Αττική

Αρχεία Ελληνικής Ιατρικής 2026, 43(5):653–661

ΣΚΟΠΟΣ Η διερεύνηση του ρόλου της ανθεκτικότητας στη μείωση των επιπτώσεων της ψυχολογικής χειραγώγησης και της σιωπηρής αποχώρησης στον χώρο εργασίας, καθώς και η ταυτόχρονη εξέταση της δυνατότητάς της να ενισχύει την εργασιακή δέσμευση. **ΥΛΙΚΟ-ΜΕΘΟΔΟΣ** Διενεργήσαμε μια συγχρονική μελέτη στην Ελλάδα τον Ιανουάριο του 2025 με τη χρήση διαδικτυακού ερωτηματολογίου, το οποίο διανεμήθηκε μέσω κοινωνικών και επαγγελματικών δικτύων. Χρησιμοποιήθηκε ένα δείγμα ευκολίας εργαζομένων που πληρούσαν τα κριτήρια συμμετοχής, τα οποία περιλάμβαναν θέση υφισταμένου με τουλάχιστον ένα έτος επαγγελματικής εμπειρίας και εθελοντική συμμετοχή. Η ανθεκτικότητα αξιολογήθηκε με τη χρήση της Brief Resilience Scale (BRS). Η ψυχολογική χειραγώγηση στον χώρο εργασίας, η σιωπηρή αποχώρηση και η εργασιακή δέσμευση αξιολογήθηκαν με τις κλίμακες Galighting at Work Scale (GWS), Quiet Quitting Scale (QQS) και Utrecht Work Engagement Scale-3 (UWES-3), αντίστοιχα. Οι συσχετίσεις εξετάστηκαν με μοντέλα γραμμικής παλινδρόμησης, κατόπιν προσαρμογής για το φύλο, το μορφωτικό επίπεδο και

την εργασιακή εμπειρία. **ΑΠΟΤΕΛΕΣΜΑΤΑ** Συνολικά, 291 εργαζόμενοι συμμετείχαν στη μελέτη, από τους οποίους η πλειοψηφία ήταν γυναίκες (77%), με μέση ηλικία τα 42,15 έτη (τυπική απόκλιση [TA]=10,28) και μέση εργασιακή εμπειρία 16,69 έτη (TA=9,48). Η ανθεκτικότητα σχετιζόταν αρνητικά με την ψυχολογική χειραγώγηση στον χώρο εργασίας, όπως καταγράφηκε στη συνολική βαθμολογία της GWS ($b=-0,354$, 95% διάστημα εμπιστοσύνης [ΔΕ]= $-0,501$ έως $-0,206$, $p<0,001$), στην απώλεια εμπιστοσύνης στον εαυτό του ($b=-0,410$, 95% ΔΕ= $-0,558$ έως $-0,263$, $p<0,001$) και στην κατάχρηση εξουσίας ($b=-0,306$, 95% ΔΕ= $-0,468$ έως $-0,145$, $p<0,001$). Η σχέση μεταξύ ανθεκτικότητας και σιωπηρής αποχώρησης ήταν επίσης αρνητική ($b=-0,345$, 95% ΔΕ= $-0,458$ έως $-0,232$, $p<0,001$), καθώς και η συσχέτιση με τις υποκλίμακες της αποστασιοποίησης ($b=-0,284$, 95% ΔΕ= $-0,411$ έως $-0,157$, $p<0,001$), της έλλειψης πρωτοβουλίας ($b=-0,365$, 95% ΔΕ= $-0,501$ έως $-0,228$, $p<0,001$) και της έλλειψης κινήτρου ($b=-0,438$, 95% ΔΕ= $-0,585$ έως $-0,291$, $p<0,001$). Αντίθετα, η δέσμευση στην εργασία βρέθηκε να σχετίζεται θετικά με την ανθεκτικότητα ($b=0,650$, 95% ΔΕ= $0,422$ έως $0,879$, $p<0,001$). **ΣΥΜΠΕΡΑΣΜΑΤΑ** Η ανθεκτικότητα προστατεύει τους εργαζόμενους από την ψυχολογική χειραγώγηση και τη σιωπηρή αποχώρηση στον χώρο εργασίας και ενισχύει τη δέσμευσή τους στην εργασία. Η ενίσχυση της ανθεκτικότητας στον εργασιακό χώρο ενδέχεται να συμβάλλει ουσιαστικά στην προστασία της ευημερίας των εργαζομένων και στη βελτίωση της απόδοσης του εργατικού δυναμικού.

Λέξεις ευρετηρίου: Ανθεκτικότητα, Ελλάδα, Εργασιακή δέσμευση, Σιωπηρή αποχώρηση, Ψυχολογική χειραγώγηση

References

1. LING J, CHOK JI, ZHANG W, LOWERY CM. The impacts of organizational changes on work engagement and quiet quitting. *Am J Manag* 2025, 25:13–28
2. SERENKO A. The human capital management perspective on quiet quitting: Recommendations for employees, managers, and national policymakers. *J Knowl Manag* 2024, 28:27–43
3. IBRAHIM F, SAMSUDIN EZ, CHEN XW, TOHA HR. The prevalence and work-related factors of burnout among public health workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Occup Environ Med* 2022, 64:e20–e27
4. WOOT, HO R, TANG A, TAM W. Global prevalence of burnout symptoms among nurses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Psychiatr Res* 2020, 123:9–20
5. KAINALAINEN A, KORHONEN P, PENTTINEN MA, LIIRA J. Job stress and burnout among Finnish municipal employees without depression or anxiety. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2024, 74:235–241
6. ESEADI C, ARDI Z, VICTOR-AIGBODION V, NDILLE R, OBASUYI HU, OGBUABOR SE. Intervention for job burnout reduction among a sample of Nigerian lecturers. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2023, 102:e33425
7. SWEET PL. The sociology of gaslighting. *Am Sociol Rev* 2019, 84:851–875
8. DURU P, OCAKTAN ME, ÇELEN Ü, ÖRSAL Ö. The effect of workplace bullying perception on psychological symptoms: A structural equation approach. *Saf Health Work* 2018, 9:210–215
9. MOISOGLOU I, KATSIROUMPA A, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, PAPATHANASIOU IV, KATSAPI A, PRASINI I ET AL. Workplace gaslighting is associated with nurses' job burnout and turnover intention in Greece. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2025, 13:1574
10. KATSIROUMPA A, MOISOGLOU I, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, GALLOS P, REKLEITI M, RIZOS F ET AL. Workplace gaslighting affects nurses' mental health and work life: Evidence from Greece. *Preprints.org* 2025. Available at: <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202506.0494/v1>
11. ASHRAF S. Investigating the antecedents and consequences of workplace gaslighting: Interdependence theory and affective events theory perspectives. Dissertation. Business Administration, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois, 2024
12. KIM KT, SOHN YW. The impact of quiet quitting on turnover intentions in the era of digital transformation: The mediating roles of job satisfaction and affective commitment, and the moderating role of psychological safety. *Systems* 2024, 12:460
13. MOISOGLOU I, KATSIROUMPA A, KATSAPI A, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, GALANIS P. Poor nurses' work environment increases quiet quitting and reduces work engagement: A cross-sectional study in Greece. *Nurs Rep* 2025, 15:19
14. MOISOGLOU I, KATSIROUMPA A, PAPATHANASIOU IV, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, KATHARAKI M, MALLIAROU M ET AL. Engaging leadership reduces quiet quitting and improves work engagement: Evidence from nurses in Greece. *Nurs Rep* 2025, 15:247
15. HALBESLEBEN JRB, NEVEU JP, PAUSTIAN-UNDERDAHL SC, WESTMAN M. Getting to the "COR": Understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *J Manag* 2014, 40:1334–1364
16. CHEN S, HU X, XUE Y, WANG Y. The effect of collectivism-oriented human resource management on employee resilience of hospitality employees. *Front Psychol* 2024, 15:1342318
17. LIU F, ZHANG C, GONG Y, ZHANG J, SUN L. When do resilient employees work harder? Exploring the moderating roles of overqualification and family motivation. *Pers Individ Differ* 2023, 210:112214
18. ONAN G, SÜRÜCÜ L, BEKMEZCI M, DALMIŞ AB, SUNMAN G. Relationships between positive leadership styles, psychological resilience, and burnout: An empirical study among Turkish teachers. *Behav Sci* 2025, 15:713
19. MOISOGLOU I, KATSIROUMPA A, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, PAPATHANASIOU IV, PRASINI I, REKLEITI M ET AL. Resilience protects nurses from workplace gaslighting and quiet quitting, and

- improves their work engagement: A cross-sectional study in Greece. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2025, 13:2064
20. ARSHAD A, SUN PYT, DESMARAIS F. Abusive supervision and employee empowerment: The moderating role of resilience and workplace friendship. *J Leadersh Org Stud* 2021, 28:479–494
 21. KHAN R, JALIL A, KHAN ZU. Impact of abusive supervision on work engagement: Mediation by organizational justice and moderation by resilience. *Pak Soc Sci Rev* 2020, 4:919–935
 22. WUT TM, LEE SW, XU J. Role of organizational resilience and psychological resilience in the workplace – internal stakeholder perspective. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022, 19:11799
 23. HUSSAIN Z, FARID H, LIU X, SHAHEEN WA. Unveiling the effects of stressors on task performance: The role of thriving at work and resilience. *Front Psychol* 2022, 13:896505
 24. BARDOEL EA, PETTIT TM, DE CIERI H, McMILLAN L. Employee resilience: An emerging challenge for HRM. *Asia Pac J Hum Resour* 2014, 52:279–297
 25. VON ELM E, ALTMAN DG, EGGER M, POCOCK SJ, GØTZSCHE PC, VANDENBROUCKE JP ET AL. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008, 61:344–349
 26. SMITH BW, DALEN J, WIGGINS K, TOOLEY E, CHRISTOPHER P, BERNARD J. The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *Int J Behav Med* 2008, 15:194–200
 27. KYRIAZOSTA, STALIKAS A, PRASSA K, GALANAKIS M, YOTSIDIV, LAKIOTI A. Psychometric evidence of the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) and modeling distinctiveness of resilience from depression and stress. *Psychology* 2018, 9:1828–1857
 28. KATSIROUMPA A, MOISOGLOU I, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, TSIACHRI M, KOLISIATI A, GALANIS P. The Gaslighting at Work Scale: Development and initial validation. *J Workplace Behav Health* 2025, 1–23
 29. KATSIROUMPA A, MOISOGLOU I, TSIACHRI M, LAMPRAKOPOULOU K, GALANI O, TSAKALAKI A ET AL. Gaslighting at Work Scale: Determination of an optimal cut-off point. *Int J Caring Sci* 2025, 18:614–621
 30. GALANIS P, KATSIROUMPA A, VRAKA I, SISKOU O, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, MOISOGLOU I ET AL. The quiet quitting scale: Development and initial validation. *AIMS Public Health* 2023, 10:828–848
 31. GALANIS P, KATSIROUMPA A, VRAKA I, SISKOU O, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, KATSIOULAS T ET AL. Nurses quietly quit their job more often than other healthcare workers: An alarming issue for healthcare services. *Int Nurs Rev* 2024, 71:850–859
 32. SCHAUFELI WB, SHIMAZU A, HAKANEN J, SALANOVA M, DE WITTE H. An ultra-short measure for work engagement: The UWES-3 validation across five countries. *Eur J Psychol Assess* 2019, 35:577–591
 33. KATSIROUMPA A, MOISOGLOU I, KALOGEROPOULOU M, KONSTANTAKOPOULOU O, GALLOS P, TSIACHRI M ET AL. Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (3 items version): Translation and validation in Greek. *Int J Caring Sci* 2024, 17:1342–1349
 34. WORLD MEDICAL ASSOCIATION. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA* 2013, 310:2191–2194
 35. ZHU Y, ZHANG S, SHEN Y. Humble leadership and employee resilience: Exploring the mediating mechanism of work-related promotion focus and perceived insider identity. *Front Psychol* 2019, 10:673
 36. JAMIL S, KHAN S, ZAFAR S. Resilient employees in resilient organizations: The influence on competency of an organization through sustainable human resource management. *Global Journal for Management and Administrative Sciences (GJMAS)* 2022, 3:91–107
 37. SHATTÉ A, PERLMAN A, SMITH B, LYNCH WD. The positive effect of resilience on stress and business outcomes in difficult work environments. *J Occup Environ Med* 2017, 59:135–140
 38. CABRERA-AGUILAR E, ZEVALLOS-FRANCIA M, MORALES-GARCÍA M, RAMÍREZ-CORONEL AA, MORALES-GARCÍA SB, SAIRITUPA-SANCHEZ LZ ET AL. Resilience and stress as predictors of work engagement: The mediating role of self-efficacy in nurses. *Front Psychiatry* 2023, 14:1202048
 39. GALANIS P, MOISOGLOU I, MALLIAROU M, PAPATHANASIOU IV, KATSIROUMPA A, VRAKA I ET AL. Quiet quitting among nurses increases their turnover intention: Evidence from Greece in the post-COVID-19 era. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2023, 12:79
 40. MOON IO, PARK SK, JUNG JM. Effects of resilience on work engagement and burnout of clinical nurses. *J Korean Acad Nurs Adm* 2013, 19:525–535
 41. MOISOGLOU I, KATSIROUMPA A, MALLIAROU M, PAPATHANASIOU IV, GALLOS P, GALANIS P. Social support and resilience are protective factors against COVID-19 pandemic burnout and job burnout among nurses in the post-COVID-19 era. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2024, 12:710
 42. ZHOU F, LONG K, SHEN H, YANG Z, YANG T, DENG L ET AL. Resilience, organizational support, and innovative behavior on nurses' work engagement: A moderated mediation analysis. *Front Public Health* 2023, 11:1309667
 43. GALANIS P, KATSIROUMPA A, MOISOGLOU I, KALOGEROPOULOU M, GALLOS P, VRAKA I. Emotional intelligence protects nurses against quiet quitting, turnover intention, and job burnout. *AIMS Public Health* 2024, 11:601–613

Corresponding author:

P. Galanis, 123 Papadiamantopoulou street, 115 27 Athens, Greece
e-mail: pegalan@nurs.uoa.gr