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Abstract

Work anecdotes and popular media programs such as Office Space, The Office, and Dilbert suggest that there are a number of workers in the U.S. that feel a sense of apathy toward their workplace and their job. This paper develops these ideas theoretically and provides validity evidence for a scale of job apathy across two studies. Job apathy is defined as a type of selective apathy characterized by diminished motivation and affect towards one’s job. A scale of job apathy was developed and data from a sample of currently or recently employed college students supported two dimensions: apathetic action and apathetic thought. Job apathy was found to be empirically distinct from clinical apathy, negative affectivity, cynicism, and employee engagement. Job apathy was also found to have incremental validity in the prediction of personal initiative, withdrawal, and organizational deviance. Practical implications and future research directions for job apathy are discussed.
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“Yeah. Oh and remember, next Friday is Hawaiian shirt day!” [Cuts to expressionless workforce crowd.] “So, y'know, if you want to, go ahead and uh, wear a Hawaiian shirt and jeans.”

—Bill Lumbergh, “the boss,” played by Gary Cole, in the movie Office Space (1999)

“Right now this is just a job. If I advance any higher in this company, then this would be my career. And well, if this were my career I'd have to throw myself in front of a train.”

—Jim Halpert, played by John Krasinski, in the TV show The Office (2005)

Our popular culture often portrays employees that feel little attachment to their jobs in organizations, a sentiment commonly referred to as apathy. A 2013 Gallup poll found that worldwide only 13% of workers reported feeling engaged in their jobs, with 63% reporting feeling not engaged and another 24% suggest they were even actively disengaging from the workplace (Crabtree, 2013). Clearly, a number of workers are having work experiences that lead them to feel disconnected from their jobs. We believe this phenomenon, in part, can be represented in the concept of job apathy. According to the American Heritage College Dictionary, apathy is defined as a “lack of interest or concern” or a “lacking [of] emotion or feeling.” Such feelings of indifference or impassivity are likely to be negatively related to important work-relevant outcomes, and might thus negatively impact organizational health and productivity.

While apathy is a well-known phenomenon anecdotally, very little work-related research has examined the concept (Ladebo, 2005; Spector, 1975). Many studies in the management and psychology literature have focused on the positive end of job involvement such as proactive
behaviors and job engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Weigel et al., 2010). For the negative end of job involvement research has primarily focused on burnout, which has been seen as the opposite end of engagement, (Alarcon, 2011; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Romá, & Bakker, 2002) and to a lesser degree psychological detachment (Sonnentag, Kuttler, & Fritz, 2010). While both of these constructs help to illustrate the negative end of job involvement and its impact their concept conceptualizations leave unexamined potential avenues of interest to researchers and organizations.

Burnout focuses on work-related stressors having an impact on workers’ future responses, leading to exhaustion, increased disinterest in a job, and decreased feelings of personal efficacy related to work (Alarcon, 2011; Bakker, Demerouti, Sanz-Vergel, 2014; Bakker, Emmerik, & Euwema, 2006). Burnout, thus, is a process over time with experienced stress playing a significant role in how burnout takes place. Psychological disengagement also focuses on stress, specifically disengaging from thinking about work during non-work times (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005; Sonnentag, Kuttler, & Fritz, 2010). While stress has a significant impact on workers’ experiences certainly the negative end of job involvement might have more unexplored areas in its construct space. Job apathy offers one construct that does not need such a direct tie to worker experienced stress and can be used to examine other factors of lowered job involvement.

We need to better understand the concept of job apathy as it seems potentially related to important outcomes in organizations. First of all, feeling apathetic toward one’s job would decrease one’s job satisfaction at the individual level. Also, given that affective states are highly contagious, it is likely that one’s apathetic attitudes toward their job might affect other individuals’ sense of apathy in the workplace (Bakker et al., 2006). Moreover, for jobs in the
service sector in which being attuned to customers’ needs and feelings is critical, having an apathetic attitude could severely hinder customer satisfaction and organizational performance.

This paper presents a theoretical conceptualization of job apathy and provides validity evidence for a scale of job apathy. We begin by discussing the existing research on general apathy as a psychological disorder. We then define and explain how job apathy can be seen as a particular form of selective apathy. Across two studies we first provide validity evidence for a job apathy scale and in the second study demonstrate that job apathy has incremental predictive validity over employee engagement for several important workplace constructs. We conclude by discussing what we still need to know about job apathy and practical implications.

Apathy as a Psychological Disorder

In psychiatry, clinical apathy is a psychological disorder defined as a pervasive “set of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive features such as reduced interest in the main activities of daily life, a lack of initiative, a trend toward early withdrawal from initiated activities, indifference, and flattening of affect” (Sockeel, et al., 2006, p. 579). Marin (1990) denotes apathy as a state of diminished motivation not caused by a decrease in one’s level of consciousness or an intellectual deficiency, which is accompanied by a lack of emotion. In necessitating a reduction in both motivation and emotion, Marin (1990) was able to distinguish apathy from other clinical diagnoses such as depression, delirium, and dementia.

The clarification of apathy as an independent concept led to the development of the first apathy measure, the Apathy Evaluation Scale (AES; Marin, Biedrzycki & Firinciogullari, 1991). The AES operationalized apathy as a simultaneous deficiency of the overt behavioral, cognitive, and emotional components of goal-directed behavior. Although the measure was found to be
predictive of clinical apathy in patients with mental or behavioral disorders (Marin, Biedrzycki, & Firinciogullari, 1991), the desire for an apathy measure more descriptive of apathy’s mental and behavioral components led to the creation of the Lille Apathy Rating Scale (LARS; Sockeel et al., 2006) which focuses on nine dimensions of clinical apathy: reduction in everyday productivity, lack of interest, lack of initiative, extinction of novelty seeking and motivation, blunting of emotional responses, lack of concern, poor social life and extinction of self-awareness, (Stuss, Van Reekum, & Murphy, 2000). These nine dimensions load onto four factors: intellectual curiosity, emotion, action initiation and self-awareness (Sockeel et al., 2006).

**Selective Apathy**

While clinical apathy describes an individual who lacks motivation and affect towards all facets of life, Marin (1990) also introduced the concept of selective apathy, a less pervasive construct characterized by a lack of interest, activity and emotional involvement within a specific life domain. In the case of selective apathy, an individual might be apathetic towards one particular area of his or her life (i.e., work, family, school), but otherwise function normally in other areas. For instance, a person may show apathy toward their workplace, displaying a lack of interest and emotional involvement, but have normal interest and emotional involvement in their family and other important life domains.

In contrast to clinical apathy, which suggests a pervasive psychological disorder, Marin (1990, 1996) describes selective apathy as relatively common and even adaptive. Selective apathy was argued to be common in that people often have areas of life where they may not want to invest their effort and attention. A person cannot be highly motivated and emotionally invested in every potential aspect of their life at any moment. Selective apathy can also be a means for individuals to avoid investing emotion and effort in something from which they cannot
benefit or impact. To Marin (1990), selective apathy might be a rational response to a specific life domain that only causes pain or frustration. Selective apathy is then a means to avoid squandering valuable effort or emotional energy in an unproductive endeavor. While Marin (1990, 1996) saw selective apathy as a common occurrence in everyday life, no research as of yet has examined selective apathy empirically in any form. We examine selective apathy from a work perspective, which we call job apathy and discuss in detail below.

**Job Apathy**

Job apathy can be seen as selective apathy targeted at the workplace. Borrowing from Marin’s (1990) definition, job apathy is defined as a state of diminished motivation and affect towards one’s job. An individual high in job apathy has low emotional attachment to their job and organization, coupled with a low level of motivation related to thinking about and performing their job and related organizational functions. It is important to note that individuals in a state of job apathy can still function normally in other settings. They may be dedicated to their family, passionately follow their favorite baseball team, and engage in volunteer work in the community; however, they exhibit a clear lack of emotional and motivational engagement with their workplace.

Important to note here is that job apathy does not need to arise as a result of perceived job stressors as is the case for burnout (Alarcon, 2011). A person may have job apathy due to their personality, lack of felt connection the job, lack of interest in their job-task, attention paid to other life domains instead, or other factors.

**Existing empirical work on job apathy.**

To date, very little research has examined job apathy empirically. Based on our review, only two studies have examined apathy related to the workplace and in both cases job apathy was
looked at in a tangential, ad hoc manner and without the selective apathy base of this research. Spector (1975) examined employee reactions to organizational frustration. In analyzing the factor structure of the responses to frustration scale he found a grouping of items he labelled “apathy about the job,” that had a positive correlation \( r = .29 \) with employee frustration. The “apathy about the job” factor was focused on apathetic behaviors, and seems significantly broader than how we conceptualize job apathy in this paper, with two items stating “purposely did job incorrectly” and “take any kind of drug at work to get high.” This does suggest frustration as a potential cause of job apathy, though the different conceptualization of apathy about the job in Spector (1975) compared to this work make a direct comparison difficult.

The second study that had an element of job apathy was by Ladebo (2005) and looked at how the work-related attitudes of primary school teachers in Nigeria impacted their intentions to stay in the profession. Measuring job apathy was not part of the original intent of the researchers; rather when they examined the factor structure of a job satisfaction scale used (Rodgers-Jenkinson & Chapman, 1990) they found the scale broke into three distinct factors, one of which they called job apathy. This included the items “I am often bored with my work,” “Most of the times I have to force myself to go to work,” along with 3 others. The sub-scale was coded in the direction that a higher score meant lower levels of job apathy. The sub-scale was found to have a significantly positive relationship with professional commitment \( r = .32 \), a job satisfaction index \( r = .72 \), and a quit intentions scale where a higher score meant less intention to leave \( r = .35 \).

In both of the cases above (Spector, 1975; Ladebo, 2005), job apathy was a factor that emerged in a factor analysis rather than a construct that was being directly and purposefully examined. As such, these conceptualizations of job apathy may have significant elements of
construct deficiency and contamination. Worth noting is that the job apathy factors in both were sub-factors of a scale of a different construct (i.e., reactions to frustration in Spector (1975) and job satisfaction in Ladebo, 2005). They offer tentative evidence that job apathy is a meaningful construct and can predict workplace constructs, but the happenchance inclusion of job apathy in the studies makes it difficult to draw conclusions on the nature of job apathy. This paper focuses on clearly conceptualizing job apathy and creating a valid scale for measurement.

**The conceptualization of job apathy.**

To systematically describe the construct of job apathy, we looked at clinical apathy and the dimensional breakdown of clinical apathy proposed by the LARS (Sockel et al., 2006). Based on the analysis presented by the LARS and with an eye to selective apathy, we suggest three primary components of job apathy: apathetic emotion, apathetic thought, and apathetic action. We propose that these three factors represent the construct space of job apathy, and may affect outcomes of interest differentially. High levels across these factors as a whole suggest an apathetic worker.

The first general factor, apathetic emotion, refers to the emotional connection and concern an individual has for the job and the job context. A person high in this job apathy factor would be predicted to invest little emotional energy in job tasks, coworkers or the organization; job successes or failures would barely arouse an emotional response. This fits with idea of an apathetic worker who just doesn’t seem to care about their job. Job apathy is characterized by an emotional detachment from the job and organization.

Apathetic thought, the second general job apathy factor, describes the degree to which an individual lacks interest in his or her job and is satisfied with the status quo at work. Motivated thought characterizes how “cognitively involved” people are in their work and the mindset with
which they approach their tasks. An individual ranking high in this dimension would have little interest in the processes of his or her job, seldom devising strategies that could benefit their overall performance. We could see this in workers who seem to be “on auto pilot,” not interested in what they are doing or considering ways the job could be done more effectively. Job apathy is characterized by little thought or mental attention being paid towards the job or the workplace.

The final factor, apathetic action, entails the degree to which individuals fail to engage in unsolicited, effortful actions directed towards their job with the intent of performing well and accomplishing necessary task functions. The factor is about an individual acting in an unmotivated way at work. A high scorer in this factor of job apathy would be unwilling to invest energy in his or her job if not prompted to do so and would likely achieve a performance level only high enough to avoid job sanctions. A worker high in this factor is not a hard worker and puts in lower levels of effort than those around him/her. Job apathy is characterized by a lack of action in the workplace beyond what is absolutely required.

These three areas are conceptualized as covering the construct space of job apathy. The apathetic worker should display signs of decreased affect toward the workplace, decreased mental investment in their job, and a lower level of effortful action towards workplace tasks. An individual high in job apathy is disconnected from the workplace and unwilling to invest effort in the organization’s success. Thus, we hypothesize that job apathy consists of three dimensions, namely apathetic thought, apathetic emotion, and apathetic action (Hypothesis 1).

In addition to testing the dimensionality of the job apathy scale, we also examine the convergent and discriminant validity of the job apathy scale. We expect that there will be moderate correlations between job apathy and theoretically relevant constructs such as trait negative affectivity and cynicism. Employees who are high on trait negative affect are prone to
distress and aversive emotional states (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). This tendency may serve as motivation to withdraw from work in order to lessen exposure to potential instigators. The proposed theory of job apathy suggests that severing emotional ties can be an adaptive coping mechanism for distressed employees (Marin, 1990). Employees high in negative affect may choose to worry less about problems at work in order to regulate emotions that could otherwise become debilitating. This is consistent with the established finding that individuals high in negative affect are less satisfied with their jobs (Judge & Larsen, 2001). Therefore, we would expect that trait negative affect should be positively related to job apathy (Hypothesis 2).

Cynicism refers to a largely negative attitudinal state characterized by feelings of mistrust and disillusionment concerning the motives and integrity of other people (Kaplan, Bradley & Ruscher, 2004). Research has shown that cynical employees tend to care little for their performance and are frequently withdrawn from their jobs, rarely attempting to seek the approval of others or do more than what is required to maintain their position (Kaplan et al., 2004). In this sense, cynicism should decrease motivation to perform on the job and, thus, contribute towards an apathetic state. However, a cynical employee’s low levels of performance motivation are likely to be accompanied by relatively high levels of negative affect. Unlike apathy, cynicism is perpetuated by the strength of an individual’s disdain or disapproval for their organization and its employees and thus possesses an identifiable emotional impetus. We expect cynicism and job apathy will be positively related (Hypothesis 3).

**Study 1 Method**

The goal of the first study was to develop and test a scale to measure job apathy. We also tested the convergent and discriminant validity of the scale with trait affectivity and cynicism.

**Item Generation and Refinement**
A large pool of items was created to reflect each of the three dimensions of the proposed job apathy conceptualization. The preliminary items were created based on previously published measures of clinical apathy that fit with our three proposed dimensions of job apathy; they were primarily modeled after the clinical apathy scale by Sockel et al. (2006) with the items modified to represent selective apathy. In total, 55 items were initially created based on wording modifications to better reflect job apathy. The authors then had several meetings to sort through the items and narrow the item pool into a smaller list of items for use in the first study. The purpose of the initial item screening process was to come up with a representative yet manageable number of items to test the proposed three dimensions of the job apathy construct. After a series of item refinement and reduction, the initial item pool included 16 items – 4 for apathetic thought, 6 for apathetic emotion, and 6 for apathetic action.

**Participants**

The data was collected in an online survey distributed to members of a psychology subject pool at a large public Midwestern university. The sample consisted of 248 undergraduates who completed the survey for extra credit or course credit. Ninety-six percent of participants worked at least part-time within the last 6 months, 82% of participants were working at the time of the survey, with 20% of participants working full-time. Participants ranged from 18 to 33 years old (mean = 21.1), 71% were female and 65% were Caucasian.

**Measures**

**Negative Affectivity.** Trait negative affect was assessed using the 10-item Negative Affect Schedule (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Responses were made on a 5-point scale (1 = Very slightly or not at all to 5 = Extremely). Items consist of adjectives such as “irritable.”
Cynicism. Cynicism was measured using the 7-item scale of general cynicism by Kanter and Mirvis (1989). Participants indicated their agreement with statements on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly disagree). A sample item is “Most people will tell a lie if they can gain by it.”

Job Apathy. Job Apathy was measured using the 16 items developed by the authors. The items were based in part on the clinical apathy scale of Sockel et al. (2006) with modifications made to fit the job apathy domain. The measure was designed to have three sub-scales: apathetic thought (4 items), apathetic emotion (6 items), and apathetic action (6 items). Participants indicated their agreement with statements on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly disagree).

Study 1 Results

Psychometric assessment of job apathy items. We used principal component analysis with oblique rotation in SPSS to examine the underlying factor structure of the job apathy items. In order to reduce the length of the measure to meet practical needs while retaining its psychometric integrity, we followed two steps in our approach to further trim down the number of items. As a criterion to retain factors, those factors that had an Eigenvalue greater than one were retained. We then eliminated items that had factor loadings of .32 or below on their highest loading factor (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). Factors that consisted of only one or two items were deleted.

The results showed that we should distinguish two dimensions of job apathy instead of the proposed three dimensions. The first factor consisted of the apathetic thought and apathetic emotion items. The second factor consisted of the apathetic action items. Content analysis of the apathetic thought and apathetic emotion items revealed some conceptual overlap across the two dimensions. Though we originally conceptualized the two dimensions as conceptually distinct,
for employees thoughts and emotion may be highly related to each other. Accordingly, we labeled the first factor as apathetic cognition and the second one as apathetic action. In conclusion, Hypothesis 1 was not supported. The results indicated that apathetic thoughts and apathetic emotions should be included as one factor, resulting in two total dimensions of job apathy for the scale.

The final set of 10 items is presented in Table 1. Together, the two factors explained 54.24% of the variance. The first factor (Eigenvalue=5.39), which explained 25.67% of the variance, is formed by the items for apathetic cognition (5 items). The second factor (Eigenvalue=2.99), explaining 14.26% of the variance, is formed by the items for apathetic action (5 items). The results of Study 1 provide conceptual support for the hypothesized job apathy dimensions but simultaneously indicate that it would be better to use two dimensions instead of the three originally proposed.

We also tested hypotheses 2 and 3 using the correlation coefficients between the job apathy dimensions and measures of related constructs – trait affectivity and cynicism. As shown in Table 2, there were significant negative relationships as expected between trait positive affect and apathetic cognition (r=-.38; p<.01) and apathetic action (r=-.44; p<.01). There were moderate, positive relationships between trait negative affect and apathetic cognition (r=.19; p<.01) and apathetic action (r=.31; p<.01). These values were smaller than the correlation between the two dimensions of job apathy (r=.62; p<.01). These results support convergent and
discriminant validity of job apathy scale such that job apathy is a related, yet distinct construct from trait affectivity. Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Similarly, cynicism was positively related to apathetic cognition ($r=.26; p<.01$) and apathetic action ($r=.13; p<.05$) as proposed. Also, as expected the relationships were weaker compared to the correlation between the two dimensions of job apathy ($r=.62; p<.01$). These results suggest that job apathy is related to cynicism yet is a distinct construct. Hypothesis 3 was supported.

While the results of study 1 largely supported our initial set of hypotheses, there are some limitations. First, the factor structure of the job apathy scale was different than our proposed model. Second, we did not test convergent and discriminant validities with other theoretically interesting and relevant constructs such as job engagement and clinical apathy. Finally, we did not test the criterion-related validity of the job apathy scale. In study 2, we will replicate this factor structure and further examine the construct validity of the job apathy scale.

In study 2, we utilized an independent sample to replicate the two dimensional factor structure of the job apathy scale using confirmatory factor analysis. We also measured other constructs theoretically relevant to job apathy (i.e., clinical apathy and job engagement), to further establish its convergent validity, as well as outcome variables that we believe that job apathy predicts (i.e., job withdrawal, personal initiative, and deviance behaviors). Weald and Downey (2009) argue that despite a relatively short history of job engagement literature, the popularity of engagement research indicates the need to further examine relevant constructs and build a comprehensive understanding on the feeling of engagement as well as disengagement (See also, Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010). Study 2 answers that call by examining both job apathy and job engagement and their relationships with relevant variables.
Study 2

Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Job Apathy

Clinical Apathy.

As discussed above, clinical apathy is a general state of diminished motivation and lack of emotion that extends to all spheres of life (Marin, 1990). Job apathy is a form of selective apathy where a person feels a state of diminished motivation and affect towards one’s job. We hypothesize that clinical apathy and job apathy are positively related but are distinct from each other due to the fact that clinical apathy applies to all life domains while job apathy is restricted to the work domain (Hypothesis 4).

Employee Engagement.

Schaufeli et al. (2002) define employee engagement as a positive and fulfilling state of mind with three major components: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor is high levels of energy and mental resilience while working. Dedication is characterized by the sense of significance and enthusiasm an individual has for his/her job. Absorption is high levels of concentration and engrossment in one’s work (Gonzalez-Roma, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Lloret, 2006). A number of scholars see employee engagement as on the same scale as burnout but the opposite pole (Bakker et al., 2014; Schaufeli et al., 2006).

Job apathy and employee engagement seem conceptually similar, but there are differences in their conceptualization. Employee engagement is focused more directly on worker behaviors while job apathy focuses on more general motivational and affective evaluations of the job. Engagement also focuses on identification with and positive feelings towards a job. While individuals high in job apathy do lack identification with a job they do not have negative feelings toward the job, rather neutral feelings. They lack emotional connection positive or negative.
Employee engagement also has a greater focus on commitment to the job, in terms of sustained effort (dedication) and continuance on the job despite other competing demands (absorption). Though job apathy and employee engagement are expected to have a relatively strong negative relationship with each other, they are expected to be empirically distinct concepts (Hypothesis 5).

**Criterion-related validity of job apathy scale.**

It is important to not only show that job apathy has discriminant validity but that it also relates to important existing constructs that job apathy would be expected to predict. In this study we specifically look at job withdrawal behaviors, personal initiative, and organizational deviance.

**Job Withdrawal Behaviors.**

Employee withdrawal behaviors, including withholding effort at work, lateness, absenteeism, and turnover are detrimental to organizations (Hackett, 1989). Withdrawal behaviors range in their degree of cognition involved, from deliberate intentions to quit to subtle psychological neglect at work (Rusbult, Farrell, & Mainous III, 1998). Hanisch and Hulin’s (1991) theorized that withdrawal behaviors reflect negative attachment to the job or organization, as well as mood and emotions that can influence behavior in the absence of conscious evaluation. Job apathy may be likely to lead to withdrawal behaviors through conscious decisions by apathetic workers to withdraw their effort and attention. Job apathy could also accentuate the tendency to engage in withdrawal behaviors through non-intentional channels, with the feelings of job apathy leading to unconscious engagement in withdrawal behaviors. Therefore, we expect job apathy to be positively related to job withdrawal (Hypothesis 6).

**Personal Initiative.**

Apathetic employees perform at the bare minimum level. Because they are likely to identify weakly with the organization, they are focused on the short-term demands of their job
and care little about long-term benefits to the organization. In contrast to this type of passive approach that characterizes job apathy is the proactive orientation referred to as personal initiative (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997). According to Frese and Fay (2001, p. 97), personal initiative is a behavioral tendency indicated by “an individual taking an active and self-starting approach to work goals and tasks and persisting in overcoming barriers and setbacks.”

Personal initiative is differentiated from other constructs such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) because of its distinctive long-term orientation (Frese et al., 1997). Personal initiative is concerned not with helping or conscientiousness, but instead with behaviors meant to ensure that one’s performance leads to the ultimate goals of the organization. We hypothesize that because of the passive orientation characterizing job apathy it should be negatively related to personal initiative (Hypothesis 7).

**Organizational Deviance.**

Organizational deviance is defined as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both” (Robinson & Bennett, p. 556). Deviance may encompass behaviors such as withholding effort, neglecting direction, and engaging in behaviors that go against organizational values and waste productive resources (Pearson & Porath, 2005). Kaplan (1975) conceptualized two pathways to deviance, either through lack of motivation to conform or through the motivation to violate normative expectations in the organization. Job apathy is expected to influence both of these pathways, especially through lack of motivation. Thus, we hypothesize that job apathy is positively related to deviance behaviors (Hypothesis 8).

**Study 2 Method**

**Procedure and participants**
The data was collected in an online survey administered to participants of a psychology subject pool at a large public Midwestern university who completed the survey for extra credit or course credit. The sample consisted of 442 students who were working at the time of the survey (15% working full-time). On average, participants worked at their current job for 15 months (SD = 14 month). Participants ranged from 18 to 53 years old (mean = 20), 71% were female, and 80% were Caucasian.

**Measures**

**Job apathy.** Job apathy was measured using the 10-item scale of job apathy developed in Study 1. The measure contains two sub-scales: apathetic cognition (5 items) and apathetic action (5 items). Participants indicated their agreement with statements on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly disagree). The full list of items can be found in Table 1.

**Clinical apathy.** Clinical apathy was measured using the 32-item scale developed by Sockeel et al. (2006). Participants indicated their agreement with statements on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly disagree). A sample item is: “When I decide to do something, I find it difficult to make an effort.”

**Employee engagement.** The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale–9 [UWES-9] was employed for measuring employee engagement (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). This 9-item scale had a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always). A sample item is “At my work, I feel bursting with energy.”

**Withdrawal.** Organization withdrawal was measured by a scale developed by Marcus, Schuler, Quell, and Humpfer (2002). This 17-item measure had a 7-point scale from 1 (never) to 7 (every time). A sample item is “I intentionally worked slowly or carelessly.”
Personal Initiative. Personal initiative was measured with a 7-item measure (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997) on a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item is “I actively attack problems.”

Organizational Deviance. The organizational deviance scale developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000) was used. This 12-item measure had a 7-point scale from 1 (never) to 7 (daily). A sample item is “I’ve taken property from work without permission.”

Study 2 Results

Confirmatory factor analysis

We used confirmatory factor analysis within the AMOS program to test dimensionality of job apathy scale. The purpose of the analysis was to test whether the two-factor solution identified in Study 1 fit the data provided by a new sample of working adults. In order to assess the model fit, a number of different fit indices were utilized as there is no single fit index that can evaluate all the different aspects of goodness of fit. Five indices were used: chi-square/df ratio ($\chi^2$/df), the Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), the Incremental Fit Index (IFI), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudek, 1993). The chi-square/df ratio indicates the extent to which a particular model fits the data compared to a perfect fit. Browne & Cudeck (1993) suggested TLI and CFI values of .90 or greater to be considered as acceptable fit. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested TLI and CFI values to greater than .95 to be considered as good fit. For RMSEA a value under .08 indicates an acceptable fit (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

[Insert Table 3 Here]
We present a comparison of the two-factor job apathy model with the one-factor model in Table 3. The fit indices for the two-factor model suggested an acceptable fit (RMSEA = .068; CFA = .96; TLI = .94). The fit of the two-factor model was significantly better in comparison to the one-factor model in which all items were loaded on one general factor (Δχ²=246.79, Δdf=1, \( p<.001 \)). Therefore, the two-factor model of job apathy consisting of the apathetic cognition and apathetic action dimensions was supported.

The correlations of clinical apathy with the two dimensions of job apathy and overall job apathy are presented in Table 4. There were significantly positive correlations of clinical apathy with apathetic cognition (\( r=.29; p<.01 \)) and apathetic action (\( r=.46; p<.01 \)). While the correlations between clinical apathy and the two job apathy dimensions were significant and positive, the strength of the relationships were weaker than the correlation between the two dimensions of job apathy (\( r=.59; p<.01 \)). This suggests that clinical apathy and job apathy are positively related yet two separate constructs and provides support for hypothesis 4.

We further tested the convergent and divergent validity of job apathy and clinical apathy using confirmatory factor analysis (Table 5). Three different models were created to test Hypothesis 4. In model 1, all clinical apathy and job apathy items were loaded on a single factor. This model, therefore, assumed no distinction between job apathy and clinical apathy. In model 2, all job apathy items were loaded on a single job apathy factor and all clinical apathy items were
loaded on a clinical apathy factor. The two factors were allowed to covary. In model 3, the apathetic action items were loaded on an apathetic action factor, the apathetic cognition items were loaded on an apathetic cognition factor, and the clinical apathy items were loaded on a clinical apathy factor. The three factors were allowed to covary. According to Hypothesis 4, we expected that the two-factor and three-factor models would have better fit compared to the one-factor model. Supporting the hypothesis, the results showed that the two-factor (Δχ²=820.13, Δdf=1, p<.001) and three-factor models (Δχ²=961.97, Δdf=3, p<.001) had significantly better fit compared to the one-factor model. These results provide support for Hypothesis 4.

The correlations of employee engagement with the two dimensions of job apathy and job engagement are presented in Table 4. There were significantly negative correlations of employee engagement with apathetic cognition (r=-.68; p<.01) and apathetic action (r=-.51; p<.01).

Contrary to our expectation, the correlation between apathetic cognition and employee engagement was stronger than the correlation between the two dimensions of job apathy. Therefore, inconsistent with hypothesis 5, the results from the correlation coefficients suggest that job engagement and job apathy may be the opposite ends of a construct instead of two separate constructs. To further test the divergent validity of job apathy and employee engagement, we performed confirmatory factor analysis. Three different models were created to test Hypothesis 5 (Table 5). In model 1, all employee engagement items and job apathy items were loaded on a single factor. This model, therefore, assumes no distinction between job apathy and employee engagement. In model 2, all job apathy items were loaded on a job apathy factor and all employee engagement items were loaded on a clinical apathy factor. The two factors were allowed to covary. In model 3, the apathetic action items were loaded on an apathetic action factor, the apathetic cognition items were loaded on an apathetic cognition factor, and the
employee engagement items were loaded on an employee engagement factor. The three factors were allowed to covary. According to Hypothesis 5, we expected that the two-factor and three-factor models would have better fit compared to the one-factor model. Supporting the hypothesis, the results showed that two-factor ($\Delta \chi^2=474.47$, $\Delta \text{df}=1$, $p<.001$) and three-factor models ($\Delta \chi^2=655.89$, $\Delta \text{df}=3$, $p<.001$) had significantly better fit compared to the one-factor model. This result provides support for Hypothesis 5. The relationship between employee engagement and job apathy will be further examined in the incremental validity testing to be conducted in the subsequent analyses.

[Insert Table 6 Here]

Hypotheses 6 through 8 concerned the criterion-related validity of the job apathy scale. The result of the regression analyses can be found in Tables 6-7. For each test of criterion-related validity, we also tested the incremental validity of the job apathy dimensions over employee engagement using hierarchical linear regression. Because employee engagement is a widely used and published construct in organizational science (Macy & Schneider, 2008), we thought it would be important to examine the contribution of job apathy relative to employee engagement. Consistent with Hypothesis 6, job apathy was negatively related to personal initiative ($b=-.09$, $p<.01$ and $b=-.31$, $p<.01$ for apathetic cognition and action, respectively) (Table 6). We then tested the incremental validity of job apathy over employee engagement. After controlling for employee engagement, the job apathy dimensions still explained a significant amount of variance in personal initiative ($\Delta R^2=.09$; $p<.01$). The results indicate that job apathy has incremental validity above employee engagement.

[Insert Table 7 Here]
Consistent with Hypothesis 7, job apathy was positively related to job withdrawal behaviors ($b=.18$, $p<.01$ and $b=.32$, $p<.01$ for apathetic cognition and action, respectively) (Table 7). We then tested the incremental validity of job apathy over employee engagement. After controlling for employee engagement, the job apathy dimensions still explained a significant amount of variance in withdrawal behaviors ($\Delta R^2=.08$; $p<.01$). The results indicate that job apathy has incremental validity above employee engagement.

[Insert Table 8 Here]

Consistent with Hypothesis 8, job apathy was positively related to organizational deviance ($b=.10$, $p<.01$ and $b=.32$, $p<.01$ for apathetic cognition and action, respectively) (Table 8). We then tested the incremental validity of job apathy over employee engagement. After controlling for employee engagement, the job apathy dimensions still explained a significant amount of variance in organizational deviance ($\Delta R^2=.07$; $p<.01$). The results indicate that job apathy has incremental validity above employee engagement.

Overall, the results suggest that job apathy significantly predicts behaviors in organizations. Also, the testing of incremental validity shows that despite the fact that there is a great amount of overlap between job apathy and employee engagement, job apathy still has incremental validity in predicting those important organizational behaviors. Particularly, the results suggest that apathetic action dimension of job apathy has greater incremental validity compared to the apathetic cognition dimension of the job apathy.

Discussion
Overall, the results found here give support to job apathy as a meaningful construct, as well as a start to illuminate the nomological network of job apathy and its incremental prediction of work-related variables. These results provide validity evidence for a job apathy scale that could be used in future research.

**Job Apathy as a Concept**

Overall, the results of this study support our theoretical conceptualization of job apathy. The scale developed was supported by exploratory factor analysis in Study 1 and confirmatory factor analysis in Study 2. In Study 1 analyses suggested a two-factor structure for job apathy (apathetic cognition and apathetic action) and showed convergent and discriminant validity with trait negative affectivity and cynicism.

In Study 2 the two-factor model of apathy was supported by confirmatory factor analysis, with support also found for job apathy as distinct from clinical apathy. The distinction between job apathy and employee engagement received mixed support such that the correlation between employee engagement and job apathy was large and significantly negative yet CFA evidence suggests that the two constructs are unique. Job apathy was also found to have incremental validity of workplace constructs beyond employee engagement, suggesting it adds predictive value beyond employee engagement. Future research should examine this relationship in more detail to more clearly determine if job apathy and employee engagement are fully distinct or if aspects or facets have conceptual overlap. With burnout seen as an antipode of employee engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2006) it might also make sense to compare job apathy directly with burnout or use a scale that has engagement and burnout at different scale poles.

In Study 2, job apathy was found to have incremental validity above and beyond employee engagement in predicting personal initiative, organizational withdrawal, and
organizational deviance. These results suggest that job apathy is a potentially valuable concept related to organizational outcomes and that the scale presented here is psychometrically sound.

Future research could focus on more clearly examining how job apathy can impact organizational outcomes. Increased attention could be given to how the factors of job apathy (apathetic cognition and apathetic action) could have differential predictive power for job-related outcomes. One potential relationship to examine would be how job apathy relates to tardiness at work, as we might think workers high in job apathy would be more likely to be tardy. The result in this study already point the way toward some differences in strength of relationships.

**Limitations**

One significant limitation of this research is that both studies employed student samples and the majority of participants had been working only part-time. In the first study, the sample was restricted purposely to college students who were currently employed or had previous work experience. In the second study, the sample was restricted to college students who were currently working. As it can be argued that student workers are not representative of the workforce as a whole, the generalizability of these research findings can be questioned. Job apathy is not conceptualized to have differential relationships for part-time versus full-time workers. It might be argued that part-time workers are more likely to experience job apathy, as they often fill less desirable jobs. The sample used makes these results especially salient to organizations in industries often filled by college students and part-time workers, such as the service or retail sector. Future research in job apathy would benefit from examining an older sample of full-time employees to note any possible discrepancies.

Another limitation can be found in the correlational nature of this study’s design and the fact that all responses to the surveys were self-reported. The correlational nature of the study
negates the possibility of determining the causal direction for any of the relationships found. The self-report nature of the results is a limitation, although participants provided self-reports about their personality and work-related behaviors and cognitions, most of which are constructs of a perceptual nature and thus generally require self-report. Common method bias is always a concern in such a self-report focused design, but the incremental validity focus alleviates some of these concerns, as job apathy was found to explain variance above and beyond other variables. Job apathy was found to have differential relationships with variables of interest in both direction and magnitude. Nevertheless, future research should examine more objective work outcomes such as actual turnover and attendance as well use peer or supervisor ratings for variables such as organizational citizenship behaviors. Longitudinal data would also help to clarify the direction of causation of relationships found.

Future Directions and Practical Implications

Future research in job apathy should focus on establishing the discriminant validity of the construct. The research presented here attempted to lay a conceptual groundwork for job apathy as consisting of a behavioral (apathetic action) and cognitive component (apathetic cognition), as well as providing psychometric and validity evidence for a scale of job apathy. This study also sought to demonstrate empirically, through the use of confirmatory factor analysis, that job apathy is distinct from the more established constructs of trait negative affectivity, cynicism, clinical apathy, and employee engagement.

Future research could compare job apathy to other related constructs to establish discriminant validity and help determine areas of overlap. As noted previously, burnout would be a valuable construct to compare job apathy to. While we have discussed theoretical reasons for distinction between burnout and job apathy, further empirical examination is needed. Ladebo
(2005) found a strong relationship between the factor they labeled job apathy and job satisfaction, so future work should examine the relationship between job apathy and job satisfaction. Such work could help to establish empirically discriminant validity between the concepts as well as potentially examine if there might be potential causative relationships between the two constructs (for example low job dissatisfaction leads to greater job apathy over time). Future investigations might also benefit from the use of multitrait-multimethod matrices (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) or by looking at differential relationships with correlates (e.g., Mathieu & Farr, 1991).

Future research may also want to look at job apathy with a more tenured full-time working sample to examine if it functions differential from our student sample. Looking at job apathy in different industries or different countries could help in determining if job apathy is experienced similarly in such different cultural contexts. This would help managers and counselors in understanding how job apathy might play out in their own particular work context.

This study indicates that job apathy may lead to adverse outcomes, but future studies should utilize longitudinal designs to better elucidate causal order. If job apathy is fueling turnover a company with apathetic employees has a costly problem on its hands. Identifying environmental characteristics that facilitate or reduce job apathy is important for organizations.

Organizations also may have reasons to be worried about apathetic employee attitudes “rubbing off” on other employees. Research by Bakker, van Emmerik, and Euwema (2006) found that employee engagement and burnout were contagious in work teams, such that teams with individuals high in burnout and low in employee engagement had them emerge as team-level phenomenon. This could potentially happen with job apathy, creating apathetic work groups. Future research should examine this potential multi-level effect of job apathy.
While the present paper argues that job apathy is both personally and environmentally determined, it would be a futile effort to argue which is more influential. Nevertheless, there may be cases in which organizations foster a sense of job apathy, or “apathetic climate.” Multilevel research could examine how job apathy impacts variables at the team or organizational level.

Finally, the major contribution of this research is the creation of a scale that allows future researchers to quantify a pervasive but hitherto unmeasured problem in today’s workplace. Our measure was created with insight from clinical research on general apathy, but was modified to be applicable to an occupational setting. The present scale for job apathy is an important step toward understanding an under-researched topic of concern to many organizations.

Conclusion

Apathy has been a topic neglected in academic research although very present in popular culture conceptualization of the workplace. This research is an important first step of empirical research examining the concept of job apathy by validating a scale of the concept, finding discriminant validity from related constructs, and finding incremental predictive relationships with important job-related constructs. The first steps taken here and those suggested for the future offer an immediate direction for better understanding how organizations might prevent workers from becoming apathetic and ultimately improving employee morale and effectiveness.
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Table 1. Job apathy items and factor loadings for Studies 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Apathetic Cognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to become motivated in my job.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am indifferent toward my job.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel mentally checked out from work.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am emotionally detached from my job.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mood at work could be described as passive.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apathetic Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I don’t find something needed for a work task I give up looking quite easily.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as I finish things assigned to me, I usually do not work harder than necessary.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing work of average quality is good enough.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever new tasks present themselves, I let others take them on.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refrain from volunteering to take on assignments.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
Table 2. Correlations and Reliabilities for Main Variables in Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Apathy$^a$</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. J. Apathy AC$^b$</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. J. Apathy AA$^c$</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Positive Affect.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Negative Affect.</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cynicism</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $^a$Overall Job Apathy, $^b$Job Apathy – Apathetic cognition, $^c$Job Apathy – Apathetic action
Table 3. Confirmatory factor analysis of 1-factor versus 2-factor model for job apathy (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Fit Index</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model</td>
<td>349.85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-factor model</td>
<td>103.06</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; TLI = ; CFI = comparative fit index. All $\chi^2$ are statically significant, $p < .001$.  

Table 4. Correlations and Reliabilities for Main Variables in Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Apathy</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. J. Apathy AC</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. J. Apathy AA</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clinic. Apathy</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Engage</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.67**</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pers. Initiative</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Withdrawal</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Org. Deviance</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Overall Job Apathy, †Job Apathy – Apathetic cognition, ‡Job Apathy – Apathetic action, §Clinical Apathy, ¶Job Engagement, ‰Personal Initiative, ¶¶Organizational Deviance; *p<.05, **p<.01
Table 5. Confirmatory factor analysis of 1-factor versus 2-factor model for job apathy (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job apathy and clinical apathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model (Model 1)</td>
<td>3092.43</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-factor model (Model 2)</td>
<td>2272.30</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-factor model (Model 3)</td>
<td>2130.46</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job apathy and job engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model (Model 1)</td>
<td>1263.02</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-factor model (Model 2)</td>
<td>788.55</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-factor model (Model 3)</td>
<td>607.13</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; TLI = Tucker–Lewis Index; CFI = comparative fit index. All $\chi^2$ are statically significant, $p < .001$. 
### Table 6. Job apathy predicting personal initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Apathy – Apth. Cog.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Apathy – Apth. Act.</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-8.73**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 1**
- Job Engagement
  - B: .23
  - SE: .02
  - β: .52

**Step 2**
  - B: .05
  - SE: .03
  - β: .09
  - B: -.26
  - SE: .03
  - β: -.38

Note: *p<.05; **p<.01
Table 7. Job apathy predicting withdrawal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Apathy – Apth. Cog.</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Apathy – Apth. Act.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>5.07**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 1
- Job Engagement
  - B: -.23
  - SE: .03
  - β: -.31

Step 2
  - B: .13
  - SE: .07
  - β: .12
  - B: .31
  - SE: .07
  - β: .26

Note: *p<.05; **p<.01
Table 8. Job apathy predicting organizational deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Apathy – Apth. Cog.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.14*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Apathy – Apth. Act.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>5.74**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05; **p<.01