
The Effect of Work Community on Job Transfer Intention: The Mediation Effect of Regulatory Failure and Job Burnout

Patipat Kittichokwattana¹, Azhar Bin Harun², Zawiyah Mohd Zain³

¹School of Government, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 Sintok, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia

²School of Government, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 Sintok, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia

³School of Government, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 Sintok, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia

doi: 10.51505/ijebmr.2022.6601

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.51505/ijebmr.2022.6601>

Abstract

This study examined the effect of work community fit on job transfer intention and the indirect effect through regulatory failure and job burnout. A total of 351 teachers from public primary schools in the three southern provinces of Thailand were randomly selected. The self-report questionnaire was a data collection instrument. The partial least square structural equation modelling was used to analyse the data. The results revealed the complementary mediation effect. Community directly affects job transfer intention and indirectly through regulatory failure and job burnout in a serial manner. Promotion failure causes a lower risk of job burnout because of the failure of the maximal goal which represents the hopes and inspiration that one wants to achieve, whereas prevention failure concerns the minimal goal which represents responsibilities and obligations that must be met resulting in a higher risk of emotional exhaustion. In addition, promotion failure involves the absence of positive outcomes that increases the likelihood of disengagement and seek for an alternative that fulfills hopes and aspirations, whereas prevention failure relates to the presence of negative outcomes which motivate one to strengthen responsibilities and obligations to avoid the further loss resulting in low disengagement. The finding provides a better understanding of the underlying psychological mechanism between the regulatory focus and work well-being.

Keywords: Job transfer intention, regulatory focus, job burnout, person-environment fit, Thailand

1. Introduction

Perceive fit between the person and the work environment can generate emotional responses and attitudes toward organization. Misfit experiences bring about job stress. Chronic stress and maladjustment bring a risk of job burnout. The high degree of job burnout engenders various forms of job withdrawal such as absenteeism and turnover intention (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Based on job-person fit, Leiter and Maslach (2003, 2005) developed the mediation model of burnout which postulates that experiencing misfit can generate work-related outcomes through the mediation effect of job burnout.

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) indicates that people are motivated to reach a condition where outcome experience matches with the desired end-state. The discrepancies in the outcome experiences are critical for emotional-motivational predispositions. Fail to get the rewards, for example, engender non-gain situation which reflects the absence of positive outcomes or promotion failure. Fail to avoid punishments, on the other hand, generate loss situation which reflects the presence of negative outcomes or prevention failure. Both do not equally induce approach and avoidance tendencies.

Previous evidence asserts that failure under the promotion focus condition tends to be more eager while prevention failure tends to be more vigilance (e.g., Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Higgins et al., 2001; Memmert et al., 2013; Polman et al., 2020; Roney et al., 1995; Werth & Förster, 2007). Outcome discrepancies that reflect non-gain induce the state of promotion failure that motivates inclination to avoid mismatches to the desired end-state. Contrary, outcome discrepancies that represent loss induce the state of prevention failure that activates approach match to the desired end-state. Hence, it reveals the mediation effect of regulatory failure in the relationship between outcome discrepancies and job transfer intention.

Moreover, regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) indicates that experiencing a non-gain or promotion failure generates dejection-related emotions, whereas experiencing a loss or prevention failure generate agitation-related emotions. Chronic regulatory failure can bring about emotional well-being issues especially anxiety, depression, and job burnout (Dai et al., 2021; Jones et al., 2013; Klenk et al., 2011; Strauman et al., 2015; Strauman & Eddington, 2017; Zivnuska et al., 2017).

According to Hayes (2013), the two mediators included in the model constitute either parallel or serial mediation. If the two mediators are associated with each other, it represents a serial mediation model. If not, it represents a parallel mediation model. As to this, it expects that misfit between the person and the work community indirectly affect job transfer intention through regulatory failure and job burnout in a serial manner.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Job Transfer Intention

Job transfer is “a change in the job accompanied by a change in the place of the job of an employee without a change in responsibility or remuneration” (Flippo, 1984). It potentially results in a more detrimental effect than turnover, especially multiple iterative job transfer. When an employee quits and replaced by an employee from another worksite who will later be replaced by a new hire successively. From the global perspective, there is only one new hire. From the local perspective, there are two inexperienced employees who need time to acquire skills of the responsible jobs and coordination in the new workgroup. The multiple iterative job transfers are likely to generate the domino effect that worsens the organizational performance (Dalton, 1997).

Job transfer research has taken one of two approaches which are retrospective or intentions (Fisher & Shaw, 1994). The retrospective approach refers to the study that aims at examining adjustment to the past job transfer experiences using retrospective surveys, such as the time an employee takes to become proficient after a job transfer. The longer the time interval between job transfer and the observation, the more problematic information emerges. Secondly, the

intention approach aims at assessing attitudes toward future job transfer regardless of a specific new job or location, such as how willing an employee would accept or reject job transfer. This approach is unclear on how relevant the observation and the prospect job transfer are since there is no actual transfer involved. Weisheit (2018) and Remhof et al. (2014) suggest that the intentional approach is more suitable because it concerns rational goal-oriented behaviour and justification of the future behaviour and its consequences

2.2 The Relationship Between Community and Job Transfer Intention

Job transfer intention reflects incongruence between employee and work environment (Player et al., 2017; Roch & Sai, 2018). The fit between a person and significant others in the work environment plays a crucial role in turnover research. Significant others may include coworkers, mentors, supervisors, and subordinates related to the issues of leader-follower value congruence, supervisor-subordinate personality similarity, and manager-employee goal congruence (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011). This study adapted the community definition from Leiter and Maslach (2003)'s the Areas of Worklife model which define it as the overall quality of social support from supervisors, subordinates, colleagues, and service recipients concerning conflict, mutual support, closeness, and the capacity to work as a team.

Nevertheless, since the study is focused on teacher, the subordinate is excluded because schools are likely to be organized in a flat structure. Regarding the service recipient or students, teaching profession is about inspiring and motivating students to realize their potential. It is unreasonable to say that students are a source of job transfer intention. Moreover, previous studies report that interaction with students can be both a source of obstacle in achieving goals and a source of job satisfaction (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2015, 2017a, 2021). Hence, the student is excluded from the definition too.

Concerning supervisors, they convey the organizational values to the daily work that shapes the employees' values and actions. It promotes the feeling of involvement, creates a sense of certainty, and ultimately enhances rewards and career opportunities (van Vianen, 2018). Colleagues are a group of employees in the same workplace that individuals seek for socializing and friendship. Shared beliefs and values with colleagues convey quality interpersonal interactions which affect an individual ability and make contributions to the work group performance (Seong et al., 2015; Werbel & Johnson, 2001).

Previous studies indicate employees expressed high intention to turnover or job transfer when they experience conflict at work (Kim & Kao, 2014), abusive supervision (Xu et al., 2015), low supervisor support (Gordon et al., 2018), low collegial atmospheres (Grissom et al., 2015), low principal leadership (Player et al., 2017), and abusive coworker (Tews & Michel, 2019). In sum, when employee lose a positive sense of connection or lack of trust and support from their colleagues and supervisors in the workplace, there is a possibility to leave an organization.

2.3 The Mediation Effect of Job Burnout

According to Schaufeli et al. (2009), job burnout has been found in the mid-1970s by a psychiatrist Herbert J. Freudenberger who describes burnout symptoms as emotional depletion, loss of motivation, and reduced commitment. Simultaneously, a social psychologist Christina

Maslach describes job burnout as emotionally exhausted, negative perceptions about clients, and crises in professional competence. Then it was defined as the three-dimensional construct of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment by Maslach and Jackson. Later, researchers recognized that job burnout can happen in other professions and redefined it to a more general form of emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy.

The needs-supplies fit literature (e.g., Edwards & Cooper, 1990; French et al., 1982; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011) indicates that employees are in the dynamic process of comparing what the work environment provides and what employee needs that resulting in the condition of fit or misfit. When an individual perceives that the supports from supervisors and colleagues deviate from the needs, it likely impacts emotion and well-being negatively. In the seminal work of French et al.(1982) indicates that needs-supplies misfit can produce negative psychological, physiological, and behavioral outcomes.

Based on job-person fit theory, Leiter and Maslach (2003, 2005) developed the mediation model of job burnout in the relationship between the six Areas of Worklife (i.e., workload, control, community, fairness, rewards, and values) and perceived organizational change. It hypothesized two sets of converging paths: from the Areas of Worklife to job burnout and from job burnout to outcomes. That is, the more fit between the person and the Areas of Worklife, the more likely to engage with the work, and conversely, the more misfit, the more likelihood of job burnout. And then all three dimensions of job burnout contribute to predict the perceived organizational change.

The meta-analysis conducted by Dall'Ora et al.(2020) asserts that substantial studies supported the Leiter and Maslach's mediation model of burnout but insufficient tests in some areas. Out of the 91 studies included, only 39 studies covered support from colleagues and supervisors. Two studies focused on community, and only one found the association with job burnout. Many studies embraced the job characteristics that fall outside the original model, such as team relationship and supervisor support, and the results show a significant association with job burnout and organizational outcomes. Importantly, no studies examined the impact of job burnout on job transfer intention.

2.4 The Mediation Effect of Regulatory Failure

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) is a child of self-discrepancy theory. It indicates that the discrepancy between the actual and desired end-states generates two distinct failure experiences; failure because of the absence of desired end states, and failure because of the presence of undesired end states. Failure to achieve the desired end states produce a state of a non-gain or promotion failure, whereas failure to avoid undesired end states refer to as a state of loss or prevention failure. Failure of the two systems do not equally regulate approach and avoidance behaviors.

Higgins (2015, 2018) states that promotion focus involves ideal-self guide that perceives advancement or gain (+1) as success that one pursues and lack of progress or non-gain (0) as a failure that must avoid. Prevention focus involves ought-self guide which perceives maintaining the status quo or non-loss (0) as success to strive for, whereas fall behind or loss (-1) is a failure

that must avoid. Being at status quo (0) is not a neutral state. It has positive valence in the prevention focus system because of success in attaining positive outcomes but has negative valence in the promotion focus system because it fails to attain positive outcomes.

Accordingly, negatively changes in the relationship with supervisors and colleagues regarding friendship, closeness, and social support that perceive as a hindrance to achieve growth and advancement, represent the state of non-gain or promotion failure, could motivate one to seek alternatives that return to the state of gain. The relationships that bring about the issues in responsibilities and obligations, or the state of prevention failure, on the other hand, could motivate one to tighten up the commitment to restore the status quo.

This notion was supported in the pioneering works of Higgins et al.(1994) that asserts the effect of friendship on approach-avoidance inclinations. Results show that when subjects were induced by the negative friendship framing condition, they prone to choose more avoidance strategies, and vice versa. As well as Molden et al.(2009)and Park and Baumeister (2015) who revealed that being rejected from group can produce a sense of social loss and lead to prevention focus response. They vigilantly withdraw from social contact to protect further experience of social loss.

Kark et al.(2015) and Delegach et al.(2017) demonstrate that transformation leadership which focus on growth and development can influence followers' promotion focus and enhance safety initiative behaviors, whereas transaction leadership which focus on duties and obligation will exert it influence on followers' prevention focus and exhibit safety compliance behaviors. Likewise, Henker et al.(2015) indicate mediating role of promotion focus on the relationship between transformational leadership and employee creativity. Recently, Kark et al.(2018) and Shang et al.(2019) found leadership style can fluenice followers' regulatory focus and subsequent creativity behaviors.

The studies mentioned above imply the psychological mechanism of regulatory failure. It suggests that community misfits that generate promotion failure in which the state of non-gain can motivate one to seek alternatives that return to the state of gain resulting in avoidance inclinations or high job transfer intention. Contrary, community misfits that bring about prevention failure in which the state of loss motivates one to restore the status quo resulting in inclinations to approach or low job transfer intention.

2.5 The Serial Mediation Effect of Job Burnout and Regulatory Failure

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) indicates the association between regulatory focus and emotional consequences. Promotion focus concerns the presence or absence of positive outcomes. Progress or achievement of a goal bring happiness and enjoyment, while lack of progress or missing of a goal cause sadness and discontent. Prevention focus concerns the presence or absence of negative outcomes. Fail to avoid negative outcomes bring anxiety and fear, whereas successful in protecting the negative outcomes result in feelings of quiescence and relief. Furthermore, occasional regulatory failure engenders a negative affective state which in turn helps people to adopt more effective means to pursue their goals. Chronic regulatory failure can increase high job stress, emotional exhaustion, and ultimately job burnout.

Previous studies assert the association between regulatory failures and emotional well-being. Idson, Liberman, and Higgins (2000) state that failure in prevention goal (-1) tends to experience more intense emotion than promotion failure (0) because it fails to achieve an obligation or minimal goal. In contrast, success in promotion goal (+1) tends to experience more intense emotion than prevention success (0) because the aspiration or maximal goal is achieved. Klenk, Strauman, & Higgins (2011) added that chronic promotion failure causing negative self-evaluation and “hypo-eagerness” in which vulnerable to the depressive symptom. Chronic prevention failure brings feeling of being at risk and produce “hyper-vigilant” which related to anxiety symptoms. Recently, Zivnuska *et al.* (2017) found that prevention self-guide that motivates individual to do the things the right way can increase fatigue and exhaustion syndrome of job burnout.

According to Hayes (2013), the two mediators included in the model can demonstrate either parallel or serial mediation roles depending upon the association between each other. If the two mediators illustrate association with each other, it is the serial mediation. If not, it is the parallel mediation. Furthermore, previous research has not demonstrated the psychological mechanism between community misfits and job burnout clearly. Adding regulatory failure into the model can clarify whether promotion or prevention failure mediates the effect of misfit on job burnout. Therefore, this study expects the serial mediation to explain how community fit affects job transfer intention through regulatory failure and job burnout, where regulatory failure precedes job burnout.

2.5 Research Question

Is community misfits produce regulatory failure reflecting promotion or prevention failure that differently affects job burnout and consequent job transfer intention?

2.6 Research Objective

The objective of this study is to examine the mediation effect of regulatory failure and job burnout in the relationship between community and job transfer intention.

2.7 Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Community negatively related to job transfer intention

Hypothesis 2: The negative relationship between community and job transfer intention is mediated by job burnout.

Hypothesis 3: The relationship between community and job transfer intention is mediated by regulatory failure.

Hypothesis 4: The relationship between community and job transfer intention is serially mediated by job burnout and prevention failure.

3. Method

3.1 Participants

The target population of this study was teachers who currently work at public primary schools in the three southern provinces of Thailand namely Pattani, Narathiwat, and Yala. According to the Office of the Basic Education Commission (2018), there were 10,741 teachers in the public

primary schools located in these areas. A total of 371 teachers were selected based on Dillman (2007) sampling formula. The multi-stage random sampling method was applied to ensure the sample represents teachers in the three southern provinces.

3.2 Measures

The measurement instrument in this study comprised 35 items adapted from the previous studies. The 3-items Intention to Leave scale (Vekeman et al., 2017) was adapted to measure job transfer intention. The 6-items Supportive Relation with Colleagues and Supervisors scale (Skaalvik&Skaalvik, 2017b) was adapted to measure community. The 16-items Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (Demerouti et al., 2010) was adapted to measure job burnout. The 5-items promotion failure and the 5-items prevention failure from the Reference-point subscales (Summerville &Roese, 2008) were adapted to measure regulatory failure. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) was used to examine how strong the respondents agree or disagree with the statement.

In addition, to examine the relative strength of regulatory failures that activate emotional and behavioral inclinations, the dominant regulatory focus method (Lockwood et al., 2002) was utilized. By subtracting the mean scores on prevention failure subscale from the mean scores on promotion failure subscale, positive score indicates dominant promotion failure while negative scores represent dominant prevention failure.

The group of experts composed of human resource management academics and an expert level teacher were requested to examine the appropriateness of measurement. Importantly, this study focused on Thai people who use the Thai language as a medium of communication, all items were translated into Thai following back translation method suggested by Brislin and Freimanis (2000). After Thai version was approved, pilot test was administered. The results from the internal consistency reliability test revealed the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient ranging from 0.73 to 0.94 which was above the recommended threshold of 0.7 (Hair et al., 2013). It indicates reliability of the instrument was established.

3.3 Data Analysis

The descriptive statistic was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. The Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) approach was used for structural model analysis since its flexibility for statistical model building (Lowry & Gaskin, 2014). It also works efficiently with small sample size, require no distributional assumptions, can handle reflective and formative measurement model, high efficiency in parameter estimation and so forth (Hair et al., 2016). Therefore, this study used Smart-PLS version 3.3.2 to examine reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity of the outer model and to determine significance of the path coefficients, coefficient determination, the effect size, and predictive relevance of inner model.

4. Results

After a cross-sectional field survey and raw data was collected, 363 out of 371 questionnaires were returned which made the response rate of 97.844%. However, 12 questionnaires were

determined as wrongly filled and were rejected for further analysis. Hence, 351 questionnaires were usable which considered as 94.609% response rate. Because of the above 85% of response rate, the additional follow up of non-respondents was unnecessary (Lindner et al., 2001). In addition, the outlier data was examined using Mahalanobis distance method for multivariate outlier detection (Tabachnick&Fidell, 2013). As a result, the total of 329 samples remained in this study.

4.1 Respondant Characteristics

Table 1 demonstrates the large part of the respondents were female (75.988%). Most respondents were in middle age as the table shows nearly half of them aged between 30-40 years of age (40.122%). More than half of the respondents were Islam (62.614%) and followed by Buddhism (36.474%). As much as 77.204% of the respondents earn a bachelor’s degree or equivalent. Nearly half of teachers were professional level (44.377%), followed by senior professional level (23.100%), and contract teachers (15.502%). Majority of teachers had less than 10 years teaching experience in a current school, mostly in 5-10 years (36.778%) and less than 5 year (28.875%).

Table 1. Respondents’ Characteristics

Characteristics		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	79	24.012
	Female	250	75.988
Age	Less than 30 years	37	11.246
	30-40 years	132	40.122
	41-50 years	98	29.787
	More than 50 years	62	18.845
Marital status	Single	88	26.748
	Married	229	69.605
	Divorced	10	3.040
Religion	Buddhism	120	36.474
	Islam	206	62.614
	Christian	1	0.304
	Other	1	0.304
Education level	Bachelor or equivalent	254	77.204
	Master or equivalent	74	22.492
	PhD or equivalent	1	0.304
Career status	Contractor	51	15.502
	Assistant	25	7.599
	Practitioner	27	8.207
	Professional	146	44.377
	Senior professional	76	23.100
	Expert	3	0.912
	Advisory	1	0.304
Teaching experience	Less than 5 years	95	28.875
	5-10 years	121	36.778
	11-19 years	77	23.404
	20-29 years	25	7.599
	More than 30 years	11	3.343

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

After the data screening and preliminary analysis, the descriptive statistics of the latent constructs were analyzed as shown in Table 2. Regarding community, the mean score was considerable high (5.637) which indicate fit on support from supervisors and colleagues. In specific to regulatory failure, this study utilized the dominant regulatory failure method (Lockwood et al., 2002) that subtracting the mean scores on prevention failure subscale from the mean scores on promotion failure subscale. The positive score indicates dominant promotion failure while negative scores represent dominant prevention failure. The results revealed a negative value (-0.64) which suggest that prevention failure was the dominant motivational system behind emotional and behavioral outcomes. That is, teachers are concerned about the failure to meet their obligations and duties. Job burnout was moderately high (4.422) which implies that teachers work in a stressful but tolerable work environment. However, moderate stress entails optimal performance. Lastly, a middling mean score in job transfer intention (3.281) indicates the moderate intention to transfer to another school.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Latent Constructs

Latent Construct	Mean	Standard Deviation
Community	5.637	0.909
Regulatory failure	-0.640	1.043
Job burnout	4.422	0.540
Job transfer intention	3.281	1.523

4.3 Measurement Model Assessment

In this study, all latent variables were reflective measure and conceptualized as first-order constructs. The regulatory failure utilized a single indicator of dominant regulatory failure which positive value represents promotion failure and vice versa. Following Hair *et al.*(2016) recommendation, the appropriate assessment of first-order reflective measurement model including internal consistency reliability using Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability (CR), convergent validity using indicator reliability and average variance extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity using Fornell-Larcker criterion, the indicator’s outer loadings, and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT).

Firstly, individual item reliability was determined using the outer loading of each construct indicators. Based on Hair *et.al.* (2016), seven items including brn1, brn5, brn7, brn10, brn14, brn15, and brn16 were deleted due to the outer loading below the threshold of 0.40. The results from Table 3 reveal that Cronbach’s alpha values range between 0.883 to 0.898 which exceed the recommended threshold value of 0.70. The CR values range between 0.907 to 0.931 in which above 0.60 and below 0.95 recommended threshold. These indicate internal consistency of the measures were reliable. The AVE values range from 0.551 to 0.819 which exceed the threshold value of 0.50. It can be concluded that convergent validity was established.

Table 3. Loading, Cronbach's Alpha, and AVE

Construct	Indicators	Loading	Cronbach's alpha	CR	AVE
TRF	trf1	0.800	0.887	0.931	0.819
	trf2	0.962			
	trf3	0.946			
BRN	brn2	0.722	0.883	0.907	0.551
	brn3	0.795			
	brn4	0.639			
	brn6	0.725			
	brn8	0.668			
	brn9	0.782			
	brn11	0.793			
	brn12	0.799			
	REF	ref			
COM	com1	0.737	0.898	0.922	0.664
	com2	0.708			
	com3	0.815			
	com4	0.864			
	com5	0.883			
	com6	0.865			

The Fornell-Larcker criterion was used to assess the discriminant validity. It determines if a construct is unique and captures phenomena not represented by other constructs in the model. It compares the square root of the AVE values with the latent variable correlations. The square root of each constructs's AVE should be greater than its highest correlation with any other construct (Hair et al., 2016). The results in Table 4 shows the square root of AVE in bold numbers were greater than its highest construct's correlation among other latent constructs. This indicated that discriminant validity was achieved.

Table 4 Fornell-Larcker Criterion

Variable	COM	BRN	TRF	RFT
COM	0.815			
BRN	0.196	0.743		
TRF	-0.228	-0.678	0.905	
RFT	-0.202	-0.268	0.242	1.000

In addition, the cross-loading was adopted to examine the indicator's outer loading on the associated construct toward its correlation on other constructs. The presence of outer loading values exceed the cross-loading on other constructs suggest that discriminant validity is established. In contrast, greater value of cross-loading than the indicator's outer loading indicates a discriminant validity problem. Table 5 show absence of discriminant validity problem since no any other indicator had loading more than the one it intended to measure.

Table 5. Cross Loading

Items	COM	BRN	TRF	REF
ref	-0.202	-0.268	0.242	1.000
brn2	0.037	0.722	-0.478	-0.128
brn3	0.218	0.795	-0.515	-0.174
brn4	0.041	0.639	-0.374	-0.139
brn6	0.143	0.725	-0.442	-0.249
brn8	0.209	0.668	-0.504	-0.322
brn9	0.221	0.782	-0.541	-0.190
brn11	0.156	0.793	-0.542	-0.135
brn12	0.094	0.799	-0.587	-0.228
com1	0.737	0.064	-0.138	-0.214
com2	0.708	0.053	-0.135	-0.171
com3	0.815	0.251	-0.232	-0.109
com4	0.864	0.188	-0.172	-0.142
com5	0.883	0.162	-0.198	-0.157
com6	0.865	0.183	-0.213	-0.214
trf1	-0.095	-0.517	0.800	0.182
trf2	-0.244	-0.666	0.962	0.259
trf3	-0.259	-0.648	0.946	0.211

Based on Henseler *et al.*(2015)and Hair *et al.* (2016), the cross loading fail to indicate discriminant validity when two constructs are perfectly correlated while the Fornell-Larcker criterion poorly detect discriminant validity when indicator loading differ slightly. They suggest the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT) to enhance assessing the discriminant validity. The HTMT value above 0.90 indicates a lack of discriminant validity while the value above 0.85 represents a more conservative threshold. Table 6 indicates the HTMT values lower than the conservative threshold value of 0.85. Hence, it represents the acceptable construct discriminant validity.

Table 6. The Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio of Correlations (HTMT)

Variable	COM	BRN	TRF	RFT
COM	-			
BRN	0.228	-		
TRF	0.241	0.755	-	
RFT	0.217	0.281	0.255	-

4.4Structural Model Assessment

To ensure collinearity between the constructs is not an issue, the variance inflation factor (VIF) was examined before proceeding the structural model assessment. Each set of predictor constructs were separately examined with the threshold value of VIF below 5 (Hair et al., 2016). Table 7 reveals that the VIF of all constructs clearly less than the threshold value of 5. Therefore,

it can be concluded that there was no collinearity problem among the predictor constructs in the structural model. The next stage of structural model assessment can be carried out.

Table 7. Collinearity assessment

Construct	BRN	TRF	RFT
COM	1.046	1.067	1.000
BRN		1.105	
RFT	1.043	1.105	

Assessing a structural model involves several criteria which obtained by two means. The path coefficient, path significance, coefficient of determination (R^2), and f^2 effect size were obtained using PLS-SEM algorithm and bootstrapping with 5,000 iterations with significance level of 5% one-tailed test, 95% bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa). Blindfolding is used to assess predictive relevance (Q^2) via Stone-Geisser with the omission distance of 8. The results were shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Effects on endogenous variables


Effects	Point estimate	t-Value	Confidence Interval	R^2	F^2	Q^2
REF				0.041		0.037
COM→REF	-0.202	4.328	-0.275, -0.121		0.043	
BRN				0.093		0.047
COM→BRN	0.148	2.662	0.043, 0.228		0.023	
REF→BRN	-0.238	4.753	-0.316, -0.153		0.060	
TRF				0.472		0.378
COM→TRF (H1)	-0.091	2.046	-0.164, -0.018		0.015	
REF→TRF	0.050	1.289	-0.016, 0.113		0.004	
BRN→TRF	-0.647	18.416	-0.701, -0.584		0.719	

According to Table 8, five out of six direct effects were significant except the effect of regulatory failure on job transfer intention ($t = 1.289$, CI [-0.016, 0.013]). Specifically, hypothesis H1 which expected the negative relationship between community and job transfer intention was statistically supported ($t = 2.046$, CI [-0.164, -0.018]). Therefore, the more fit in the community, the lower the job transfer intention. The R^2 value indicated 0.472 of the total variances in the job transfer intention. Meaning that community, regulatory failure, and job burnout collectively explain 47% of the variance in the job transfer intention or moderate level of predictive accuracy (Hair et al., 2016). However, job burnout and regulatory failure revealed weak predictive accuracy ($R^2 = 0.093$ and 0.041 respectively) meaning that there were high variability data with significant trend between the exogenous and endogenous constructs.

Based on Hair *et al.*(2016)and Cohen (1988) recommendation, the f^2 value of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 represent small, medium, and large effect of exogenous variable. The f^2 value of less than 0.02 indicates lack of effect. The results demonstrated that the effect size of job burnout on job transfer intention was considerable large ($f^2_{BRN \rightarrow TRF} = 0.719$) meaning that removing job burnout from the model caused very large impact of the predictive power on job transfer intention. With respect to job burnout, it revealed small effect size from regulatory failure (f^2

REF→BRN = 0.060) as well as community that showed small effect size on regulatory failure (f^2 COM→REF = 0.043). It indicates a small impact if remove these exogenous from the model. The other constructs found no effects size which implied that the effect was not large enough to be meaningful.

The Stone-Geisser test is an additional assessment of goodness-of-fit (GoF) which PLS-SEM commonly used to determine the model predictive relevance (Q^2) (Hair et al., 2016). In this study, the Q^2 value is obtained by using the blindfolding procedure with the omission distance of 8 and the cross-validated redundancy approach of data prediction. The Q^2 value larger than 0 suggest that the model has predictive relevance of a certain endogenous construct. As indicated in Table 8, the predictive relevance (Q^2 statistics) for the endogenous latent variables of job transfer intention, job burnout, and regulatory focus were greater than zero. This suggests a predictive relevance of the model.



H1 = Community→Job transfer intention = c'

H2 = Community→Job burnout→Job transfer intention = a_1b_1

H3 = Community→Regulatoryfailure→Job transfer intention = a_2b_2

Figure 1. Structural model results

4.5 Testing of Mediation Effect

Based on Zhao *et al.* (2010) and Nitzlet *et al.* (2016), it requires a two-step procedure for testing mediation. Firstly, testing the significance of indirect effect. If the indirect effect is not significant, the mediation relationship does not exist at all. Secondly, indicates mediation type by considering the significance of the direct effect. Significant indirect effect along with insignificant direct effect suggests the indirect-only or full mediation effect. Significant of both

indirect and direct effect which reveals the same direction either positive or negative represents a complementary mediation effect. Whereas significant of both indirect and direct effect which reveals different direction represents the competitive mediation effect.

Table 9. Mediation effect testing

Effect	Point estimate	t-Value	Confidence Interval
Indirect effect			
H2: COM→BRN→TRF	-0.096	2.680	-0.147, -0.027
H3: COM→REF→TRF	-0.010	1.177	-0.027, 0.001
H4: COM→REF→BRN→TRF	-0.031	2.911	-0.050, -0.015
Direct effect			
H1: COM→TRF	-0.091	2.014	-0.164, -0.014

As indicated in Table 9, the specific indirect effect of community on job transfer intention through job burnout (H2: a_1b_1) revealed a significance negative indirect effect ($t = 2.680$, CI [-0.147, -0.027]). Therefore, H2 was support. However, the mediation effect of regulatory failure in the relationship between community and job transfer intention (H3: a_2b_2) was not significant ($t = 1.177$, CI [-0.027, 0.001]). Hence, H3 was not support. Finally, the result illustrated that community negatively affected regulatory failure and job burnout which in turn affected job transfer intention (H4: $a_1a_3b_2$). Instead of mediating the effect of community on job transfer intention, regulatory failure conveyed the effect of community on job burnout and subsequently triggered job transfer intention. Meaning that, regulatory failure and job burnout serially mediated the effect of community on job transfer intention. In addition, since the mediation effect ($a_1a_3b_2$) and direct effect (c') demonstrated the same direction, it unveiled the complementary mediation effect.

5. Discussion

The findings revealed the mediating role of regulatory failure and job burnout in two aspects. On the one hand, it found that low fit in community can stimulate promotion failure motivational system which inherently sensitive to the absence of positive outcomes or non-gains. These experiences were less painful (Idson et al., 2000) and less vulnerable to job burnout. At the same time, promotion failures will reduce optimistic and feeling less interest to do the things (Klenk et al., 2011; Strauman&Eddington, 2017) which results in high disengage and low exhaustion. High job transfer intention was revealed. On the other hand, the more fit in community can generate prevention failure or concern for potential loss. Since it involves the presence of negative outcomes which bring about experience feelings of being at risk and exhaustion (Klenk et al., 2011; Strauman&Eddington, 2017), it more vulnerable to job burnout. Because prevention motivational state associated with high exhaustion and low disengage or maintaining status quo, low job transfer intention was found.

As the results unveiled the psychological process between community and job transfer intention, this study establishes that community may directly affect job transfer intention and indirectly through the motivational states of regulatory failure and the emotional well-being of job burnout. It consistent with the previous studies that report both direct and indirect effect of work context

misfit on withdrawal behavior (Andela & van der Doef, 2019; Delegach et al., 2017; Gordon et al., 2018; Kark et al., 2015; Kim & Kao, 2014; Moloney et al., 2018; Player et al., 2017; Tews & Michel, 2019).

Furthermore, the findings extend the mediation model of burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2016) by illustrating that community misfit indirectly produce regulatory failure and engender job burnout that determine organizational outcomes. By including regulatory failure into the model, it shed the light on why community misfit can generate either positive or negative outcomes. Outcome experiences derived from comparing the outcomes with a referent point generate the judging valence of regulatory failure. According to the principle of goal supportiveness, discrepancy or incongruence between current situation and ideal/ought goals will determines emotion and motivation responses (Higgins, 2018). These psychological mechanisms are obviously illustrated in self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987) that the positive/negative outcomes discrepancies associated with different kinds of emotion. Likewise, the cybernetic theory (Edwards, 1992) which indicates feedback loops derived from comparing sensed environment with reference value and subsequent mental health and behavior.

This study unveiled the complicated effect of regulatory failure on job burnout and job transfer intention. Regulatory failure can partly influence employees who expose to job burnout but remain on the job. On the one hand, regulatory failure determines the degree of emotional exhaustion. Pain from non-gain or promotion failure is less harmful when compared to prevention failure derives from pain from the loss (Idson et al., 2000). On the other hand, regulatory failure determines the degree of disengagement. Promotion failure concerns approach strategic means while prevention failure concerns avoidance strategic means (Higgins, 1997). It possible that these complex mechanisms can influence the symptom of job burnout and subsequent behavior. That is, prevention failure affects more exhaustion than disengage which lead to high job burnout and low job transfer intention, whereas promotion failure affects more disengage than exhaustion which results in low job burnout and high job transfer intention. However, further investigation is needed.

This study extends the fit theory that propose the experience of misfit has similarly harmful effects whether the direction of discrepancy is positive or negative (Edwards & Shipp, 2007; van Vianen, 2018). In general, misfit perception is primarily associated with avoidance, but regulatory focus theory shed the light on how misfit and avoidance inclinations may differ. It argues that not getting what one wants is not equal to losing what one needs. The psychological state of non-gain is less intense than loss which in turn affect the strength of emotional stress and avoidance propensities. Combining person-environment fit with regulatory focus theory, it uncovered the association between the negative discrepancies and regulatory failure.

References

- Andela, M., & van der Doef, M. (2019). A comprehensive assessment of the person-environment fit dimensions and their relationships with work-related outcomes. *Journal of Career Development, 46*(5), 567–582.
- Brislin, R. W., & Freimanis, C. (2000). Back-translation: A tool for cross-cultural research. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology* (pp. 359–360). Oxford University Press.

- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision-making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69(2), 117–132.
- Dall’Ora, C., Ball, J., Reinius, M., & Griffiths, P. (2020). Burnout in nursing: a theoretical review. *Human Resources for Health*, 18.
- Dalton, D. R. (1997). Employee transfer and employee turnover: A theoretical and practical disconnect? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(5), 411–413.
- Delegach, M., Kark, R., Katz-Navon, T., & van Dijk, D. (2017). A focus on commitment: The roles of transformational and transactional leadership and self-regulatory focus in fostering organizational and safety commitment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(5), 724–740.
- Demerouti, E., Mostert, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Burnout and work engagement: A thorough investigation of the independency of both constructs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(3), 209–222.
- Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Edwards, J. R. (1992). A cybernetic theory of stress, coping, and well-being in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 238–274.
- Edwards, J. R., & Cooper, C. L. (1990). The person-environment fit approach to stress: Recurring problems and some suggested solutions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(4), 293–307.
- Edwards, J. R., & Shipp, A. J. (2007). Relationship between person-environment fit and outcomes: An integrative theoretical framework. In C. Ostroff & T. A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on Organizational Fit* (pp. 209–258). Jossey-Bass.
- Flippo, E. B. (1984). *Personnel management* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- French, J. R. P., Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R. van. (1982). *The mechanisms of job stress and strain*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gordon, S., Tang, C.-H. (Hugo), Day, J., & Adler, H. (2018). Supervisor support and turnover in hotels: Does subjective well-being mediate the relationship? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 496–512.
- Grissom, J. A., Viano, S. L., & Selin, J. L. (2015). Understanding employee turnover in the public sector: Insights from research on teacher mobility. *Public Administration Review*, 76(2), 241–251.
- Hair, J. F. Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2013). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

- Hair, J. F. Jr., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd.). SAGE Publication.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and condition process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford.
- Henker, N., Sonnentag, S., & Unger, D. (2015). Transformational leadership and employee creativity: The mediating role of promotion focus and creative process engagement. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 30*(2), 235–247.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115–135.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 94*(3), 319–340.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52*(12), 1280–1300.
- Higgins, E. T. (2015). Regulatory focus theory. In R. Scott & S. Kosslyn (Eds.), *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 1–18). John Wiley & Sons.
- Higgins, E. T. (2018). What distinguishes promotion and prevention? Attaining “+1” as non-gain versus maintaining “0” as non-loss. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 49*(1), 40–49.
- Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*(1), 3–23.
- Higgins, E. T., Roney, C. J. R., Crowe, E., & Hymes, C. (1994). Ideal versus ought predilections for approach and avoidance distinct self-regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(2), 276–286.
- Idson, L. C., Liberman, N., & Higgins, E. T. (2000). Distinguishing gains from nonlosses and losses from nongains: A regulatory focus perspective on hedonic intensity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*(3), 252–274.
- Kark, R., Katz-Navon, T., & Delegach, M. (2015). The dual effects of leading for safety: The mediating role of employee regulatory focus. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(5), 1332–1348.
- Kark, R., van Dijk, D., & Vashdi, D. R. (2018). Motivated or demotivated to be creative: The role of self-regulatory focus in transformational and transactional leadership processes. *Applied Psychology, 67*(1), 186–224.
- Kim, H., & Kao, D. (2014). A meta-analysis of turnover intention predictors among U.S. child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review, 47*(3), 214–223.
- Klenk, M. M., Strauman, T. J., & Higgins, E. T. (2011). Regulatory focus and anxiety: A self-regulatory model of GAD- depression comorbidity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(7), 935–943.

- Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person–environment fit. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 3–50). American Psychological Association.
- Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2003). Areas of Worklife: A structured approach to organizational predictors of job burnout. In P. L. Perrewe & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being* (pp. 91–134). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2005). A mediation model of job burnout. In A.-S. G. Antoniou & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Research Companion to Organizational Health Psychology* (pp. 544–564). Edward Elgar.
- Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 43–53.
- Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 854–864.
- Lowry, P. B., & Gaskin, J. (2014). Partial least squares (PLS) structural equation modeling (SEM) for building and testing behavioral causal theory: When to choose it and how to use it. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 57(2), 123–146.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Burnout. In G. Fink (Ed.), *Stress: Concepts, cognition, emotion, and behavior* (pp. 351–357). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800951-2.00044-3>
- Memmert, D., Hüttermann, S., & Orliczek, J. (2013). Decide like Lionel Messi! The impact of regulatory focus on divergent thinking in sports. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(10), 2163–2167.
- Molden, D. C., Lucas, G. M., Gardner, W. L., Dean, K., & Knowles, M. L. (2009). Motivations for prevention or promotion following social exclusion: Being rejected versus being ignored. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(2), 415–431.
- Moloney, W., Boxall, P., Parsons, M., & Cheung, G. (2018). Factors predicting Registered Nurses' intentions to leave their organization and profession: A job demands-resources framework. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 74(4), 864–875.
- Nitzl, C., Roldan, J. L., & Cepeda, G. (2016). Mediation analysis in partial least squares path modeling: Helping researchers discuss more sophisticated model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116(9), 1849–1864.
- Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2018). *School list*. https://www.bopp-obec.info/home/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/sch26_money611_with_set.zip
- Park, J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2015). Social exclusion causes a shift toward prevention motivation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 56(2015), 153–159.

- Player, D., Youngs, P., Perrone, F., & Grogan, E. (2017). How principal leadership and person-job fit are associated with teacher mobility and attrition. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67(October), 330–339.
- Polman, E., van Swol, L. M., & Hoban, P. R. (2020). Harbingers of foul play: A field study of gain/loss frames and regulatory fit in the NFL. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 15(3), 353–370.
- Remhof, S., Gunkel, M., & Schlaegel, C. (2014). Goodbye Germany! The influence of personality and cognitive factors on the intention to work abroad. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(16), 2319–2343.
- Roch, C. H., & Sai, N. (2018). Stay or go? Turnover in CMO, EMO and regular charter schools. *The Social Science Journal*, 55(3), 232–244.
- Roney, C. J. R., Higgins, E. T., & Shah, J. (1995). Goals and framing: How outcome focus influences motivation and emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(11), 1151–1160.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 204–220.
- Seong, J. Y., Kristof-Brown, A. L., Park, W.-W., Hong, D.-S., & Shin, Y. (2015). Person-group fit: Diversity antecedents, proximal outcomes, and performance at the group level. *Journal of Management*, 41(4), 1184–1213.
- Shang, Y., Chong, M. P. M., Xu, J., & Zhu, X. (2019). Authentic leadership and creativity in China: The role of students' regulatory-focused behaviors and supervisors' power sources. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 34, 100592.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2015). Job satisfaction, stress and coping strategies in the teaching profession—what do teachers say? *International Education Studies*, 8(3), 181–192.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017a). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal structure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67(2017), 152–160.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017b). Still motivated to teach? A study of school context variables, stress and job satisfaction among teachers in senior high school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 20(1), 15–37.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2021). Teacher Stress and Coping Strategies-The Struggle to Stay in Control. *Creative Education*, 12, 1273–1295.
- Strauman, T. J., & Eddington, K. M. (2017). Treatment of depression from a self-regulation perspective: Basic concepts and applied strategies in self-system therapy. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 41(1), 1–15.
- Summerville, A., & Roese, N. J. (2008). Self-report measures of individual differences in regulatory focus: A cautionary note. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(1), 247–254.
-

- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Tews, M., & Michel, J. W. (2019). Abusive coworker treatment, coworker support, and employee turnover. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 26(4), 413–423.
- van Vianen, A. E. M. (2018). Person-environment fit: A review of its basic tenets. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(2018), 75–101.
- Vekeman, E., Devos, G., Valcke, M., & Rosseel, Y. (2017). Do teachers leave the profession or move to another school when they don't fit? *Educational Review*, 69(4), 411–434.
- Weisheit, J. (2018). Should I stay or should I go? A systematic literature review about the conceptualization and measurement of international relocation mobility readiness. *Journal of Global Mobility*, 6(2), 129–157.
- Werbel, J. D., & Johnson, D. J. (2001). The use of person–group fit for employment selection: a missing link in person–environment fit. *Human Resource Management*, 40(3), 227–240.
- Werth, L., & Förster, J. (2007). The effects of regulatory focus on braking speed. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(12), 2764–2787.
- Xu, S., Martinez, L. R., van Hoof, H., Tews, M., Torres, L., & Farfan, K. (2015). The impact of abusive supervision and co-worker support on hospitality and tourism student employees' turnover intentions in Ecuador. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(7), 775–790.
- Zhao, X., Lynch Jr., J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37.
- Zivnuska, S., Kacmar, K. M., & Valle, M. (2017). The mechanisms of regulatory focus Mindfulness, leader-member exchange, and motivational outcomes. *Career Development International*, 22(1), 37–49.