

Learning Goal Orientation and Turnover Intention of the Malaysian Adult Students

Ong Choon Hee (Corresponding author)

Azman Hashim International Business School,

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia

Tan Owee Kowang

Faculty of Management,

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia

Adriana Mohd Rizal

Azman Hashim International Business School,

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia

Goh Chin Fei

Faculty of Management,

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia

Received: April 11, 2018 Accepted: April 26, 2018 Online published: April 28, 2018

doi:10.5296/ijhrs.v8i2.12992 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v8i2.12992>

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention of the Malaysian adult students. Adult students were selected as the respondents in this study because they were regarded as the most active participants in the nation's knowledge-based economy. In the creation of knowledge-based economy, employee turnover issues should not be overlooked as it has potential to become an obstacle in the process of organizational development. The findings of this study show that the respondents registered a high level of learning goal orientation and a moderate turnover intention. There were no significant group differences in the mean scores of learning goal orientation and

turnover intention among the respondents. Regression analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention. However, adult students who are pursuing their continuing education may not have the intention to leave their organization at this moment. But, the situation may change when they have successfully completed their study. Therefore, it is recommended that the organization's human resource department shall provide suitable responsibilities to these individuals to ensure that they remain in their organizations.

Keywords: learning goal orientation, turnover intention, adult students.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

In the process of creating knowledge-based economy, working adults in Malaysia were encouraged to acquire new knowledge and skills through continuing education. Nowadays, there are many learning opportunities provided by the higher education institutions for adults to excel in their careers. Among courses offered by the higher education institutions in Malaysia were Executive Diploma programs and Executive development short courses such as professional supervisory and engineering management skills. The launching of these programs is line with the objective of the National Higher Education Strategic Plan (NHESP) (Ministry of Education Malaysia, n.d.) that addresses the enculturation of lifelong learning with the aim of achieving knowledge-based economy. However, the participation of adult students in continuing education is related to their learning goal orientation. It is perceived that working adults who are willing to enroll in the continuing education should possess higher learning goal orientation. This is owing to the fact that learning goal orientation directs individuals towards personal improvement by acquiring new skills and improving one's competence (Van Yperen, 2003). According to Lin and Chang (2005), individuals with learning goal orientation have a stronger desire to learn and ready to adapt to new work environment and new challenges. If the organization fails to assign them with new responsibilities after completion of their continuing education, they may consider other employment opportunities that allow them to explore new challenging tasks and obtaining promotion at the same time. Therefore, adult students with learning goal orientation may be more likely to experience a state of loss of enthusiasm in their current profession which in turn may lead to turnover intention. Previous researchers (Ghiselli, La Lopa & Bai, 2001; Parker & Kohlmeyer, 2005; Barak, Nissly & Levin, 2001) had suggested that the best predictors for turnover intention are job satisfaction, organizational commitment, salary, professional commitment and burnout. However, little attention has been paid to examine the relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention. Hence, the researcher would like to fill the knowledge gap by addressing the below research questions:

RQ1: What is the level of learning goal orientation and turnover intention among the Malaysian adult students?

RQ2: Is there any significant difference in the level of learning goal orientation and turnover intention among the adult students' demographic profiles?

RQ3: Is there any significant relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover

intention?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Turnover Intention

Turnover intention is defined as the intention of an individual to voluntarily separate or leave the organization permanently (Hom & Grilith, 1995). It generates high cost to an organization if the managers fail to retain good employees that contribute towards the effectiveness of the organization. Thus, turnover intention has received significant attention in the study of organizational behavior and organizational psychology (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). The concept of turnover intention is guided by Theory of Reasoned Action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). According to this theory, it posits that one's behavioral intention is determined by one's attitude and subjective norms. In this respect, turnover intention is predicted by one's attitude and how he or she perceives the influence of people around them on this behavioral intention. However, a few conceptual models of turnover intention have been established in the earlier research based on work-related attitudes in the organization. They were focusing on various predictors such as organizational commitment (Mowday, Stress and Porter, 1979), job involvement (Kanungo, 1979) and job satisfaction (Mobley, 1977). The basic findings of these studies indicate that the predictors were negatively related to turnover intention. Individuals, who have higher organizational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction, will less incline to leave their organizations. Nevertheless, beside the main effect of these predictors, learning goal orientation is an area that little effort has been done to examine its relationship with turnover intention. Lin and Chang (2005), Dysvik and Kuvaas (2010) have provided preliminary positive effect that learning goal orientation has on turnover intention. Thus, it is the intention of this study to continue the empirical scrutiny on the relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention in the Malaysian context. For this study, turnover intention is conceptualized as the individuals' propensity to withdraw the employing organization in the near future (Price, 2001). In the case of adult students, learning goal orientation plays a significant role in determining turnover intention as it creates the mental frameworks for them to interpret achievement situations (Dweck & Leggett, 1988) and orients them towards new challenges at a new workplace. Those individuals with learning goal orientation prefer to stay with workplace that provides them the opportunity to broaden their knowledge through new work assignments. If their job scope maintain similar for a long period of time, routine duties may further develop boredom and eventually lead them to seek for new employment. Dysvik and Kuvaas (2010) in their study indicate that learning goal orientation was positively related to turnover intention. Learning goal oriented personnel tend to have higher turnover intention as they are always ready for new challenges (Lin & Chang, 2005).

2.2 Learning Goal Orientation

Goal Orientation Theory defines goal orientation as situated orientations for action in an achievement task (Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984). Goal orientation encompasses the experience of a person in achievement situation and explains why and how people are trying to attain the achievement (Anderman & Maehr, 1994). Generally, there were two major

dimensions of goal orientation delineated by goal orientation theory: Learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation. Learning goal orientation is defined as the development of skills and competence or mastering a task with self-referential standards by an individual (Ames & Archer, 1988). On the other hand, performance goal orientation is referred to as the demonstration of one's competence relative to others and avoidance of being looked incompetent (Dweck, 1986). However, a study of Lin and Chang (2005) proposed that performance goal orientation is unrelated to turnover intention as it is less concerned about personal learning and development compared to learning goal orientation. Further, Lin and Chang's (2005) finding discovered that performance goal orientation is not significantly related to turnover intention. Thus, this study will only focus on the relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention. Learning goal orientation is identified by Dweck (1986) and Dweck and Leggett (1988) in terms of broader goals pursued by individuals. The concept of learning goal orientation is related to how individuals interpret and respond to situations within their mental framework (Dweck, 1991). According to Vandewalle (1997), individuals who possess learning goal orientation tend to develop their ability from the current level and perceive it as a malleable attribute that can be improved through experience and effort. With the perception that ability is malleable, learning goal oriented individuals react to difficulties with lower task anxieties and treat failures as opportunities to gain new experience (Dweck, Hong & Chiu, 1993). Despite these explanations, Chiu, Hong and Dweck (1994) suggested that individuals may have different personality patterns across various domains. Thus, the interpretation of learning goal orientation may be different for those in the academic domain and those in the work domain. In the aspect of work domain, it can be explained that individuals with learning goal orientation are more likely to search for new challenges, exhibit high effort and readiness for future tasks and pursuing adaptive response patterns in solving problems (Vandewalle, 1997). Owing to learning goal orientation representing a mind-set that employees are concerned with personal development, it is probable that they are highly sensitive to work environment that fails to provide them opportunities to learn. They may start to search for other employments that are able to offer better prospects and continuous development. In the case of adult students, they have the interest and perseverance to learn despite they need to juggle between their career and family. It is believed that they have high learning goal orientation that drives them to pursue their academic goals and gain new knowledge. As they are upgrading themselves with professional skills and competencies, it is very likely that they started to evaluate their current workplace and their work in relation to their ability. They may leave their present job if the workplace is no longer suitable for them in accordance with their ability. On the basis of the above explanation, it is postulated that learning goal oriented individuals may have higher turnover intention. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H1: There is a significant relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention.

3. Methodology

3.1 The Present Study

This study intends to determine the level of the learning goal orientation and turnover intention among the adult students. The adult students were pursuing Executive Diploma Programs in one of the public universities in Malaysia. This study attempts to examine whether there are any significant group differences in the level of learning goal orientation and turnover intention among the respondents' demographic profiles (i.e. gender, age, and years of experience). In addition, this study also seeks to examine the relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention. The relevant unit of analysis in the present study is individual working adults who attend weekend classes in the university. Survey questionnaire method was used in this study.

3.2 Sample Selection

There were a total of 80 adult students in the current batch of the Executive Diploma Program. Therefore, this study selected each of the students to participate in the survey. Table 1 indicates the demographic profile of the respondents. Referring to Table 1, it was discovered that 65 (81.2%) of the respondents were females and 15 (18.8%) were males. The higher number of female respondents indicates that female adults were more interested in pursuing continue education than the males. Despite female adults may have additional responsibilities in handling household tasks and taking care of their family, they still persist in enhancing professional knowledge and developing new skills. In the age categories, majority of the respondents were in the group of 26 – 45 years old (N = 40, 50%), followed by 36 – 45 (N = 26, 32.5%), 18 – 25 (N = 11, 13.8%) and > 45 (N = 3, 3.7%). In terms of years of working experience, most of the respondents have worked for more than 10 years (N = 36, 45%) whilst others belong to the group of 6 – 10 years (N = 30, 37.5%), 3 – 5 years (N = 8, 10%) and 1 – 2 years (N = 6, 7.5%). In summary, most of the respondents were deemed to have sufficient work experiences but lack of professional knowledge to assist them to become professionals.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Item	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	15	18.8
	Female	65	81.2
	Total	80	100.0
Age	18 – 25	11	13.8
	26 – 35	40	50.0
	36 – 45	26	32.5
	> 45	3	3.7
	Total	80	100.0
Years of Experience	1 – 2	6	7.5
	3 – 5	8	10.0
	6 – 10	30	37.5
	> 10	36	45.0
	Total	80	100.0

3.3 Instruments and Procedures

Administered on-site survey method by Miller, Kets de Vries and Toulouse (1982) was used for data collection. Respondents were requested to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree) and 5 (Strongly agree) with regard to their learning goal orientation and turnover intention. Items deployed to measure learning goal orientation (5 items, $\alpha = 0.88$) were adopted from VandeWalle (1997) whilst items used to measure turnover intention (3 items, $\alpha = 0.90$) were adopted from Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth (1978). These items were used and tested by the authors in their studies.

3.4 Data Analysis

Although the items in the questionnaire were tested and validated by past researchers, the researcher conducted factor analysis and reliability test to re-examine the measures' validity and reliability owing to different cultural perspectives and different research setting from the previous research. This is to reasonably ascertain that the items are measuring the concept the researcher intends to measure in the Malaysian context. Descriptive analysis (i.e. mean and standard deviation) was used to determine the level of the study variables. Tests of significant differences (Independent t-Test, one-way ANOVA) were employed to explore whether the mean scores of learning goal orientation and turnover intention differ significantly among the respondents' demographic profiles. In addition, regression analysis was performed to examine whether there is any significant relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to conduct data analysis in the present study.

4. Results

4.1 Factor Analysis

The independent variables and dependent variable were validated through factor analysis. Table 2 depicts the results of the factor analysis. The value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin for Measuring of Sampling Adequacy (KMO/MSA) was 0.696. It has reached the minimum value of 0.7 for a good factor analysis (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999). The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant at the 0.001 level and supported the factorability of the correlation matrix. Principal component analysis extracted two factors with 5 items and 3 items each of strong loadings. Factor 1 was labeled as learning goal orientation (5 items) and factor 2 was named turnover intention (3 items). As indicted in Table 2, learning goal orientation and turnover intention contributed 32.17% and 28.91% of the common variance respectively with Eigenvalues of 2.574 and 2.313. The two factors cumulatively represented 61.08% of the variance. The values of factor loading for both scales were in the range of 0.605 to 0.912.

4.2 Reliability Test

Reliability test was conducted to determine the internal consistency and suitability of the measures used. Table 2 indicates the reliability test results of the variables. The reliability

coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) for factor 1 (learning goal orientation) and factor 2 (turnover intention) was 0.735 and 0.865. Since the values of Cronbach's Alpha for both variables were above the minimum value of 0.7 as suggested by DeVellis (2003) and Nunnally (1978), the measures of the variables were deemed reliable and consistent throughout the study.

Table 2. Factor Analysis and Reliability Test for Learning Goal Orientation and Turnover Intention Scales

Item	Description	Factor Loading	
		1	2
LG1	I am willing to choose a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from.	0.749	
LG2	I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge.	0.665	
LG3	I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I will learn new skills.	0.768	
LG4	For me, development of my work ability is important enough to take risks.	0.605	
LG5	I prefer to work in situations that require a high level of ability and talent.	0.702	
TO1	I often think about quitting my present job.		0.878
TO2	I will probably look for a new job in the next year.		0.865
TO3	As soon as possible, I will leave the organization.		0.912
Eigenvalue		2.574	2.313
Percentage of Common Variance (%)		32.17	28.91
Cumulative Percentage (%)		32.17	61.08
Reliability Coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha)		0.735	0.865

Note. KMO = 0.696. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: $\chi^2(28) = 208.292, p < 0.001$.

4.3 Descriptive Analysis

Mean and standard deviation were employed to analyze the level of learning goal orientation and turnover intention in accordance with the questionnaire. The values of mean and standard deviation for the variables were tabulated in Table 3. In the process of interpreting the level of mean scores, it is suggested that scores of less than 2.33 (4/3 – 1 (lowest value)) are low, 2.33 – 3.66 are moderate and 3.67 (5 (highest value) – 4/3) and above are high.

Table 3. Mean and Standard Deviation of the Study Variables

Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Learning Goal Orientation	80	4.05	0.465
Turnover Intention	80	2.65	1.028

As indicated in Table 3, learning goal orientation ($M = 4.05, SD = 0.465$) registered a high level of mean score whereas turnover intention ($M = 2.65, SD = 1.028$) registered a moderate mean score. The standard deviation for both study variables were small ($SD = 0.465$ & 1.028). It shows that the distribution of the data is not far from the mean value. Thus, the group of respondents in this study can be categorized as homogeneous. Table 4 shows the mean and standard deviation for each of the learning goal orientation measures. All the measures have recorded high mean values. The respondents registered a high level of agreement in

responding to the learning goal orientation questionnaire. Table 4 reveals that LG2 ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.711$) recorded the highest mean among the measures. The respondents reported that they often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge. They also agreed that they are willing to choose a challenging work assignment that they can learn a lot from as indicated in LG1 ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.648$). Their learning behavior in the work domain is high and persistence. In addition, LG3 ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.682$) shows that they enjoy challenging and difficult tasks where they will learn new skills. They are also willing to take risks for the development of work ability and prefer to work in situations that require high talent as reported in LG4 ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 0.698$) and LG5 ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 0.591$).

Table 4. Mean and Standard Deviation of Learning Goal Orientation Measures

Item	Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
LG1	I am willing to choose a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from.	4.10	0.648
LG2	I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge.	4.34	0.711
LG3	I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I will learn new skills.	4.13	0.682
LG4	For me, development of my work ability is important enough to take risks.	3.76	0.698
LG5	I prefer to work in situations that require a high level of ability and talent.	3.93	0.591

In contrast with learning goal orientation, all the turnover intention items registered moderate mean values. Item TO3 ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 1.190$) recorded the lowest mean where the respondents showed disagreement in leaving the organization as soon as possible. In similar occasion, they disagreed that they often think about quitting their present job and probably look for a new job in the next year as shown in TO1 ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.046$) and TO2 ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.232$). In summary, it can be explained that the adult students have no intention to leave their present organization in the near future whilst engaging with continuing education.

Table 5. Mean and Standard Deviation of Turnover Intention Measures

Item	Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
TO1	I often think about quitting my present job.	2.71	1.046
TO2	I will probably look for a new job in the next year.	2.77	1.232
TO3	As soon as possible, I will leave the organization.	2.46	1.190

4.4 Test of Significant Differences

Test of significant differences was used to examine whether there are any significant group differences in the mean scores of learning goal orientation and turnover intention in association with the profile of the respondents. Independent t-Test and one-way ANOVA were selected for the test of differences. Table 6 denotes the t-Test results for gender and learning goal orientation. It was found that the t value was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level where $t(78) = 1.142$, $p = 0.257$. Thus, there were no significant group differences between male ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.459$) and female ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.465$) in the mean scores of learning goal orientation. Table 7 represents the results for gender and turnover intention. The t value was also discovered to be not statistically significant at the 0.05 level where $t(78) =$

-0.764, $p = 0.447$. Therefore, there were no significant group differences between male ($M = 2.47$, $SD = 1.446$) and female ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 0.915$) in the mean scores of turnover intention.

Table 6. Independent t-Test for Gender and Learning Goal Orientation

Gender	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Levene's Test		t-Test	
				<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	15	4.17	0.459	0.034	0.853	1.142	0.257
Female	65	4.02	0.465				

* $p < 0.05$

Table 7. Independent t-Test for Gender and Turnover Intention

Gender	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Levene's Test		t-Test	
				<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Male	15	2.47	1.446	10.537	0.002	-0.764	0.447
Female	65	2.69	0.915				

* $p < 0.05$

Table 8 shows the descriptive statistics for age group and years of experience with the mean scores of learning goal orientation and turnover intention. The mean scores for learning goal orientation among age group and years of experience were generally high. On the contrary, the mean scores of turnover intention were moderate except for those > 45 years old where their turnover intention is high ($M = 4.11$). Table 9 represents the analysis results of one-way ANOVA for the demographic profiles and learning goal orientation. The results of the analysis were not significant at the 0.05 level where $F(3, 76) = 1.154$, $p = 0.218$ and $F(3, 76) = 0.654$, $p = 0.583$. Therefore, there were no significant group differences in the mean scores of learning goal orientation among the age group and years of experience. Table 10 reveals that the results of the analysis were also not statistically significant at the 0.05 level for both demographic profiles with $F(3, 76) = 2.452$, $p = 0.07$ and $F(3, 76) = 1.85$, $p = 0.145$. Thus, there were no significant group differences in the mean scores of turnover intention among the age group and years of experience.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Learning Goal Orientation			
Age Group			
18 – 25	11	4.00	0.400
26 – 35	40	3.96	0.408
36 – 45	26	4.18	0.536
> 45	3	4.27	0.643
Years of Experience			
1 – 2	6	3.90	0.329
3 – 5	8	3.95	0.366
6 – 10	30	4.02	0.421
> 10	36	4.12	0.535
Turnover Intention			
Age Group			
18 – 25	11	2.79	0.620
26 – 35	40	2.61	1.012
36 – 45	26	2.49	1.112
> 45	3	4.11	0.839
Years of Experience			
1 – 2	6	2.94	0.905
3 – 5	8	2.38	0.983
6 – 10	30	2.94	0.783
> 10	36	2.42	1.186

Table 9. One-Way ANOVA for Age Group, Years of Experience and Learning Goal Orientation

	Sum of Squares	<i>Df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Age Group					
Between Groups	0.963	3	0.321	1.514	0.218
Within Groups	16.117	76	0.212		
Total	17.080	79			
Years of Experience					
Between Groups	0.430	3	0.143	0.654	0.583
Within Groups	16.650	76	0.219		
Total		79			

* $p < 0.05$

Table 10. One-Way ANOVA for Age Group, Years of Experience and Turnover Intention

	Sum of Squares	<i>Df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Age Group					
Between Groups	7.372	3	2.457	2.452	0.070
Within Groups	76.161	76	1.002		
Total	83.533	79			
Years of Experience					
Between Groups	5.686	3	1.895	1.850	0.145
Within Groups	77.847	76	1.024		
Total	83.533	79			

* $p < 0.05$

4.5 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was employed to test the relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention. The results of the analysis were shown in Table 11. The F statistic (0.334) was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, it can be explained that learning goal orientation does not have a significant relationship with turnover intention ($\beta = 0.065$, $p > 0.05$).

Table 11. Regression Analysis for Learning Goal Orientation and Turnover Intention

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable Turnover Intention
Learning Goal Orientation (Beta)	0.065
<i>F</i>	0.334
<i>R</i> ²	0.004
Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	-0.009

* significant at the 0.05 level.

5. Discussion

Based on the descriptive analysis results, it was discovered that the respondents were having a moderate level of turnover intention ($M = 2.65$). Generally, adult students do not intend to find a new job or leave their present organizations whilst still pursuing their continuing education. However, this does not mean that they will still remain in their organizations after they have completed their study. As the students were possessing high learning goal orientation, it is highly possible that they will seek for new employment to explore new challenges after they have equipped themselves with professional skills and knowledge. This is supported by a study of Lin and Chang (2005), stated that learning goal oriented personnel tend to have higher turnover intention as they are always ready for new challenges. In addition, Dweck and Leggett (1988) concurred that the mental frameworks of learning goal oriented personnel orients them towards new workplace to interpret new achievement situations. For this reason, turnover intention may surface due to their readiness for future tasks and adaptive response pattern in their work style (VandeWalle, 1997). Further inspection of the overall mean score of learning goal orientation revealed that the respondents possessed a high level of learning goal orientation ($M = 4.05$). They are determined to learn new skills, acquire new knowledge and highly sensitive to work environment that fail to provide them opportunity to learn. This is congruent with past study of VandeWalle (1997) where the researcher explained that learning goal oriented individuals perceive their ability as malleable attribute that can be improved through effort. This explanation is consistent with the response from the adult students that they are willing to take risks to develop their work ability. Further, it was in line with Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons's (1990) findings that those who possess high learning goal orientation are persistence in academic activities and willing to grow and develop new competencies. Additionally, they make greater effort to learn and involve extensively in self-regulation of learning (Ames, 1992). Hence, the high level of learning goal orientation among the respondents in this study is consistent with past studies in the sense that they are moving towards personal growth with achievement related behavior (Ames & Archer, 1988). However, test of significant differences indicates that there

were no significant group differences in the mean scores of learning goal orientation and turnover intention among the respondents' demographic profiles. Regression analysis results show that there was no significant relationship between learning goal orientation and turnover intention. This finding is not consistent with the study of Dysvik and Kuvaas (2010) which emphasized that learning goal orientation is positively related to turnover intention. The findings of this study can be explained in such a way that whilst the adult students are pursuing their continuing education, they may not have the intention to leave their organization. However, the situation may change when they have successfully completed their study. They may tend to seek for a new workplace which is able to provide them with new tasks and challenging assignments. Generally, learning goal oriented individuals' mind-set is concerned with personal development especially in the work domain (VandeWalle, 1997). They are prone to involve actively in their workplace and may leave their present job if they find that the workplace is no longer suitable for them. Among other plausible reasons which can explain the regression analysis results are Malaysia may have different cultural perspective that causes the respondents to respond according to local practices. Basically, it is a normal practice that individuals may not reveal their intention of leaving their present job until their resignation has been tendered. The work culture and practices in Malaysia maybe different in the sense that workers were more conservative in handling turnover matters at the workplace.

6. Conclusion

In the wake of enculturation of lifelong learning and creating knowledge-based economy, organizations should be more attentive to the emergence of employee turnover issues. This is to anticipate the departure of knowledgeable and competent professionals from the organizations. Employee turnover may incur additional cost in re-hiring and re-training of newly recruit personnel. Further, losing the resource of manpower is akin to the loss of intellectual capital. This may impact the morale of the employees and impose more stress to those that stay in the organization where they have to undertake additional workload whilst awaiting for a replacement (Kramer, 1999). For this reason, organizations should aware that individuals with high learning oriented goals tend to look for challenging tasks. Organizations should re-designate this group of personnel by assigning new tasks and responsibilities in accordance with their ability. An innovative manpower plan shall be drawn-up by the Human Resource Department to provide these individuals with suitable responsibilities. The key in doing this is to ensure that learning goal oriented individuals shall not remain in their current position for long and perform similar duties routinely. Boredom may develop and ultimately lead them towards leaving their current organizations.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (Vot: 14J81) for providing financial support to publish this paper.

References

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures and student motivation. *Journal of*

Educational Psychology, 84(3), 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.261>

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(3), 260-267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.3.260>

Anderman, E. M., & Maehr, M. L. (1994). Motivation and schooling in the middle grades. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 287-309. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543064002287>

Barak, M. E. M., Nissly, J. A., & Levin, A. (2001). Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social work and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and meta-analysis. *Social Service Review*, 75(4), 625-661. <https://doi.org/10.1086/323166>

Chiu, C., Hong, Y., & Dweck, C. S. (1994). Toward an integrative model of personality and intelligence: A general framework and some preliminary steps. In R. J. Sternberg & P. Ruzgis (Eds.), *Personality and Intelligence* (104-134). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Cotton, J., & Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 50-70.

Dess, G. D., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Voluntary turnover, social capital and organizational performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 446-456.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and application* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational process affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040-1048. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.10.1040>

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.256>

Dweck, C. S. (1991). Self-theories and goals: Their role in motivation, personality and development. In R. A. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1990*, 38, 199-235. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Dweck, C. S., Hong, Y., & Chiu, C. (1993). Implicit theories: Individual differences in the likelihood and meaning of dispositional influence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(5), 644-656. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167293195015>

Dysvik, A., & Kuvaas, B. (2010). Exploring the relative and combined influence of mastery-approach goals and work intrinsic motivation on employee turnover intention. *Personnel Review*, 39(5), 622-638. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481011064172>

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ghiselli, R. F., La Lopa, J. M., & Bai, B. (2001). Job satisfaction, life satisfaction and

turnover intent: Among food-service managers, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42(2), 28-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010880401422002>

Heyman, G. D., & Dweck, C. S. (1992). Achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: Their relation and their role in adaptive motivation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 16, 231-247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00991653>

Hom, P. W., & Grileth, R. W. (1995). A structural equation modeling test of a turnover theory: Cross sectional and longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 350-366. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.3.350>

Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, N. (1990). *The multivariate social scientist*. London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Kanungo, R. N. (1979). The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 119-138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.1.119>

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Annual review of psychology*, 50, 569-598. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.569>

Lin, S. C., & Chang, J. N. (2005). Goal orientation and organizational commitment as explanatory factors of employees' mobility. *Personnel Review*, 34(3), 331-353. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480510591462>

Miller, D., Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Toulouse, J. (1982). Top executive locus of control and its relationship to strategy-making structure and environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(2), 237-253. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255988>

Ministry of Education Malaysia (n.d.). National Higher Education Strategic Plan. Retrieved from <http://www.moe.gov.my/en/pelan-strategik-pengajian-tinggi-negara>.

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 237-240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237>

Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 408-414. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.63.4.408>

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice and performance. *Psychological Review*, 91, 328-346. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.91.3.328>

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Parker, R. J., & Kohlmeyer, J. M. (2005). Organizational justice and turnover in public accounting firms: A research note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 30, 357-369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2004.05.001>

Porter, G., & Tansky, J. W. (1999). Expatriate success may depend on a learning orientation considerations for selection and training. *Human Resource Management*, 38(1), 46-60. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-050X\(199921\)38:1<47::AID-HRM5>3.0.CO;2-1](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199921)38:1<47::AID-HRM5>3.0.CO;2-1)

Powell, M. J., & York, R. O. (1992). Turnover in country public welfare agencies. *Journal of Applied Social Sciences*, 16(2), 111-127.

Price, J. L. (2001). Re-elections on the determinants of voluntary turnover intention. *Journal of Manpower*, 22(7), 600-624. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000006233>

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior* (12th ed.) New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*, Doubleday, New York, NY.

Vande, W. D. (1997). Development and validation of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57(6), 995-1015. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164497057006009>

Van Yperen, N. W. (2003). Task interest and actual performance: The moderating effects of assigned and adopted purpose goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(6), 1006-1015. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.6.1006>

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez, P. M. (1990). Students' differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 51-59. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.51>

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).