Turnover or turnaway? Competing risks analysis of male and female IT professionals' job mobility and relative pay gap

Joseph, Damien; Ang, Soon; Slaughter, Sandra A.

2015

Joseph, D., Ang, S., & Slaughter, S. A. (2015). Turnover or turnaway? Competing risks analysis of male and female IT professionals' job mobility and relative pay gap. *Information systems research*, 26(1), 145-164.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/105162>

<https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2014.0558>

© 2015 INFORMS. This is the author created version of a work that has been peer reviewed and accepted for publication by Information Systems Research, INFORMS. It incorporates referee' s comments but changes resulting from the publishing process, such as copyediting, structural formatting, may not be reflected in this document. The published version is available at: [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/isre.2014.0558>].

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 23:14:24 SGT

**TURNOVER OR TURNAWAY? COMPETING RISKS ANALYSIS OF MALE AND
FEMALE IT PROFESSIONALS' JOB MOBILITY AND RELATIVE PAY GAP**

DAMIEN JOSEPH
Nanyang Business School
Nanyang Technological University
Nanyang Avenue
Singapore 639798
adjoseph@ntu.edu.sg
+65 6790-4831 (Voice); +65 6792-2313 (Fax)

SOON ANG
Nanyang Business School
Nanyang Technological University
Nanyang Avenue
Singapore 639798
asang@ntu.edu.sg
+65 6790-4717 (Voice); +65 6792-2313 (Fax)

SANDRA A. SLAUGHTER
Scheller College of Business
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30308-0520, USA
sandra.slaughter@scheller.gatech.edu
1 404-385-3115 (Voice); 1 404-894-6030 (Fax)

October 17, 2014

[Revised by Soon and Sandy]

TURNOVER OR TURNAWAY? COMPETING RISKS ANALYSIS OF MALE AND FEMALE IT PROFESSIONALS' JOB MOBILITY AND RELATIVE PAY GAP

ABSTRACT

This study draws on distributive justice, human capital, and stigmatization theories to hypothesize relationships between relative pay gap and patterns of job mobility. Our study also expands the criterion space of job mobility by contrasting different job destinations when information technology (IT) professionals make a job move. We examine three moves: a) turnover to another IT job in a different firm; b) turnaway-within the same firm to a non-IT job; and c) turnaway-between to a different firm and a non-IT job. We analyze work histories spanning 28 years for 359 IT professionals drawn from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY79). We report three major findings. First, as hypothesized, larger relative pay gaps significantly increase the likelihood of job mobility. Second, IT males and IT females have different job mobility patterns. IT males are more likely to turnover than turnaway-between when faced with a relative pay gap. Further, and contrary to predictions from human capital theory, IT males are more likely to turnaway-within than turnover. This surprising finding suggests that the ubiquitous use of IT in other business functions may have increased the value of IT skills for non-IT jobs and reduced the friction of moving from IT to other non-IT positions. Third, and consistent with stigmatization arguments, IT females are more likely to turnaway from IT than to turnover, when faced with a relative pay gap. In fact, to reduce relative pay gaps, IT females tend to take on lower status jobs that pay less than their IT jobs. We conclude this study with important theoretical, practical and policy implications.

Keywords: information technology professionals, relative pay gap, turnover, turnaway, job mobility, stigmatization, human capital, survival analysis, competing risks, longitudinal.

TURNOVER OR TURNAWAY? COMPETING RISKS ANALYSIS OF MALE AND FEMALE IT PROFESSIONALS' JOB MOBILITY AND RELATIVE PAY GAP

INTRODUCTION

The information technology (IT) profession continues to grapple with a severe imbalance of IT labor. In terms of demand, IT remains a fast growing occupation in the United States (U.S.) with an expected growth of 18% between 2012 and 2022 (Richards and Terkanian 2013). Yet, in terms of supply, the number of IT professionals in the U.S. has decreased sharply (National Science Board 2014). According to the National Science Foundation Science and Engineering Indicators, the number of bachelor's degrees in computer science reached a peak of 60,000 in 2004. But since then, it has declined each year, and by 2011 the number dropped below 44,000. Computer science is the only scientific discipline with a downward trend in the number of undergraduate degrees (National Science Board 2014).¹ In addition, those already in the IT profession are prone to leave it. One study showed that as many as two-thirds of IT professionals tended to leave the IT profession (Joseph et al. 2007).

The imbalance of IT labor is further exacerbated by the lack of females in the industry (Trauth et al. 2009). Interests among first year undergraduate women in computer science have declined by 79% in 2009 (Ashcraft and Blithe 2009). In addition, the proportion of females in the U.S. IT workforce has declined from 40% in 1989 (Information Technology Association of America 2005) to 26% in 2013 (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2013).

To attract and retain IT talent, firms use pay as one of their main talent attraction and retention strategies (Morello 2012). But, pay is also a powerful impetus for job mobility.

¹ Bachelor degree-holders in mathematics, biological sciences, engineering, physical sciences and social sciences have all increased in enrollment each year from 2000 to 2009 (National Science Board 2014).

Research suggests that the absolute pay matters less in decisions to leave jobs compared to relative pay (Gerhart and Rynes 2003). Relative pay gap refers to the gap in one's pay compared to the pay received by comparable others (Galizzi and Lang 1998; Gupta et al. 2006; Schumacher 1997). Distributive justice theory suggests that when pay received is lower than comparable others for similar jobs (i.e. a situation of inequity), action will be taken to restore this inequity (Colquitt 2008). This action, typically, is leaving one's job (Younts and Mueller 2001).

Empirical evidence supports the predictions of distributive justice. For example, field studies of U.S. manufacturing workers (Levine 1993), Italian automotive industry workers (Galizzi 2001; Galizzi and Lang 1998), and German blue-collar workers (Pfeifer and Schneck 2012) all report a positive relationship between relative pay and voluntary quits, controlling for the level of pay.

While extant research has examined why individuals leave their jobs, it has been silent about the job *destinations* of workers who leave their current jobs. Joseph et al. (2012) discovered that job mobility is complex when one views the phenomenon less as a binary construct of staying or leaving a job and more as taking on another job (i.e., the destination). Job destinations are more complex as a construct because they are defined by two kinds of boundaries associated with job mobility: organizational and occupational.

Exploring an enriched criterion space for job mobility is important for refining theories of job mobility because it acknowledges that not all forms of job mobility, as a phenomenon, are binary in nature (Direnzo and Greenhaus 2011). That is, when individuals leave their jobs, they may cross organizational, occupational, or both boundaries (Joseph et al. 2012). Accordingly, we would expect different nomological networks (Cronbach 1958) for different types of job mobility in which the factors associated with job mobility within an occupation may differ from those

associated with job mobility across occupations (McDuff and Mueller 2000).

In the context of our study, an enriched criterion facilitates understanding about whether relative pay gap retains or pushes IT professionals out of firms and/or professions. In essence, this study examines patterns of IT professionals' job mobility associated with relative pay gap. In the next sections, we draw on distributive justice, human capital, and stigmatization theories to hypothesize relationships between relative pay gap and job moves by IT professionals.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Joseph et al.'s (2012) taxonomy (Table 1) differentiates job mobility by changes in firm (or employer or organization) and/or occupation (i.e. the IT profession in this case).

TABLE 1
Job Mobility Destinations for IT Professionals

		Occupation	
		No Change	Change
Firm	No Change	Stay (Cell 1)	Turnaway-Within (Cell 3)
	Change	Turnover (Cell 2)	Turnaway-Between (Cell 4)

For *Stay* (Cell 1 in Table 1), there are no changes in either firm or occupation. For the purposes here, *Stay* is defined as remaining in an IT job in the current firm and in the IT profession. *Turnover* (Cell 2) involves a change in firm but not occupation. *Turnover*, therefore, is defined as voluntarily leaving an IT job for an alternative IT job with a different employer. *Turnaway-within* (Cell 3) involves no change in firm but a change of occupation. *Turnaway-within* is defined as voluntarily leaving an IT job for a non-IT job within the current firm. Finally, *Turnaway-between* (Cell 4) involves a change of both firm and occupation. *Turnaway-between* is defined as voluntarily leaving an IT job for a non-IT job with a different firm.

Figure 1 provides an overview of the theories, hypotheses and relationships in this study. First, we hypothesize relative pay gap and job mobility using tenets of distributive justice theory (*Hypothesis 1*). Then, we draw on human capital and stigmatization theories to distinguish different patterns of job mobility (turnover, turnaway-within and turnaway-between) for IT males (*Hypotheses 2a, 2b and 2c*) and IT females (*Hypotheses 3a, 3b and 3c*).

FIGURE 1
Overview of the Theoretical Foundation, Hypotheses and Relationships²

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice reflects the fairness in the allocation of rewards (Colquitt 2008). Distributive justice theory suggests that an unfair allocation of rewards, for similar work

² We thank a reviewer for suggesting this figure.

conducted under similar conditions, creates a sense of distress. This distress prompts an action to restore fairness (Greenberg 1987). Through the lens of distributive justice theory, relative pay gap reflects an unfair allocation of pay for similar work conducted under similar conditions (Gerhart and Rynes 2003). Hence, relative pay gap is likely to prompt an action to restore fairness. Prior empirical research offers evidence that job mobility is one action that restores such fairness (Tekleab et al. 2005). A worker restores fairness in pay by leaving her current job for another where pay commensurates with market rates (Galizzi and Lang 1998; Schumacher 1997). Hence, as a baseline hypothesis, we expect that:

Hypothesis 1: The larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood of job mobility.

Human Capital Specificity and Stigmatization

Although distributive justice theory provides an established explanation for the above hypothesis, it is silent about explaining relative pay's relationship to various job destinations. This silence offers the opportunity to further refine our understanding of the link between relative pay gap and job mobility. We draw on human capital theory (Becker 1975, Sturman, et al. 2008) to justify our hypotheses that associate relative pay gap with different forms of job mobility patterns and on stigmatization theory (Crocker, et al. 1998, Major and O'Brien 2005) to address gender differences in job mobility patterns.

Human Capital Specificity. Human capital theory distinguishes between general and specific human capital (Becker 1975; Sturman et al. 2008). General human capital includes skills that are easily transferable across domains, whereas specific human capital refers to skills that are unique and specialized to a particular domain, such as a firm or occupation. The uniqueness and transferability of specific human capital has cost-related implications for job mobility.

Recent research has identified two kinds of specific human capital held by IT professionals, i.e. firm-specific and IT-specific human capital (Mithas and Krishnan 2008; Slaughter et al. 2007). Firm-specific human capital is unique to a firm and less readily transferable to other firms (Slaughter et al. 2007). Firms tend to bear a significant portion of the costs associated in an employee's development of firm-specific human capital (Carless and Arnup 2011). To recoup investments and retain human capital within the firm, firms pay lower in the earlier period in exchange for higher pay in a latter period (Carless and Arnup 2011). Investments in firm-specific competencies tend to deter mobility across organizational boundaries because workers incur a cost by forgoing returns to their firm-specific human capital when they leave the firm.

IT-specific human capital is unique to IT jobs and less readily transferable to other occupations (Slaughter et al. 2007). Investments in occupation specific human capital begin during formal occupational education in school and continue on the job (Carless and Arnup 2011). Moreover, IT-specific human capital requires continued investments because it is subject to professional obsolescence (Joseph et al. 2010; Joseph et al. 2011). Investments in formal occupational education and continual professional development are often funded by workers and are not readily recouped by leaving the occupation (Maxwell 1987). IT professionals may be able to reap returns to their IT-specific human capital as long as they remain within the IT profession (Joseph et al. 2012). Investments in occupation-specific competencies tend to deter mobility across occupational boundaries because workers incur a cost by forgoing returns to their occupation-specific human capital when they leave their occupations.

From the human capital specificity point of view, we expect that IT professionals would turnover (find another IT job in another firm) rather than leave the profession to redress the

relative pay gap as turnover is the least costly strategy of job mobility. IT skills are valuable and transferable to IT jobs across firms because of the standardization of IT (Slaughter et al. 2007). The standardization of IT reduces training costs for firms when they purchase IT-specific human capital from the external labor market. Firms may pass part of the savings in training costs to IT professionals as higher pay (Mithas and Krishnan 2008), thereby narrowing a relative pay gap. As such, to redress a relative pay gap, IT professionals may be enticed to turnover rather than to turnaway-within or –between.

In comparing the likelihood of turnaway-within and -between, we expect from a human capital specificity standpoint that turnaway-within is more likely than turnaway-between as the next likely mobility to redress relative pay gaps. Turnaway-within is the “seeding the line” strategy first reported by Reich and Kaarst-Brown (1999). The ubiquity of information technologies in line functions requires incumbents in these line functions to possess IT skills. By seeding the line, IT professionals move laterally into non-IT, line jobs so that firms are able to reap the benefits of both their IT-specific and firm-specific human capital. Furthermore, firms would invest additionally to train these IT professionals in their new occupations within the firm (Kambourov and Manovskii 2009), and pay these professionals for their unique mix of IT, line, and firm specific human capital.

Turning away-between is expected to be the least likely form of job mobility. From a human capital perspective, turnaway-between discounts the value of both firm and IT-specific human capital. Leaving firm and profession requires individuals to “start from scratch” and rely on general human capital (Kambourov and Manovskii 2009). General human capital tends to be more available in the labor market and as a result is less valuable to firms compared to specific human capital (Møen 2005). As such, returns to general human capital should be lower

compared to returns to specific human capital (Gathmann and Schonberg 2010).

Given higher individual investments in IT skills, and the prospect of deferred returns to firm-specific competencies, the costs associated with turnover are likely to be lower compared to costs associated with turnaway -within and –between firms. Hence, based on human capital arguments, we would expect relative pay gap to be more strongly associated with turnover than with turnaway-within or with turnaway-between. However, this expectation is based on the premise that all IT professionals are treated equally. That may not be the case for IT females. As we describe in the following section, females suffer from stigmatization in the IT profession, and as such we would expect IT females to exhibit a different pattern of job mobility in relation to a relative pay gap than the pattern of job mobility described above.

Stigmatization. Stigmatization theory states that possessing a characteristic devalued in a particular social context (called a stigma) activates stereotypes in others (Crocker et al. 1998; Major and O'Brien 2005). Members of a social category are expected to behave in ways that are consistent with that social category's stereotype (Rudman and Phelan 2008). Disconfirming a social category's stereotype tends to attract "social and economic reprisals for behaving counterstereotypically" (Rudman and Phelan 2008, p. 61). Social reprisals are often in the form of verbal aggression, threats and humiliation in the workplace (Harlos 2010) while economic reprisals tend take the form of discounting the value of competencies and contributions (Tomaskovic-Devey and Skaggs 2002). The empirical studies of Blau and Tatum (2000) and von Hippel et al. (2011) show gender based stereotyping and reprisals in organizations to be positively related to females leaving their jobs.

In the IT profession, being male and, thus, assumed to be technically competent is a stereotypical characteristic of an IT professional (Enns et al. 2006). Being female in the IT

profession disconfirms the IT stereotype, thereby attracting social and economic reprisals (Ahuja 2002; Trauth et al. 2009). As stigmatization tends to permeate the IT profession (Leventman 2007; Trauth et al. 2009), we expect IT females to prefer to leave the IT profession.

We therefore hypothesize that for IT females, the larger the relative pay gap, the more likely they will turnaway-within and turnaway-between than turnover. Leaving the IT profession may be less costly than expected because the stereotyping of IT females tends to discount returns to their IT-specific skills. By disconfirming the IT stereotype, IT females are thought to be less capable of undertaking technical work (Cohoon and Aspray 2006; Margolis and Fisher 2002). Therefore, IT females may be excluded from mainstream IT work (Adya 2008, p. 614). This exclusion from mainstream IT work is likely to lower the value of IT-specific human capital and make it less costly to turnaway-within and –between compared to turning over to alternative IT jobs. However, turnaway-within is likely to remain less costly compared to turnaway-between because the latter discounts returns to both firm-specific and IT specific human capital.

When taken together, the combination of distributive justice, human capital, and stigmatization theories suggests different patterns of job mobility associated with relative pay gaps for IT males and IT females. Hence, for IT males:

Hypothesis 2a: The larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT males will turnover than turnaway-within.

Hypothesis 2b: The larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT males will turnover than turnaway-between.

Hypothesis 2c: The larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT males will turnaway-within than turnaway-between.

Conversely, for IT females:

Hypothesis 3a: The larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway-within than turnover.

Hypothesis 3b: The larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway-between than turnover.

Hypothesis 3c: The larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway-within than turnaway-between.

METHOD

This study's sample and data are drawn from a longitudinal archival dataset containing demographics, labor market experiences and pay information of individuals living in the U.S. We test our hypotheses using a set of competing risks models of survival analyses (Allison 1984; Morita et al. 1993; Singer and Willett 1991) that evaluate the likelihood of IT professionals' turning over, turning away-within or turning away-between. Competing risks models facilitate the analysis and comparison of multiple events that are independent of each other.

Data and Sample

The data span 28 years of work histories for a sample of IT professionals drawn from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY79). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) began the NLSY79 program in 1979 by surveying a nationally representative sample of 12,686 respondents between the ages of 14-21 years (as of January 1, 1979). The NLSY79 remains an active survey program of the BLS. The BLS continues to interview this cohort to collect data on topics, including work history, occupation and income. The NLSY79 is ideal for this study as it contains work history data - detailed information on jobs and pay over individuals' careers

(Bureau of Labor Statistics 2008)³

We used three criteria to draw this study's sample from the larger dataset. First, we drew all respondents tracked from 1979 to 2006. Second, respondents must have attained at least a bachelor's degree. Third, respondents must have held an IT job as a permanent job at any point in their work history. The BLS defines a permanent job as one in which an incumbent has spent "one continuous year in a job" (Polivka 1996). The preceding criteria exclude marginal workers in jobs that do not require a bachelor's degree and those who may have regarded IT jobs as temporary jobs. Temporary and marginal workers are argued to be unlikely to undergo the same processes as individuals within the primary labor market (Hulin et al. 1985).

IT jobs in the NLSY79 dataset are identified by their U.S. Census Bureau's Occupation Classification System (OCS) code (U.S. Census Bureau 1971; U.S. Census Bureau 2003). IT jobs in the OCS include: Computer and Information Systems Managers, Systems Analysts, Computer Programmers and Technical Specialists (e.g. Computer Support Specialists, Database Administrators and Network Administrators). Table 2 reports the number of respondents holding a particular IT job over the sampling period of our study, and the proportion of females and males in each IT job.

TABLE 2
IT Jobs and Proportions of IT Males and IT Females in IT Jobs

	N¹	Percentage Female	Percentage Male
Computer and Information Systems Managers	71	36.6%	63.4%
Systems Analysts	101	33.7%	66.3%
Computer Programmers	111	35.1%	64.9%
Technical Specialists	214	52.8%	47.2%

1 "N" reported refers to the number of individuals holding the particular IT job role over the sampling period. The total number of IT professionals in the IT job roles sums to greater than 359 because IT professionals may hold different IT job roles over the course of their work history.

³ This research utilized the Bureau of Labor Statistics' restricted access GEOCODE data. The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Overall, our sample includes a total of 359 individuals: 162 (45.1%) females and 197 (54.9%) males. In terms of race, 78.6% of the sample is Caucasian and the remaining 21.4% is non-Caucasian, including African-Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders. Our selection criteria ensured that all respondents attained a bachelor's degree, including both non-IT majors (56.5%) and IT majors (43.5%); and 22% of the sample had postgraduate qualifications.

We further note that each individual in our sample contributed a number of detailed work history observations which we refer to as “person-period observations” – one observation for each year that individual worked full time in the workforce. For example, if a particular respondent was included in our sample, and worked full time for each of 10 years during the sampling period of our study, that respondent would contribute 10 person-period observations (one for each year in the workforce). In sum, the total number of person-period observations for the 359 IT professionals in our sample was 6,219.

Measures

Table 3 lists the variables utilized in this study and their corresponding definitions. The following paragraphs provide details explaining how each variable was operationalized.

Dependent Variables. The dependent variables are the types of job mobility. Following prior studies that have also utilized the NLSY79 dataset (e.g. Lee et al. 2008; Maltarich et al. 2010; Trevor and Nyberg 2008), we coded job mobility for each year of a respondent's work history based on the respondent's answers to multiple questions contained in the NLSY79. Specifically, we used information on the start and stop dates of employment; reason for leaving the job if the respondent changed jobs (i.e. quit to take another job); and the OCS codes for respondents' most recent and subsequent jobs.

TABLE 3
Variables and Corresponding Definitions

Variable	Definition
Dependent Variables	
<i>Job Mobility</i>	Voluntarily leaving an IT job
<i>Turnover</i>	Voluntarily leaving an IT job for an alternative IT job with a different firm
<i>Turnaway-Within</i>	Voluntarily leaving an IT job for an alternative non-IT job within one's firm
<i>Turnaway-Between</i>	Voluntarily leaving an IT job for an alternative non-IT job in a different firm
Independent Variables	
<i>Relative Pay Gap</i>	Ratio of the average male's pay to the respondent's pay, given a particular job and job tenure
Moderator Variable	
<i>Sex</i>	Biological classification of female or male
Controls – Human Capital	
<i>Cognitive Ability</i>	Measure of general ability
<i>Education Level</i>	Level of schooling
<i>Manufacturing; Professional, Business or Finance; and Retail & Trade</i>	The Standard Industrial Classification code of respondent's job; with <i>All Other Industries</i> as reference
<i>IT Education</i>	Enrolled in an IT-related major while in college
<i>Systems Analyst, Computer Programmer; and Technical Specialist</i>	Job type while in the IT profession; with <i>IT Manager</i> as reference
<i>IT-specific Experience; and IT-specific Experience (Squared)</i>	Tenure in IT profession
<i>Firm-specific Training</i>	Firm sponsored training received with a particular firm
<i>Firm-specific Experience; and Firm-specific Experience (Squared)</i>	Tenure in a particular firm
Controls – Desire to Move	
<i>Job Status</i>	Socio-economic status of a job
<i>Job Satisfaction</i>	Affective attachment to a job
Controls – Ease of Movement	
<i>Enrolled in School and Unemployed</i>	Respondent's labor force participation status; with <i>Employed</i> as reference.
<i>Unemployment Rate</i>	Local rate of joblessness in respondent's geographic location in the U.S.
Controls – Demographics	
<i>White</i>	The reported ethnic affiliation of respondent; with <i>Non-White</i> as the reference
<i>Married</i>	Whether respondent is married; with <i>Not-married</i> as reference
<i>Number of Children</i>	Number of children in respondent's household
<i>South, Northeast and Midwest</i>	Respondent's geographic region of residence within the United States with <i>West and Pacific</i> as the reference
<i>Urban</i>	Respondent's residence is within a city area; <i>Non-Urban</i> as reference
<i>Real Hourly Pay</i>	Hourly pay adjusted using the Consumer Price Index deflator (1982-1984)

Job Mobility was coded using respondents' start and stop dates of employment with an employer and reason for leaving their job. *Job Mobility* was coded as "1" if respondents started and voluntarily stopped employment on a particular job with an employer in a particular year.

Otherwise, the respondent's *Job Mobility* was coded as "0" in that year.

We refined *Job Mobility* into *Turnover*, *Turnaway-Within* and *Turnaway-Between* using respondents' start and stop dates of employment with an employer, reason for leaving their job and the OCS codes for respondents' most recent and subsequent jobs.

We coded *Turnover* as "1" if respondents started and stopped employment in a particular job with an employer; voluntarily left their job to take another job; and the OCS codes for their most recent and subsequent jobs were IT-related codes. Otherwise, turnover was coded as "0".

We coded *Turnaway-Within* as "1" if respondents started but had not stopped employment with an employer; voluntarily left their job to take another job; and the OCS code for their most recent job was an IT-related code and the OCS code for their subsequent job was a non-IT code. Otherwise, turnaway-within was coded as "0".

We coded *Turnaway-Between* as "1" if respondents started and stopped employment on a particular job with an employer; voluntarily left their job to take another job; and the OCS code for their most recent job was an IT-related code and the OCS code for their subsequent job was a non-IT code. Otherwise, turnaway-between was coded as "0".

Independent Variables. The independent variable is relative pay. *Relative Pay Gap* is operationalized as a ratio of the average male's pay to an individual's pay, given a particular job and level of job tenure. *Relative Pay Gap* is a lagged time-varying predictor of job mobility in the analyses. Relative pay gap is lagged by one year because the strength and relevance of a predictor's relationship with a dependent variable decreases with time (Griffeth et al. 2000; Kelly and McGrath 1988). Lagging a variable also mitigates the possibility of simultaneity bias between the independent and dependent variables (Singer and Willett 1991, p. 441).

This study follows a three-step process utilized in prior research to compute the relative pay gap (e.g. Blau and Kahn 1981; Gupta et al. 2006; Trevor and Nyberg 2008; Viscusi 1980) for each respondent in each year of their work history. First, we computed respondents' *Real Hourly Pay* for each job in each year from reported nominal hourly pay using a CPI deflator, with 1982-1984 as the base year (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2009). Second, we computed the mean real hourly pay of males for each job category and level of job tenure occurring in our dataset (e.g. IT manager with 5 years of job tenure or systems analyst with 3 years of job tenure). Third, we computed *Relative Pay Gap* as a ratio measure of the mean real hourly pay of males to each respondent's real hourly pay, given a job category and for a level of job tenure. A relative pay gap greater than one suggests that, all else being equal, a respondent is earning less than the "going" rate for males in that particular job and level of job tenure.

We use average male hourly pay for a given job category and job tenure as the referent for three reasons. One, the average male pay is argued to be the benchmark for the long run expected pay in a job (Blau and Kahn 1981). Two, the relative pay gap is a proxy to estimate the difference in pay associated with biases experienced by one group compared to another (Gupta et al. 2006). Three, the relative pay gap measures the potential attractiveness or utility of a job vis-à-vis alternative jobs (England et al. 2007; Reskin et al. 1999).

Control Variables. Twenty-seven (27) control variables account for alternative explanations of job mobility, such as human capital (Ang et al. 2002; Becker 1975) and organizational equilibrium (Joseph et al. 2007; March and Simon 1958) theories.

Human capital factors included in this study are general, industry, IT-specific and firm-specific human capital. General human capital measures include respondents' cognitive ability and education level. *Cognitive Ability* is a time invariant percentile score from the Armed Forces

Qualifying Test (AFQT) administered to the NLSY79 sample in 1980. The AFQT percentile score is a composite of four quantitative and verbal tests: mathematical knowledge, arithmetic reasoning, paragraph comprehension and work knowledge.

Education Level is a time varying dichotomous variable coded as “1” if and when a respondent attains a post-graduate degree; otherwise it is coded as “0” to denote attainment of a bachelor’s degree.

We use three time-varying dummy variables to represent industry-specific human capital. The following industries are the most frequently occurring reported by respondents. We used the U.S. Census’ Standard Industrial Classification (U.S. Census Bureau 1971; U.S. Census Bureau 2003) to code *Manufacturing* as “1” if a respondent reported a job in a manufacturing industry; *Professional, Business or Finance* industries as “1” if a respondent reported a job in that industry; and *Retail and Trade* as “1” if a respondent reported a job in that industry. Otherwise, the dummy codes were “0”.

IT-specific human capital measures are IT-specific education, IT job type and IT experience. *IT Education* is a time invariant dichotomous variable coded as “1” if the IT discipline was the respondent’s major field of study in college; otherwise, coded as “0.”

We noted each respondent’s IT job using IT-specific OCS codes created by NLSY79. IT job type is represented by lagged time varying dummy variables to represent: *Systems Analyst* (coded as “1”), *Programmer* (coded as “1”), *Technical Specialist* (coded as “1”), and with *IT Managers* as the reference group (coded as “0”).

IT Experience is a lagged time-varying measure in years, based on the start and end dates of IT jobs held by each respondent.

The firm-specific human capital variables include firm-specific training and firm experience. *Firm-specific Training* represents the accumulated number of firm-specific training events a respondent received in a particular firm. This lagged time varying covariate is constructed from respondents' answers to whether they had received training with an employer during the course of a year and the kind of training received (i.e. on the job training).

Firm-specific Experience is a lagged time-varying measure in years based on the start and end dates of a respondent's job with a particular firm. We follow prior human capital literature (e.g. Mincer 1974) by including squared terms of IT-specific and firm-specific experience to model nonlinear relationships between the experience variables and the dependent variables.

Following organizational equilibrium theory (March and Simon 1958) and related empirical studies, we control for desire and ease of movement. We operationalized desire to move with job status and job satisfaction. The *Job Status* variable is measured using the Duncan Socio-Economic Index (SEI, Duncan 1961). The Duncan SEI provides a prestige score for each occupation ranging from 0 (lowest) to 97 (highest). This time-varying measure represents the attractiveness of a respondent's current job vis-à-vis other jobs (Mayer and Schoorman 1998).

We follow prior studies (e.g. Dickter et al. 1996; Ganzach 1998; Gerhart 1987; Trevor 2001) in using a lagged time-varying measure of *Job Satisfaction* from the NLSY79. The job satisfaction measure in the NLSY79 is a single item providing a general indication of respondents' affective attachment to their jobs. This single item measure has shown substantial convergent validity (Wanous et al. 1997) with patterns of results similar to multiple item measures of job satisfaction (Ganzach 1998).

We operationalized ease of movement with labor force status and unemployment rate. Labor force status is represented by two time-varying dummy variables. One, *Enrolled in School*

was coded as “1” if a respondent reported being concurrently enrolled in school; otherwise it was coded as “0.” Two, *Unemployed* was coded as “1” using NLSY79’s coding of respondents’ labor force status following the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ (2008) definition of unemployment as “temporarily not in a job and actively seeking employment”; otherwise it was coded as “0.”

Unemployment Rate is a time-varying measure of the local unemployment rate in respondents’ geographic locations. This measure is computed and provided by NLSY79 in its restricted access GEOCODE dataset.

We control for demographic factors known to influence the job mobility (Joseph et al. 2012). We coded *Race*, as “1” if racial affiliation was reported as “White”. Otherwise, race was coded as “0”. *Marital Status*, a time-varying measure is coded as “1” if respondent reported being married at a given time; otherwise coded as “0.” The *Number of Children* in a respondent’s household was reported in each time period is also a time-varying, continuous measure.

Information for respondents’ state and urban area of residence was obtained from NLSY79’s restricted access GEOCODE data. We follow prior research (e.g. Blau and Kahn 1981) and NLSY79’s coding scheme to include three time-varying dummies indicating individuals’ region of residence as *South* (coded as “1”), *Northeast* (coded as “1”), and *Midwest* (coded as “1”) of the U.S.; with *West and Pacific* as the reference (coded as “0”).

Urban area of residence is denoted by a dummy variable *Urban* (coded as “1”); with *Non-urban* (coded as “0”) as reference. NLSY79’s coding of urban and rural residence for each respondent’s geographic location is based on Census population data in the NLSY79 restricted access GEOCODE.

Data Analysis

We employed survival analysis to estimate the effect of relative pay gap on job mobility. Survival analysis is a statistical approach that accounts for the timing of individuals' job moves and provides insight into why such moves occur (Dickter et al. 1996). Models in survival analysis account for the effects of time by including a measure of "time to an event" (Hosmer and Lemeshow 1999, p. 2), in our case the time to each job move. For example, turnover research (Hom et al. 2008) indicates that firm tenure has a curvilinear relationship with turnover, suggesting that turnover is less likely with increasing firm-specific experience. As such, considering "when" job mobility occurs is as important and relevant as understanding "why" such moves occur (Peters and Sheridan 1988).

We use a Cox regression for the survival analysis (Cox 1972) for three reasons. First, Cox regression allows predictors to be included in a standard regression form allowing easy interpretations of the results (Allison 1995). Second, Cox regression accounts for the influence of truncation and censoring of observations (Hosmer and Lemeshow 1999). The data assembled for this study is left truncated and right censored because of the sample selection criteria and study design. Finally, Cox regression does not require the specification of the baseline hazard, which is required in other forms of survival analyses (Allison 1995). The baseline hazard is the hazard of an event in the absence of covariates (Hosmer and Lemeshow 1999). The form of the baseline hazard is typically not normally distributed, known or theorized in turnover research (Morita et al. 1989; Morita et al. 1993).

Competing Risks Model. This study tests the hypotheses using competing risks models of survival analyses (Allison 1984; Morita et al. 1993; Singer and Willett 1991). The assumption underlying competing risks models is that events are independent of each other (Allison 1984;

Singer and Willett 2003). In other words, the occurrence of one type of event removes individuals from the risk of all other types of events at that particular time. In this study, IT professionals can only perform one type of job mobility at any given time. Undertaking a particular type of job mobility removes IT professionals from the risk of enacting all other types of job mobility at that time.

The null hypothesis is that the coefficients for relative pay gap are not significantly different from each other across the types of job mobility. Each type of job mobility is estimated separately and the equality of coefficients across these models is tested using a 1-degree-of-freedom Wald's chi-square statistic (Allison 1995; Hosmer and Lemeshow 1999). A significant Wald's chi-square statistic rejects the null hypothesis and indicates that the likelihood of one job mobility is higher or lower than another in relation to a relative pay gap.

Censoring Other Forms of Movement. Following the approach used in the literature (e.g. Lee et al. 2008; Trevor 2001), other types of job mobility (e.g. involuntary quits, leaving for higher education or leaving the workforce) were censored as they are outside the scope of this study. Unlike traditional research designs, censoring is not problematic for survival analysis because it utilizes information from all observations up to the point of censoring to estimate hazard rates (Dickter et al. 1996; Morita et al. 1989).

Repeated Events and Observations. Job mobility is a repeated event in respondents' work histories. Each respondent also provides multiple observations. Repeated events and multiple observations per respondent violate the assumption of independence of observations by biasing standard errors and coefficients (Allison 1984; Hosmer and Lemeshow 1999).

We correct for non-independence of observations using a robust variance estimator advocated by Lin and Wei (1989). The robust variance estimator does not require assumptions of

a specific structure for the dependence among events or observations (Morita et al. 1993). Instead, the robust variance estimator computes standard errors from pooled within-respondent error residuals (Hosmer and Lemeshow 1999).

Stratified Analysis. The distributions of job mobility are known to be significantly different for IT males and IT females (Joseph et al. 2012; Joseph et al. 2007). The gender difference in the distribution of job mobility is attributed to the dissimilar work experiences of IT females and IT males (e.g. Ahuja 2002; Leventman 2007). The different distributions of job mobility threaten to violate the assumption of proportional hazards. The assumption of proportional hazards requires the hazard function for all respondents to be a constant multiple or proportion of the baseline hazard (Allison 1984; Hosmer and Lemeshow 1999).

We tested the equality of job mobility distributions for IT males and IT females with log rank tests. The log rank tests indicate that IT males and IT females have significantly different distributions of job mobility ($\chi^2 = 5.82$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.05$), turnover ($\chi^2 = 22.00$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$), and turnaway-within ($\chi^2 = 4.17$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.05$); and marginally different distributions for turnaway-between ($\chi^2 = 3.55$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.059$). These results indicate a violation of the assumption of proportional hazards.

As recommended by Allison (1984) and Hosmer and Lemeshow (1999), we resolved this violation with a stratified Cox regression. A stratified analysis is performed by first fitting hypothesized models to all data, ignoring gender of respondent. Second, hypothesized models are analyzed separately by gender. Third, a stratification test is conducted to ascertain whether the stratified model fits the data better than a combined model (Singer and Willett 2003, pp. 560-561). A significant difference between the log-likelihoods of the stratified and combined models indicates model fit (Allison 1995; Singer and Willett 2003).

The model stratification tests confirm a stratified model for job mobility ($\chi^2 = 949.11$, $df = 28$, $p < 0.001$), turnover ($\chi^2 = 641.56$, $df = 28$, $p < 0.001$), turnaway-within ($\chi^2 = 210.32$, $df = 28$, $p < 0.001$) and turnaway-between ($\chi^2 = 150.25$, $df = 28$, $p < 0.001$). The tests indicate that IT males and IT females have different likelihoods of job mobility for the examined set of predictors and that their data should be analyzed separately.

RESULTS

The means, standard deviations and correlations are presented in Table 4. Table 5 presents the results for the competing risks models of job mobility, turnover, turnaway-within and turnaway-between. The coefficients (β) in Table 5 are interpreted as odds ratios, a comparative measure of event occurrence (Hosmer and Lemeshow 1999).

Distributive Justice

Hypothesis 1 states that the larger the relative pay, the higher the likelihood of a job move. Results from the Cox regression on job mobility support Hypothesis 1 (Table 5) for both IT males and IT females. Specifically, we find that the larger the relative pay, the higher the likelihood of a job mobility for IT males' (Model 1: $\beta = 0.286$, $p < 0.001$) and IT females' (Model 5: $\beta = 0.392$, $p < 0.001$).

As staying (Table 1, Cell 1) is the reference category in this hypothesis, the results may also be interpreted symmetrically as the larger the relative pay gap, the lower the likelihood of staying. Graphing these results for IT males (Model 1) and IT females (Model 5), we find that the probability of staying decreases as relative pay gap increases for both IT males and IT females (Figure 2).

TABLE 4
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations of Study Variables for IT Males and IT Females¹

	IT Males		IT Females		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD														
1 Turnover	0.091	0.288	0.057	0.232		-0.041	-0.033	0.016	-0.017	0.030	0.017	-0.011	-0.047	0.042	0.008	0.049	-0.028	0.016
2 Turnaway-Within	0.016	0.126	0.023	0.149	-0.038		-0.013	-0.029	0.011	0.020	-0.013	-0.026	0.003	-0.010	0.000	-0.016	-0.023	-0.008
3 Turnaway-Between	0.010	0.102	0.015	0.122	-0.031	-0.019		0.005	-0.021	-0.007	0.006	-0.026	0.031	-0.001	-0.007	0.013	0.019	-0.008
4 Region: South	0.350	0.477	0.419	0.493	0.048	-0.006	0.041		-0.473	-0.365	-0.139	-0.137	-0.005	0.004	-0.049	-0.100	0.040	-0.235
5 Region: Northeast	0.293	0.455	0.307	0.461	-0.030	0.021	-0.020	-0.565		-0.320	0.097	0.100	0.039	0.049	-0.078	0.127	-0.007	0.132
6 Region: Midwest	0.198	0.399	0.091	0.287	0.006	-0.040	0.001	-0.268	-0.210		0.012	-0.061	-0.033	-0.047	-0.058	0.079	-0.029	0.117
7 Urban	0.660	0.474	0.699	0.459	-0.026	0.018	-0.007	-0.051	0.098	-0.098		-0.162	-0.013	0.020	0.007	0.032	-0.008	-0.013
8 Unemployment Rate	6.161	2.700	6.198	2.790	-0.056	-0.024	-0.025	-0.116	0.015	0.007	-0.235		0.085	0.141	0.016	0.004	0.039	0.034
9 Enrolled in School	0.033	0.178	0.029	0.169	-0.007	0.015	-0.005	0.016	-0.031	0.032	-0.030	0.047		0.327	-0.042	-0.009	0.087	0.016
10 Unemployed	0.118	0.323	0.162	0.368	0.023	-0.010	0.078	0.059	-0.051	-0.040	-0.037	0.099	0.143		-0.017	-0.004	0.112	-0.025
11 Industry - Manufacturing	0.167	0.373	0.083	0.276	0.019	0.014	-0.006	-0.077	0.123	-0.060	0.006	-0.008	-0.007	0.030		-0.406	-0.160	0.011
12 Industry - Professional	0.451	0.498	0.493	0.500	0.059	-0.010	0.033	0.020	-0.021	-0.002	0.012	-0.020	0.015	0.019	-0.296		-0.324	0.054
13 Industry - Retail & Trade	0.113	0.317	0.113	0.316	-0.030	0.027	0.020	-0.026	0.008	-0.016	0.021	0.046	0.004	0.039	-0.107	-0.351		-0.016
14 Race	0.807	0.396	0.759	0.429	0.019	0.006	-0.022	-0.246	0.185	0.057	-0.146	0.011	-0.039	-0.056	0.134	-0.115	0.045	
15 Marital Status	0.552	0.497	0.488	0.500	0.019	0.006	0.023	0.027	0.020	-0.033	-0.151	-0.138	-0.062	-0.041	0.017	-0.052	-0.062	0.227
16 Number of Children	0.644	1.032	0.756	1.031	-0.003	-0.016	0.010	0.045	-0.092	0.035	-0.134	-0.095	0.003	0.042	-0.046	-0.024	-0.080	-0.106
17 Job Status	60.427	17.807	55.808	20.193	0.072	0.039	0.011	-0.015	0.023	0.015	0.017	-0.173	-0.058	-0.070	0.123	0.127	-0.153	0.090
18 Job Satisfaction (Lag)	2.793	1.368	2.586	1.485	0.037	-0.082	-0.002	0.035	0.009	0.020	0.043	-0.059	-0.063	-0.185	0.040	-0.001	-0.055	0.053
19 Cognitive Ability	76.756	22.086	67.224	25.455	0.061	0.001	-0.033	-0.231	0.256	0.038	0.005	-0.040	-0.034	-0.033	0.129	-0.025	-0.059	0.515
20 Education Level	0.218	0.413	0.233	0.423	-0.003	-0.017	0.014	0.002	-0.007	-0.024	0.102	-0.036	0.017	0.015	-0.018	0.066	-0.078	0.044
21 IT Education	0.508	0.501	0.346	0.477	0.093	-0.021	-0.023	0.112	-0.036	0.029	-0.104	0.071	-0.012	-0.034	0.049	0.001	0.005	-0.107
22 Job Type: Systems Analyst (Lag)	0.150	0.357	0.092	0.289	0.094	-0.016	0.011	0.013	0.065	0.031	0.008	-0.086	-0.012	0.018	0.054	0.026	-0.040	0.129
23 Job Type: Computer Programmer (Lag)	0.146	0.353	0.067	0.249	0.116	0.053	0.048	-0.016	0.060	0.009	-0.008	-0.030	-0.038	-0.041	0.017	0.004	-0.020	0.046
24 Job Type: Technical Specialist (Lag)	0.239	0.427	0.232	0.422	0.155	0.161	0.123	0.060	-0.099	0.081	-0.077	0.012	-0.012	-0.005	0.013	0.052	0.004	-0.019
25 IT Experience (Lag)	5.791	5.987	4.220	5.207	0.174	0.085	0.048	0.092	-0.017	0.060	-0.064	-0.215	-0.026	-0.102	0.143	-0.012	-0.073	0.149
26 IT Experience (Squared, Lag)	69.371	113.928	44.913	93.700	0.131	0.092	0.034	0.088	-0.028	0.052	-0.050	-0.173	0.001	-0.067	0.113	-0.017	-0.053	0.124
27 Firm-Specific Training (Lag)	0.549	1.012	0.453	0.885	0.023	0.010	-0.005	-0.026	0.031	0.098	0.000	-0.104	-0.033	-0.098	0.013	-0.085	-0.084	0.082
28 Firm Experience (Lag)	4.074	4.339	3.908	4.426	0.002	-0.005	0.005	-0.022	0.033	0.000	0.045	-0.157	-0.067	-0.157	0.070	-0.106	-0.038	0.026
29 Firm Experience (Squared, Lag)	35.419	70.645	34.849	72.337	-0.016	0.010	-0.005	-0.030	0.031	-0.011	0.041	-0.137	-0.046	-0.112	0.073	-0.100	-0.028	0.017
30 Real Hourly Pay (Lag)	12.204	7.060	9.016	5.248	0.124	0.025	-0.015	-0.112	0.096	-0.017	0.096	-0.206	-0.076	-0.152	0.181	-0.050	-0.132	0.174
31 Relative Pay Gap (Lag)	1.250	0.709	1.542	0.882	-0.029	0.029	0.074	0.103	-0.141	0.033	-0.105	0.129	0.046	0.105	-0.082	0.017	0.088	-0.119

¹ There are a total of 6,578 person-period observations. After lagging time-varying independent variables, 359 first period observations were dropped. The remaining total of 6,219 person-period observations were used for subsequent analyses. For IT males, descriptives and correlations between time varying variables or between time-varying and time-invariant variables were obtained from cross-sectional time series data covering 3,356 person-period observations. Descriptives and correlations between time-invariant variables were obtained from 197 IT males. For IT females, descriptives and correlations between time varying variables or between time-varying and time-invariant variables were obtained from cross-sectional time series data covering 2,863 person-period observations. Descriptives and correlations between time-invariant variables were obtained from 162 IT females. Correlations for IT females are reported below the diagonal.

TABLE 4 (Continued)
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations of Study Variables for IT Females and IT Males¹

	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
1 Turnover	0.016	0.005	0.080	0.043	0.033	-0.003	0.076	0.053	0.104	0.143	0.106	0.066	-0.020	-0.034	-0.048	0.059	-0.015
2 Turnaway-Within	0.011	0.030	0.022	-0.064	-0.003	-0.010	-0.040	-0.001	0.008	0.067	0.089	0.106	0.024	0.014	0.016	0.033	0.014
3 Turnaway-Between	-0.014	0.027	-0.029	0.028	-0.025	0.031	-0.022	0.006	0.007	0.087	0.008	-0.011	0.002	-0.014	-0.021	-0.017	0.035
4 Region: South	0.076	0.003	-0.047	0.010	-0.230	-0.041	0.017	0.013	-0.117	0.097	0.020	0.019	0.090	0.018	0.019	-0.036	-0.002
5 Region: Northeast	-0.092	-0.076	-0.005	-0.045	0.092	0.061	-0.001	0.005	0.012	-0.064	-0.060	-0.051	-0.064	-0.041	-0.033	0.015	0.046
6 Region: Midwest	0.054	0.055	0.090	0.011	0.134	-0.043	-0.036	-0.049	0.153	-0.028	0.085	0.072	-0.013	0.041	0.038	0.013	-0.023
7 Urban	-0.123	-0.151	0.088	-0.013	0.052	0.019	-0.045	0.012	0.082	-0.081	-0.157	-0.172	-0.022	-0.122	-0.137	0.055	-0.057
8 Unemployment Rate	-0.118	-0.080	-0.166	-0.081	0.060	0.041	0.012	-0.065	0.028	-0.024	-0.166	-0.137	-0.147	-0.162	-0.142	-0.194	0.087
9 Enrolled in School	-0.147	-0.092	-0.185	-0.163	0.029	0.069	-0.056	-0.054	-0.010	-0.084	-0.137	-0.085	-0.080	-0.128	-0.084	-0.121	0.041
10 Unemployed	-0.253	-0.179	-0.219	-0.262	-0.033	0.009	-0.035	-0.052	-0.049	-0.084	-0.252	-0.174	-0.154	-0.230	-0.157	-0.234	0.083
11 Industry - Manufacturing	0.056	0.025	0.042	0.027	-0.008	-0.009	0.068	0.054	0.007	0.086	0.031	0.004	0.018	0.061	0.053	0.070	-0.115
12 Industry - Professional	-0.002	0.026	0.138	0.011	0.137	0.102	-0.025	0.035	0.055	-0.011	0.018	0.002	-0.066	-0.070	-0.076	0.063	0.026
13 Industry - Retail & Trade	-0.119	-0.063	-0.214	-0.093	-0.044	-0.054	0.029	-0.053	-0.057	-0.108	-0.092	-0.032	-0.077	-0.069	-0.028	-0.160	0.135
14 Race	0.053	-0.019	0.098	0.036	0.495	0.131	0.033	-0.008	0.027	-0.010	0.028	0.028	-0.009	0.007	-0.006	0.108	-0.058
15 Marital Status		0.528	0.182	0.163	0.037	-0.002	-0.012	0.103	-0.092	0.084	0.336	0.264	0.198	0.262	0.203	0.351	-0.206
16 Number of Children	0.476		0.125	0.128	0.006	0.071	-0.049	-0.037	-0.062	0.080	0.354	0.306	0.207	0.225	0.172	0.317	-0.141
17 Job Status	0.062	-0.071		0.188	0.147	0.090	-0.007	0.174	0.099	-0.038	0.294	0.224	0.140	0.189	0.149	0.426	-0.151
18 Job Satisfaction (Lag)	0.033	-0.025	0.181		0.017	0.021	0.003	0.095	0.031	0.055	0.166	0.091	0.134	0.298	0.158	0.188	-0.037
19 Cognitive Ability	0.129	-0.084	0.259	0.021		0.219	0.015	0.095	0.140	-0.099	0.118	0.113	0.027	0.079	0.070	0.202	-0.136
20 Education Level	0.013	-0.131	0.198	0.036	0.188		-0.182	0.008	-0.056	0.001	-0.030	-0.037	-0.032	-0.049	-0.050	0.095	0.001
21 IT Education	0.029	0.035	0.114	0.026	-0.059	-0.037		0.110	0.158	-0.043	0.152	0.144	0.023	-0.005	-0.014	-0.008	-0.028
22 Job Type: Systems Analyst (Lag)	0.109	0.093	0.189	0.086	0.171	0.023	0.108		-0.174	-0.236	0.188	0.105	0.011	0.133	0.116	0.137	0.008
23 Job Type: Computer Programmer (Lag)	-0.002	-0.043	0.097	0.030	0.068	0.026	0.125	-0.085		-0.232	0.016	-0.037	0.035	-0.081	-0.083	-0.033	-0.067
24 Job Type: Technical Specialist (Lag)	0.025	0.017	-0.074	0.056	-0.064	-0.108	0.091	-0.175	-0.147		0.206	0.138	0.053	0.049	0.027	0.017	-0.024
25 IT Experience (Lag)	0.214	0.274	0.217	0.134	0.143	-0.031	0.241	0.303	0.047	0.242		0.937	0.288	0.525	0.492	0.471	-0.189
26 IT Experience (Squared, Lag)	0.167	0.240	0.165	0.079	0.133	-0.033	0.211	0.244	-0.014	0.162	0.929		0.250	0.494	0.508	0.412	-0.156
27 Firm-Specific Training (Lag)	0.108	0.152	0.182	0.165	0.109	0.018	0.053	0.186	0.021	0.069	0.306	0.242		0.450	0.387	0.213	-0.093
28 Firm Experience (Lag)	0.094	0.154	0.164	0.331	0.051	0.008	0.041	0.134	-0.047	0.051	0.361	0.302	0.436		0.934	0.287	-0.043
29 Firm Experience (Squared, Lag)	0.051	0.129	0.109	0.180	0.041	0.009	0.035	0.096	-0.050	0.037	0.316	0.284	0.369	0.932		0.219	-0.039
30 Real Hourly Pay (Lag)	0.168	0.107	0.432	0.240	0.350	0.091	0.115	0.271	0.046	0.006	0.464	0.409	0.350	0.359	0.285		-0.571
31 Relative Pay Gap (Lag)	-0.045	0.000	-0.180	-0.033	-0.234	-0.043	-0.005	-0.097	-0.046	0.110	-0.097	-0.079	-0.138	-0.049	-0.044	-0.535	

¹ There are a total of 6,578 person-period observations. After lagging time-varying independent variables, 359 first period observations were dropped. The remaining total of 6,219 person-period observations were used for subsequent analyses. For IT males, descriptives and correlations between time varying variables or between time-varying and time-invariant variables were obtained from cross-sectional time series data covering 3,356 person-period observations. Descriptives and correlations between time-invariant variables were obtained from 197 IT males. For IT females, descriptives and correlations between time varying variables or between time-varying and time-invariant variables were obtained from cross-sectional time series data covering 2,863 person-period observations. Descriptives and correlations between time-invariant variables were obtained from 162 IT females. Correlations for IT females are reported below the diagonal.

TABLE 5
IT Females' and IT Males' Job Mobility Responses to Relative Pay Gap

	IT Males				IT Females			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Job Mobility	Turnover	Turnaway Within	Turnaway Between	Job Mobility	Turnover	Turnaway Within	Turnaway Between
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Region: South	0.001	0.280	-0.887 *	-0.677	0.199	0.416	-0.262	0.991
Region: Northeast	-0.018	0.112	0.190	-0.785	-0.038	-0.125	0.176	0.639
Region: Midwest	0.096	0.213	0.144	-0.364	-0.250	0.108	-1.912	0.776
Urban	0.073	0.096	-0.155	-0.043	0.156	0.092	0.342	0.253
Unemployment Rate	-0.005	0.008	-0.072	-0.118	-0.025	-0.045	-0.004	0.049
Enrolled in School	-0.304	-1.349	0.015	2.290 ***	0.204	-0.299	0.777	-0.109
Unemployed	0.748 ***	0.904 ***	0.254	0.077	0.517 ***	0.571 **	-0.355	1.251 ***
Industry - Manufacturing	0.016	0.150	-0.275	0.160	0.130	0.148	0.175	0.508
Industry - Professional	0.077	0.197	-0.740 *	0.803	0.232	0.331	-0.262	0.829
Industry - Retail & Trade	0.313	0.384	-0.688	1.763 *	0.345	-0.053	0.477	1.208 *
Race	-0.081	-0.052	-0.439	0.282	-0.092	-0.336	0.135	0.165
Marital Status	0.045	0.164	-0.210	-0.850	-0.018	-0.004	-0.141	0.130
Number of Children	0.009	-0.039	0.088	0.334	-0.131	-0.158	-0.134	0.048
Job Status	0.011 *	0.019 **	0.003	-0.033	0.023 ***	0.008	0.050 ***	0.030
Job Satisfaction (Lag)	0.000	0.063	-0.372 ***	0.237	-0.102 *	0.039	-0.410 ***	-0.130
Cognitive Ability	0.001	0.003	0.002	-0.016	-0.002	0.007	-0.011	-0.015
Education Level	0.002	-0.001	-0.302	1.029 **	0.033	-0.108	0.190	0.583
IT Education	0.026	0.253 *	-1.127 ***	-0.278	-0.281 *	0.076	-0.854 **	-0.968 *
Job Type: Systems Analyst (Lag)	1.696 ***	1.672 ***	1.360 *	3.060 *	1.968 ***	1.694 ***	1.790 *	2.683 **
Job Type: Computer Programmer (Lag)	2.113 ***	2.170 ***	1.568 **	3.359 **	2.828 ***	2.306 ***	3.124 ***	3.985 ***
Job Type: Technical Specialist (Lag)	2.284 ***	2.306 ***	1.745 ***	3.452 ***	2.824 ***	2.145 ***	3.564 ***	3.789 ***
IT Experience (Lag)	0.032	0.069	-0.078	0.170	0.068	0.178 **	-0.049	-0.071
IT Experience (Squared, Lag)	0.000	-0.002	0.007 *	-0.013	-0.002	-0.007 **	0.005	0.001
Firm Specific Training (Lag)	-0.051	-0.116	0.150	0.139	-0.093	-0.151	0.103	-0.094
Firm Experience (Lag)	0.037	0.050	0.032	0.128	0.023	0.041	-0.095	0.236
Firm Experience (Squared, Lag)	-0.007 *	-0.008	-0.006	-0.017	-0.004	-0.006	0.003	-0.016
Real Hourly Pay (Lag)	0.030 *	0.031 *	0.022	-0.019	0.067 ***	0.085 ***	0.043	0.057
Relative Pay Gap (Lag)	0.286 ***	0.244 **	0.508 ***	0.161	0.392 ***	0.311 *	0.501 **	0.574 ***
Generalized R^2	81.62%	86.25%	50.44%	50.60%	90.66%	95.01%	76.43%	55.83%
Change in Generalized R^2 due to Relative Pay Gap	3.98%	4.62%	5.13%	1.06%	2.40%	0.32%	1.57%	1.11%
Log Likelihood Ratio χ^2	333.73 ***	390.86 ***	138.30 ***	138.91 ***	384.12 ***	485.65 ***	234.15 ***	132.36 ***
df	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
N	197	197	197	197	162	162	162	162
Observations	3,356	3,350	3,355	3,356	2863	2,858	2,862	2,862

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

From Figure 2, we see that at a relative pay gap of 0.50 (i.e., the individual's pay is greater than the average male in the same job with the same tenure, all else equal), the likelihood staying with the current job is 58% for IT males and 72% for IT females. However, when the relative pay gap is greater, such as at 1.50 (i.e., the individual's pay is less than that of the average male in the same job with the same tenure, all else equal), the likelihood of staying with the current job is 48% for IT males and 62% for IT females.

FIGURE 2
Survivor functions for IT Males and IT Females

Human Capital and Stigmatization

IT Males. Hypothesis 2a states that the larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT males will turnover than turnaway-within. The test of equality of relative pay gap coefficients does not support Hypothesis 2a (Wald $\chi^2 = 18.490$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$). We find that the larger the relative pay gap, the more likely that IT males will turnaway-within (Model 3: $\beta = 0.508$, $p < 0.001$) than turnover (Model 2: $\beta = 0.244$, $p < 0.01$).

Hypothesis 2b states that the larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT males will turnover than turnaway-between. The test of equality of relative pay gap coefficients supports Hypothesis 2b (Wald $\chi^2 = 4.170$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.05$). We find that the larger the relative pay gap, the more likely that IT males will turnover (Model 2: $\beta = 0.244$, $p < 0.01$) than turnaway-between (Model 4: $\beta = 0.161$, ns).

Hypothesis 2c states that the larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT males will turnaway-within than turnaway-between. The test of equality of relative pay gap coefficients supports Hypothesis 2c (Wald $\chi^2 = 27.174$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$). We find that the larger the relative pay gap, the more likely IT males will turnaway-within (Model 3: $\beta = 0.508$, $p < 0.001$) than turnaway-between (Model 4: $\beta = 0.161$, *ns*).

In sum, the results support two of our three hypotheses for IT males and show that the larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT males turnaway-within than turnover than turnaway-between.

IT Females. Hypothesis 3a states that the larger the relative pay, the higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway-within than turnover. The test of equality of relative pay gap coefficients confirms support for Hypothesis 3a (Wald $\chi^2 = 10.933$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$). We find that the larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway-within (Model 7: $\beta = 0.501$, $p < 0.01$) than turnover (Model 6: $\beta = 0.311$, $p < 0.05$).

Hypothesis 3b states that the larger the relative pay, the higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway-between than turnover. The test of equality of relative pay gap coefficients confirms support for Hypothesis 3b (Wald $\chi^2 = 25.323$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$). We find that the larger the relative pay gap, higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway-between (Model 8: $\beta = 0.574$, $p < 0.001$) than turnover (Model 6: $\beta = 0.311$, $p < 0.05$).

Hypothesis 3c states that the larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway-within than turnaway-between. The test of equality of relative pay gap coefficients does not support Hypothesis 3c (Wald $\chi^2 = 1.478$, $df = 1$, *ns*). We find that IT females are as likely to turnaway-within (Model 7: $\beta = 0.501$, $p < 0.01$) as they are to turnaway-between (Model 8: $\beta = 0.574$, $p < 0.001$).

In sum, the results show that the larger the relative pay gap, higher the likelihood that IT females will turnaway (-within or -between) than turnover.

FURTHER ANALYSES

We conducted further analyses to obtain additional insights for the pattern of results obtained above. The goal of these analyses was to explore the actual outcomes experienced by the IT professionals who switched jobs. First, we explored the changes in job status when IT professionals moved to alternative jobs. IT professionals may increase/maintain job status by moving to managerial and professional jobs. Alternatively, job status may decline when moving down to jobs in occupations such as such as clerical, sales, technician, craft, production and food service. Changes in job status were analyzed by evaluating relative proportions of upward or downward movement, using a chi-square test for significance.

Second, we examined whether job mobility “pays off” in terms of pay level and relative pay gap. We conducted a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) to examine changes in the marginal means of real pay and relative pay gap before and after job mobility, controlling for the same covariates as in our Cox regression. These analyses were conducted separately for IT males and IT females.

IT Males

Job Status. Analyses of job status indicate significant differences across the types of job mobility ($\chi^2 = 553.33$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.001$). All IT males increase or maintain their job status by staying in their current position (100%) or by turning over to another IT job in another company (100%). By contrast, 59% of IT males increase or maintain their job status when they turnaway-within their firm and 43% of IT males increase or maintain their job status when they move to a non-IT job in another firm (turnaway-between).

Real Pay and Relative Pay. The multivariate test ($F_{(3, 3330)} = 4.029$, $p < 0.010$) indicates significant differences in the change in real hourly pay across types of job mobility. IT males increase real hourly pay more by staying in their current IT jobs (*Mean Change*: 5.47%, $p < 0.001$) or by turning over to another IT position in another firm (*Mean Change*:

8.01%, $p < 0.001$). There is no significant increase in real pay by turning away-within (*Mean Change*: 1.28%, $p > .10$) or by turning away-between (*Mean Change*: 3.30%, $p > 0.10$).

The multivariate test, however, find no significant differences in the change in relative pay gap ($F_{(3, 3330)} = 0.68$, $p > 0.10$) across the types of job mobility for IT males. The results indicate that changes in relative pay gap do not significantly differ across turnover, turnaway-within and turnaway-between.

IT Females

Job Status. Analysis of job status indicates significant differences across the types of job mobility ($\chi^2 = 576.77$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.001$) for IT females. Consistent with the pattern for IT males, almost all IT females maintain their job status by staying in their existing IT positions (100%) or by turning over to another IT position in another company (99%). By contrast, 48% of IT females increase or maintain their job status when turning away-within to a non-IT job and 38% increase or maintain their job status when turning away-between.

Real Pay and Relative Pay. The multivariate test ($F_{(3, 2836)} = 2.648$, $p < 0.050$) indicates significant differences in the change in real hourly pay across the types of job mobility. IT females significantly increase real hourly pay by staying in their current IT positions (*Mean Change*: 4.50%, $p < 0.01$) and marginally increase real hourly pay by turning over (*Mean Change*: 6.38%, $p < 0.10$). There is no significant change in real pay by turning away-within (*Mean Change*: 2.74%, $p > 0.10$) or by turning away-between (*Mean Change*: -1.41%, $p > 0.10$). This pattern of finding is consistent with that of the IT males.

Unlike IT males, the multivariate test for IT females indicates significant differences in changes in relative pay gap ($F_{(3, 2836)} = 15.673$, $p < 0.001$) across the types of job mobility. Relative pay gap narrows significantly when IT females turnaway-within (*Mean Change*: -31.79%, $p < 0.001$) or turnaway-between (*Mean Change*: -29.64%, $p < 0.001$). The relatively pay gap did not change when IT females turnover or remain in their current IT jobs.

DISCUSSION

This study examines the relationship between relative pay gap and three forms of job mobility for IT professionals. The three forms of job mobility are: (1) turnover, i.e. moving to another IT job; (2) turnaway-within, i.e. moving to a non-IT job in the same firm; and (3) turnaway-between, i.e. moving to a non-IT job in a different firm. Overall, the results are consistent with the predictions of distributive justice. Relative pay gap is shown to be positively and significantly associated with the likelihood of job moves by IT professionals. As distributive justice theory is silent about the destinations of job mobility, we incorporated theories of human capital specificity and stigmatization to develop a set of more nuanced, gender-specific explanations of the focal relationships.

Human capital theory predicts that, *ceteris paribus*, IT professionals investing in IT-specific and not easily transferable skills would more likely turnover than turnaway-within than turnaway-between. Turnover should be the most likely job mobility to leverage on occupational skills specificity. Turnaway-within should be the next more likely job move to leverage on organizational skill specificity. Turnaway-between should be the least likely option because neither existing occupational or organizational skills can be leveraged.

Therefore, our second set of hypotheses proposes that the larger the relative pay gap, the higher the likelihood of turnover than turnaway-within or turnaway-between. However, we posit that these predictions occur only for IT males. For IT females, given the added gender-based stigmatization in the IT profession, we expect that IT females will more likely turnaway from the IT profession altogether (either to a non-IT job within the same firm or in a different firm) than to move to another IT job in another firm (turnover). Hence, we proposed in our third set of hypotheses that the larger the relative pay gap, the more likely IT females will turnaway-within than turnaway-between than turnover.

IT Males

Consistent with the human specificity arguments (*Hypotheses 2b and 2c*), we find that IT males are more likely to turnover than turnaway-between; and to turnaway-within than to turnaway-between. However, contrary to our expectations (*Hypothesis 2a*), IT males are more likely to “seed the line” by turning away-within rather than turning over to another IT position in another firm.

This surprising finding suggests that the ubiquity of IT in non-IT jobs may have eased the movement of IT males from IT to non-IT line positions. Further, as turnaway-within tends to occur at the discretion of the firm (Reich and Kaarst-Brown 1999), turnaway-within may signal the IT professional’s value to a non-IT position in that firm (Bangerter et al. 2012). Firms may move IT professionals to non-IT jobs (i.e. “seeding the line”) to reap competitive advantages from having IT-trained employees with deep firm-specific human capital (Reich and Kaarst-Brown 1999). “Seeding the line” tends to increase the sharing of information and understanding of a firm’s processes and capabilities, and break down barriers that often inhibit within-firm learning (Nembhard and Tucker 2011).

In essence, the firm retains and makes explicit knowledge and skills that were otherwise internal to individuals and/or departments (Flores et al. 2012). The relative ease of movement from IT to non-IT jobs may also explain why some IT males turnaway-between even though such a job move is the most costly and least likely.

Our further analyses of the “outcomes” experienced by IT males after they make a job move show that IT males suffer a drop in job status and forgo higher pay when they move to a non-IT job; whether in the same firm or in another firm. However, moves into and out of IT do not significantly impact relative pay gaps for IT males.

IT Females

The patterns of mobility for IT females are consistent with our *a priori* stigmatization arguments (*Hypotheses 3a and 3b*). We find that relative pay gap is associated with the higher likelihood that IT females turnaway (-within or -between) than turnover. As expected, turnover is IT females' least likely type of job mobility in relation to a relative pay gap. For IT females, our results suggest that stigmatization may have a greater influence compared to human capital specificity considerations to the extent that IT females prefer to "seed the line" within the same firm or with another firm than to move to another IT job.

We note that, similar to IT males, some IT females do "seed the line" by turning away-within to non-IT jobs. These IT females move into non-IT professional positions in functions such as human resources and finance or to non-IT general management and administration jobs. Turning away-within is likely to protect ex-IT females' returns to firm-specific human capital as it signals an employees' value to the firm. Some IT females also sought alternative jobs in the external labor market by turning away-between.

Disconfirming *Hypothesis 3c*, IT females are equally likely to turnaway from IT jobs within the same firm as to a different firm. We suspect that IT females may turnaway-between because either they are not offered a line job by their current firm, or they may wish to leave their current firm to avoid a potential spillover of stigma to line jobs within the same firm (Kulik et al. 2007; Triana 2011).

Turning away-within may confirm and reinforce the stereotype that females are suited for less technically oriented work compared to males (Serva 1994). IT females may be offered jobs that are labeled as "feminine" and viewed as requiring less overall human capital compared to jobs labeled as "masculine" (Gorman 2005; Ridgeway 1997). Jobs labelled as "feminine" are often lower in status and in pay (Kalev 2009; Reskin 1988). Further, females may also be stereotyped as holding less human capital than required for a job because of

specific efforts targeted at filling vacant job roles with workers of a demographic group (Heilman et al. 2004). Hence, the returns to IT females' firm-specific human capital may be discounted in other non-IT jobs within their current firm. The discounting of both IT-specific and firm-specific human capital lowers costs associated with turning away-between, thus making turnaway-between as viable as turnaway-within.

Additional analysis of the "outcomes" experienced by IT females after job moves reveals that, similar to IT males, remaining in their current IT job, or turning over to another IT job in another firm would significantly increase their real pay. However, neither strategy narrows relative pay gaps as much as turnaway-within and -between. Indeed, by leaving the IT profession, IT females may be able to restore pay equity. This may also substantiate why IT females are least likely to turnover in light of a relative pay gap.

However, IT females appear to experience a decline in job status as the jobs to which they move tend to be clerical, food service, sales, and production type jobs. Jobs in such occupations are often lower in status (Hauser 1998) compared to IT jobs. The clerical, food and sales jobs also tend to be gender balanced or female dominated (Budig 2002).

Stigmatization of females through pay differentials has been shown to be less likely in gender balanced and female dominated occupations (Budig 2002; England et al. 2007). The low probability of stigmatization in gender balanced and female dominated occupations may explain why IT females' real pay levels were similar to those in their previous IT jobs.

CONCLUSION

This study, to the best of our knowledge, is the first to examine how relative pay gap is related to job mobility for IT professionals. Specifically, this study examined the association between relative pay gap and three distinct types of job mobility: turnover, turnaway-within and turnaway-between. The results show that larger relative pay gaps are significantly associated with IT professionals' likelihood of making job moves. Further, our

findings indicate that IT males and IT females differ in the likelihoods of turnover, turnaway-within and turnaway-between, given a relative pay gap. In the following sections, we note important theoretical contributions and implications of our study, discuss the practical implications, and identify the limitations of the study and areas for future research.

Theoretical Contributions and Implications

We identify three theoretical contributions associated with this study. First, this study demonstrates the importance of conceptualizing and operationalizing job mobility as a multi-faceted construct. Instead of simply treating job mobility as a phenomenon of leaving one's current position, we show that job mobility is more complex when we consider individuals' job destinations. By doing so, our study represents an important extension to current theories of job mobility and turnover. It specifically addresses calls in the turnover literature (e.g. Joseph et al. 2012; Kirschenbaum and Weisberg 2002) to verify whether individuals actually move to similar jobs in other firms.

In addition, refining the concept of job mobility is important because, as this study shows, we are able to discover gender-related nuances in the job mobility patterns of IT professionals. Had we not examined job mobility in a multi-faceted manner, we would not have discovered that IT females are more likely to leave the IT profession when moving jobs in relation to a relative pay gap. With a refined and multi-faceted conceptualization of job mobility, future research could spawn more sophisticated and differentiated nomological networks around different models of job mobility. In that way, it is possible to study and develop refined explanations that truly reflect actual and complex workplace phenomena.

The second theoretical implication of our study concerns the importance of pay, specifically the importance of relative pay gap, in influencing job mobility. Prior research on IT turnover, and job mobility has focused on socio-psychological factors of turnover, such as job satisfaction, perceived job alternatives, role ambiguity and role conflict (see for example,

Joseph, et al.'s 2007 meta-analysis). This study re-introduces the importance of a hygiene factor - pay - and its potential effects on job mobility. We found that larger relative pay gaps were significantly associated with the likelihood of making job moves.

Moreover, our findings show that the effects of relative pay gap on job mobility are not homogeneous across all IT professionals. IT females appear to increase their job status and pay levels when making moves within the IT profession but seem unable to reduce relative pay gaps. IT females appear to restore pay equity only by leaving the IT profession and at the expense of lowering job status and pay levels. As such, the job moves of IT females suggest that they seem to favor receiving equitable pay, even if the job move means a decline in job status and pay level. Like IT females, IT males are able to increase job status and pay levels when moving to jobs within the IT profession but not when moving to jobs outside the IT profession. In contrast to IT females, IT males do not reduce relative pay gaps when moving to jobs outside the IT profession. Little is known about how IT professionals are able to increase both job status and pay level and reduce relative pay gaps when making job moves. Little is also known about why IT females appear to weigh pay equity more than job status and/or level of pay in their job move behaviors. Future research could examine more closely the socio-psychological mechanisms associated with the alternative forms of job mobility across genders in relation to pay equity

Third, findings of this study have theoretical implications for how IT human capital is conceptualized. In our theoretical development, we categorized IT human capital as a type of specific human capital that is unique to the IT profession. Recall that specific human capital, as contrasted with general human capital, is defined as unique and not easily transferred across other domains. Yet, our study suggests that, both males and females can leave the IT profession to “seed the line” perhaps because of the ubiquitous deployment of IT in firms. Such ease of movement of IT professionals to jobs outside of the IT profession suggests that

IT skills, unlike other professional skills (e.g. medicine, law, or accounting), may be more easily transferable than previously thought.

In effect, it may thus be more appropriate to treat IT human capital as likely having both some general and some specific components. Future research could distinguish the kinds of IT skillsets that allow an IT professional to seed the line easily from those that do not. For example, perhaps an IT professional who is more entrenched in IT infrastructure is less likely to transfer his or her IT skills than one who has systems analysis skills which may more readily be applied to other jobs.

Implications for Practice

For practice, our findings imply that managers should focus attention on the importance of pay, especially relative pay. The results reported here show that IT professionals (both males and females) will leave the IT profession, given relative pay gaps. We find that a 10% increase in relative pay gap increases the likelihood of IT males' job mobility, controlling for covariates, by 4.67%, turnover by 3.90%, turnaway-within by 9.35% and turnaway-between by 2.47%. In turn, we find that a 10% increase in relative pay gap increases the likelihood of IT females' job mobility, controlling for covariates, by 5.44%, turnover by 4.14%, turnaway-within by 7.37% and turnaway-between by 8.80%. Firms that compensate IT professionals inequitably may find it difficult to retain IT talent. The loss of talent is doubled when firms are unable to retain female IT talent. One, firms may lose talent that may be equal to or better than the average male IT talent. Two, firms lose IT-specific and firm-specific human capital that would otherwise increase their effectiveness and efficiency.

Our results also imply that managers in charge of compensation should continue to be vigilant. As "laws alone do not remedy the gender (pay) gap" (Vogt 2008, p. 338), managers must continue to emphasize pay policies based on meritocracy or risk an attrition of talent (Blau and Kahn 2003). There continues to be a relative pay gap despite the monitoring and

enforcement of equal employment opportunity laws. Estimates using Current Population Survey data indicate a widening relative pay gap between IT females and IT males from 9% in 1997 to 19% in 2003, controlling for human capital, job and organizational characteristics (Levina and Xin 2007). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012b) estimates a relative pay gap of between 13% to 28% in the median pay of IT males and females across IT jobs in the U.S. IT workforce.

The ubiquity of IT across different functional areas of a firm creates a boon for IT professionals and a bane for managers tasked to retain IT professionals. The ubiquity of IT facilitates ease of movement out of the IT profession (Reich and Kaarst-Brown 2003). This ease of movement, coupled with a relative pay gap, suggests that the IT profession will continue to face persistent labor imbalances, and also a gender imbalance.

While IT males are most likely to stay within their firm or turnover to another IT position even if they change firms, the study finds that IT females are most likely to turn away outside the IT profession as a way to close the relative pay gap. This finding suggests that potential solutions to attract and retain IT females in the IT profession may need to be quite different and that a "one size fits all" approach may not work for both IT males and females.

Limitations and Future Research

The NLSY79 contains detailed work histories that enabled us to examine the origins and destinations of job mobility. The longitudinal nature of this dataset allowed us to examine relative pay gap and its consequences. We are unaware of any other study in the IT or management literature examining the relationship between relative pay and job mobility over a similar length of time. However, as with any empirical study, there are constraints in the data.

One, job mobility beyond 2006 remains unobserved. The right censoring of our data

is an opportunity for future research to examine the relationship between relative pay gap and job mobility toward the end of IT professionals' careers. Respondents in our dataset are between 41 and 48 years old (as of 2006). The extant literature (e.g. Joseph, et al. 2012) suggests that the frequency of job mobility should decrease with tenure and age. It would be interesting to examine whether the relationship examined here is attenuated with tenure and age.

Two, with the exception of job satisfaction (which is captured in the NLSY79 data), we were not able to examine subjective experiences and motivations associated with relative pay. For example, as the NLSY79 data does not contain perceptual measures, no direct measures of pay equity (or inequity) perceptions are available. Even so, the behavioral manifestations reported in this study are consistent with the central tenets of pay equity theories. The results reported here are also consistent with results in labor economics and human resource management that use psychological theories to explain and predict such relationships using objective measures. Nonetheless, future research could draw on primary data collection methods, such as experimental economics, to corroborate and complement this study by probing more deeply into the subjective attitudes and perceptions of both IT females and IT males.

Three, future research should also examine other potential explanations for the differences in job mobility patterns of IT males and females. Prior research has highlighted that IT males and IT females have different experiences in the IT work environment or might experience the IT work environment differently (e.g. Reid, et al. 2010, Trauth, et al. 2009). IT males and IT females also differ in the dispositions to move (e.g. Adya 2008, Ahuja 2002). These differences could contribute to different job mobility patterns. Another factor that might be examined is that IT professionals may have a greater desire to move than non-IT professionals, i.e. there is more of a "turnover culture" in IT (Moore and Burke 2002).

The findings reported in this study underscore the theoretical and practical importance of IT professionals' career related actions to relative pay. Our study suggests that future research should adopt a more nuanced explanation for IT professionals' career related behaviors; explanations that may require application of multiple theoretical lenses. Our study also suggests that relative pay gap should be an important component in the effort to retain IT professionals within firms and the IT profession. Failure to address a relative pay gap may adversely affect the productivity of the firm and the level of diversity within the IT profession.

REFERENCES

- Adya, M. P. (2008) Women at Work: Differences in IT Career Experiences and Perceptions between South Asian and American Women. *Human Resource Management* 47(3):601-635.
- Ahuja, M. K. (2002) Women in the Information Technology Profession: A Literature Review, Synthesis and Research Agenda. *European Journal of Information Systems* 11(1):20-34.
- Allison, P. (1984) *Event History Analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Allison, P. D. (1995) *Survival Analysis Using Sas®: A Practical Guide*. Cary, NC.: SAS Institute Inc.
- Ang, S., Slaughter, S., and Ng, K. Y. (2002) Human Capital and Institutional Determinants of Information Technology Compensation: Modeling Multilevel and Cross-Level Interactions. *Management Science* 48(11):1427-1445.
- Ashcraft, C., and Blithe, S. (2009). Women in IT: The Facts. National Centre for Women & Information Technology, Boulder, CO.
- Bangerter, A., Roulin, N., and Konig, C. J. (2012) Personnel Selection as a Signaling Game. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 97(4):719-738.
- Becker, G. (1975) *Human Capital*. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press.
- Blau, F. D., and Kahn, L. M. (1981) Race and Sex Differences in Quits by Young Workers. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 34(4):563-577.
- Blau, G., and Tatum, D. (2000) Correlates of Perceived Gender Discrimination for Female Versus Male Medical Technologists. *Sex Roles* 43(1-2):105-118.
- Budig, M. J. (2002) Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Escalator? *Social Problems* 49(2):258-277.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008). National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 User Guide. U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009). Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers. U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2013). Current Population Survey: Employed Persons by Detailed Occupation, Sex, Race, and Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity. Washington, D.C.
- Carless, S. A., and Arnup, J. L. (2011) A Longitudinal Study of the Determinants and Outcomes of Career Change. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 78(1):80-91.
- Cohoon, J. M., and Aspray, W. (2006) *Women and Information Technology: Research on Underrepresentation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Colquitt, J. A. (2008) Two Decades of Organizational Justice: Findings, Controversies, and Future Directions. In *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Behavior: Volume 1 - Micro Approaches*, J. Barling and C.L. Cooper (eds.). London, UK.: Sage, 73-88.
- Cox, D. R. (1972) Regression Models and Life Tables (with Discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* B34:187-220.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., and Steele, C. (1998) Social Stigma. In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, S. Fiske, D. Gilbert and G. Lindzey (eds.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill, 504-553.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1958) Proposals Leading to Analytic Treatment of Social Perception Scores. In *Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior*, R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo (eds.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 353-379.
- Dickter, D. N., Roznowski, M., and Harrison, D. A. (1996) Temporal Tempering: An Event History Analysis of the Process of Voluntary Turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81(6):705-716.
- Direnzo, M. S., and Greenhaus, J. H. (2011) Job Search and Voluntary Turnover in a Boundaryless World: A Control Theory Perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 36(3):567-589.
- Duncan, O. D. (1961) A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations. In *Occupation and Social Status*, J. Albert J. Reiss (ed.). New York: Free Press.
- England, P., Allison, P., and Wu, Y. X. (2007) Does Bad Pay Cause Occupations to Feminize, Does Feminization Reduce Pay, and How Can We Tell with Longitudinal Data? *Social Science Research* 36(3):1237-1256.
- Enns, H. G., Ferratt, T. W., and Prasad, J. (2006) Beyond Stereotypes of IT Professionals: Implications for IT Hr Practices. *Communications of the ACM* 49(4):105-109.
- Flores, L. G., Zheng, W., Rau, D., and Thomas, C. H. (2012) Organizational Learning: Subprocess Identification, Construct Validation, and an Empirical Test of Cultural Antecedents. *Journal of Management* 38(2):640-667.
- Galizzi, M. (2001) Gender and Labor Attachment: Do within-Firms' Relative Wages Matter? *Industrial Relations* 40(4):591-619.
- Galizzi, M., and Lang, K. (1998) Relative Wages, Wage Growth, and Quit Behavior. *Journal of Labor Economics* 16(2):367-391.
- Ganzach, Y. (1998) Intelligence and Job Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal* 41(5):526-539.
- Gathmann, C., and Schonberg, U. (2010) How General Is Human Capital? A Task-Based Approach. *Journal of Labor Economics* 28(1):1-49.
- Gerhart, B. (1987) How Important Are Dispositional Factors as Determinants of Job Satisfaction? Implications for Job Design and Other Personnel Programs. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 72(3):366-373.
- Gerhart, B., and Rynes, S. (2003) *Compensation: Theory, Evidence, and Strategic Implications*. New Jersey, NY.: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Gorman, E. H. (2005) Gender Stereotypes, Same-Gender Preferences, and Organizational Variation in the Hiring of Women: Evidence from Law Firms. *American Sociological Review* 70(4):702-728.
- Greenberg, J. (1987) A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. *Academy of Management Review* 12(1):9-22.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., and Gaertner, S. (2000) A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Correlates of Employee Turnover: Update, Moderator Tests, and Research Implications for the Next Millennium. *Journal of Management* 26(3):463-488.
- Gupta, N. D., Oaxaca, R. L., and Smith, N. (2006) Swimming Upstream, Floating Downstream: Comparing Women's Relative Wage Progress in the United States and

- Denmark. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 59(2):243-266.
- Harlos, K. (2010) If You Build a Remedial Voice Mechanism, Will They Come? Determinants of Voicing Interpersonal Mistreatment at Work. *Human Relations* 63(3):311-329.
- Hauser, J. R. (1998) Research, Development, and Engineering Metrics. *Management Science* 44(12):1670-1689.
- Heilman, M., Wallen, A., Fuchs, D., and Tamkins, M. (2004) Penalties for Success: Reactions to Women Who Succeed at Male Gender-Types Tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(3):416-427.
- Hom, P. W., Roberson, L., and Ellis, A. D. (2008) Challenging Conventional Wisdom About Who Quits: Revelations from Corporate America. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93(1):1-34.
- Hosmer, D., and Lemeshow, S. (1999) *Applied Survival Analysis: Regression Modeling of Time to Event Data*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hulin, C. L., Roznowski, M., and Hachiya, D. (1985) Alternative Opportunities and Withdrawal Decisions: Empirical and Theoretical Discrepancies and an Integration. *Psychological Bulletin* 97(2):233-250.
- Information Technology Association of America (2005). Itaa Diversity Study: Numbers of Women, Minorities in Tech Too Low. Information Technology Association of America, Arlington, VA.
- Joseph, D., Boh, W. F., Ang, S., and Slaughter, S. A. (2012) The Career Paths Less (or More) Traveled: A Sequence Analysis of IT Career Histories, Mobility Patterns, and Career Success. *MIS Quarterly* 36(2):427-452.
- Joseph, D., Koh, S. K., and Foo, A. (2010) Sustainable IT Human Capital: Coping with the Threat of Professional Obsolescence. *International Conference on Information Systems*, St. Louis, MO: Association for Information Systems.
- Joseph, D., Ng, K. Y., Koh, S. K. C., and Ang, S. (2007) Turnover of Information Technology Professionals: A Narrative Review, Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling, and Model Development. *MIS Quarterly* 31(3):547-577.
- Joseph, D., Tan, M. L., and Ang, S. (2011) Is Updating Play or Work?: The Mediating Role of Updating Orientation in Linking Threat of Professional Obsolescence to Turnover/Turnaway Intentions. *International Journal of Social and Organizational Dynamics* 1(4):37-47.
- Kalev, A. (2009) Cracking the Glass Cages? Restructuring and Ascriptive Inequality at Work. *American Journal of Sociology* 114(6):1591-1643.
- Kambourov, G., and Manovskii, I. (2009) Occupational Mobility and Wage Inequality. *Review of Economic Studies* 76(2):731-759.
- Kelly, J. R., and McGrath, J. E. (1988) *On Time and Method*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Kirschenbaum, A., and Weisberg, J. (2002) Employee's Turnover Intentions and Job Destination Choices. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23(1):109-125.
- Kulik, C. T., Roberson, L., and Perry, E. L. (2007) The Multiple-Category Problem: Category Activation and Inhibition in the Hiring Process. *Academy of Management Review* 32(2):529-548.
- Lee, T. H., Gerhart, B., Weller, I., and Trevor, C. O. (2008) Understanding Voluntary Turnover: Path-Specific Job Satisfaction Effects and the Importance of Unsolicited Job Offers. *Academy of Management Journal* 51(4):651-671.
- Leventman, P. G. (2007) Multiple Pathways toward Gender Equity in the U.S. Information Technology Workforce. In *Reconfiguring the Firewall: Recruiting Women to Information Technology across Cultures and Continents*, C.J. Burger, E.G. Creamer

- and P.S. Meszaros (eds.). Wellesley, MA: AK Peters, 211-238.
- Levine, D. I. (1993) What Do Wages Buy. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38(3):462-483.
- Lin, D. Y., and Wei, L. J. (1989) The Robust Inference for the Cox Proportional Hazards Model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 84(408):1074-1078.
- Major, B., and O'Brien, L. T. (2005) The Social Psychology of Stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology* 56:393-421.
- Maltarich, M. A., Nyberg, A. J., and Reilly, G. (2010) A Conceptual and Empirical Analysis of the Cognitive Ability-Voluntary Turnover Relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95(6):1058-1070.
- March, J., and Simon, H. A. (1958) *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Margolis, J., and Fisher, A. (2002) *Unlocking the Clubhouse: Women in Computing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Maxwell, N. L. (1987) Occupational Differences in the Determination of U.S. Workers' Earnings: Both the Human Capital and the Structured Labor Market Hypotheses Are Useful in Analysis. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 46(4):431-443.
- Mayer, R. C., and Schoorman, F. D. (1998) Differentiating Antecedents of Organizational Commitment: A Test of March and Simon's Model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 19(1):15-28.
- McDuff, E. M., and Mueller, C. W. (2000) The Ministry as an Occupational Labor Market: Intentions to Leave an Employer (Church) Versus Intentions to Leave a Profession (Ministry). *Work and Occupations* 27(1):89-116.
- Mincer, J. (1974) *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Mithas, S., and Krishnan, M. S. (2008) Human Capital and Institutional Effects in the Compensation of Information Technology Professionals in the United States. *Management Science* 54(3):415-428.
- Møen, J. (2005) Is Mobility of Technical Personnel a Source of R&D Spillovers? *Journal of Labor Economics* 23(1):81-114.
- Morello, D. (2012). Ceo Survey 2012: Talent Concerns Permeate Ceo Objectives. G00230135, Gartner Inc., Stamford, CT.
- Morita, J. G., Lee, T. W., and Mowday, R. T. (1989) Introducing Survival Analysis to Organizational Researchers: A Selected Application to Turnover Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74:280-292.
- Morita, J. G., Lee, T. W., and Mowday, R. T. (1993) The Regression-Analog to Survival Analysis - a Selected Application to Turnover Research. *Academy of Management Journal* 36(6):1430-1464.
- National Science Board (2014). Science and Engineering Indicators 2014. National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA.
- Nembhard, I. M., and Tucker, A. L. (2011) Deliberate Learning to Improve Performance in Dynamic Service Settings: Evidence from Hospital Intensive Care Units. *Organization Science* 22(4):907-922.
- Peters, L. H., and Sheridan, J. E. (1988) Turnover Research Methodology: A Critique of Traditional Designs and a Suggested Survival Model Alternative. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* 6:231-262.
- Pfeifer, C., and Schneck, S. (2012) Relative Wage Positions and Quit Behavior: Evidence from Linked Employer-Employee Data. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 65(1):126-147.
- Polivka, A. E. (1996) Contingent and Alternative Work Arrangements Defined. *Monthly Labor Review* 119(10):3-9.
- Reich, B. H., and Kaarst-Brown, M. L. (1999) "Seeding the Line": Understanding the

- Transition from IT to Non-IT Careers. *MIS Quarterly* 23(3):337-364.
- Reskin, B. F. (1988) Bringing the Men Back In: Sex Differentiation and the Devaluation of Women's Work. *Gender & Society* 2(1):58-81.
- Reskin, B. F., McBrier, D. B., and Kmec, J. A. (1999) The Determinants and Consequences of Workplace Sex and Race Composition. *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:335-361.
- Richards, E., and Terkanian, D. (2013) Occupational Employment Projections to 2022. In: *Monthly Labor Review*. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (1997) Interaction and the Conservation of Gender Inequality: Considering Employment. *American Sociological Review* 62(2):218-235.
- Rudman, L. A., and Phelan, J. E. (2008) Backlash Effects for Disconfirming Gender Stereotypes in Organizations. In *Research in Organizational Behavior, Vol 28: An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews*, A.P. Brief and B.M. Staw (eds.). 61-79.
- Schumacher, E. J. (1997) Relative Wages and Exit Behavior among Registered Nurses. *Journal of Labor Research* 18(4):581-592.
- Serva, M. A. (1994) The Effects of High Demand Information Technology on the Equity Perceptions of Systems Analysts: A Field Study. Austin: University of Texas.
- Singer, J. D., and Willett, J. B. (1991) Modeling the Days of Our Lives: Using Survival Analysis When Designing and Analyzing Longitudinal Studies of Duration and the Timing of Events. *Psychological Bulletin* 110(2):268-290.
- Singer, J. D., and Willett, J. B. (2003) *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurrence*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Slaughter, S., Ang, S., and Boh, W. F. (2007) Firm-Specific Human Capital and Compensation-Organizational Tenure Profiles: An Archival Analysis of Salary Data for IT Professionals. *Human Resource Management* 46(3):373-394.
- Sturman, M. C., Walsh, K., and Cheramie, R. A. (2008) The Value of Human Capital Specificity Versus Transferability. *Journal of Management* 34(2):290-316.
- Tekleab, A. G., Bartol, K. M., and Liu, W. (2005) Is It Pay Levels or Pay Raises That Matter to Fairness and Turnover? *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26(8):899-921.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D., and Skaggs, S. (2002) Sex Segregation, Labor Process Organization, and Gender Earnings Inequality. *American Journal of Sociology* 108(1):102-128.
- Trauth, E. M., Quesenberry, J. L., and Huang, H. (2009) Retaining Women in the U.S. IT Workforce: Theorizing the Influence of Organizational Factors. *European Journal of Information Systems* 18(5):476-497.
- Trevor, C. O. (2001) Interactions among Actual Ease-of-Movement Determinants and Job Satisfaction in the Prediction of Voluntary Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal* 44(4):621-638.
- Trevor, C. O., and Nyberg, A. J. (2008) Keeping Your Headcount When All About You Are Losing Theirs: Downsizing, Voluntary Turnover Rates, and the Moderating Role of Hr Practices. *Academy of Management Journal* 51(2):259-276.
- Triana, M. D. (2011) A Woman's Place and a Man's Duty: How Gender Role Incongruence in One's Family Life Can Result in Home-Related Spillover Discrimination at Work. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 26(1):71-86.
- U.S. Census Bureau (1971). 1970 Census of Population Classified Index of Industries and Occupations. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2003). 2003 Standard Occupation Classification. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Viscusi, W. K. (1980) Sex Differences in Worker Quitting. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 62:388-398.
- von Hippel, C., Issa, M., Ma, R., and Stokes, A. (2011) Stereotype Threat: Antecedents and

- Consequences for Working Women. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 41(2):151-161.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., and Hudy, M. J. (1997) Overall Job Satisfaction: How Good Are Single-Item Measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(2):247-252.
- Younts, C. W., and Mueller, C. W. (2001) Justice Processes: Specifying the Mediating Role of Perceptions of Distributive Justice. *American Sociological Review* 66(1):125-145.