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Abstract

Today, it is mandatory for companies to develop, retain and motivate their IT teams for the adequate performance of their business activities. However, companies have encountered difficulties in doing this. One of the reasons for this is the turnaway phenomenon in the IT area, namely career transition of IT professionals to other functional areas. Thus, this work aims to identify the main reasons why the IT professional intends to switch to another area using the Delphi-based approach. An attempt was therefore made to ascertain and present the factors to the turnaway intention of the IT professional by order of relevance. The study reveals that the quest for professional advancement, the desire to acquire new experience and abilities to remain attractive in the market, the IT operations area, prior and conscious training for this turnaway and job exhaustion are factors that have impacted primarily the turnaway intention of the IT professional.
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Introduction

Organizations have made major investments in Information Technology (IT) as it has had a great influence on their business processes and has been an important source of competitive advantage (Kretschmer, 2012). However, IT personnel management has been a critical variable for companies (Barton & Martin, 1982; Lounsbury et al., 2007) as the swift growth of IT use in organizations has led same to pursue ever-more prepared IT professionals to perform successfully increasingly complex responsibilities.

According to Ramos and Joia (2014), the hiring and training of IT professionals involves major investments. Besides, the specific characteristics of this area lead this professional to be in great demand and companies to have difficulties in motivating and retaining them (Carayon et al., 2006; Joia & Mangia, 2017).

In line with this, two phenomena related to the IT professional can be observed, namely turnover and turnaway. The former occurs when the professional moves to another job without leaving the IT area, while the latter occurs when the IT professional abandons the IT field, assuming a position in another functional area either within the same company or elsewhere, usually assuming a managerial position (Ramos & Joia, 2011; Joia & Mangia, 2017).

In the knowledge area in which this paper's research problem is embedded – IT professional career management – there is literature and theory that has been developed since the 1980s (Barton & Martin, 1982; Turner & Baroudi, 1986; Moore, 2000; Lounsbury et al., 2007; Joseph et al., 2015). However, most of this literature addresses the IT professionals turnover phenomenon (Turner & Baroudi, 1986; Reich & Kaarst-Brown, 1999; Brown, 2006; Joseph et al., 2015). With respect to the IT professionals turnaway phenomenon, the situation is more complex, as the problem is neither well understood nor properly
investigated in the IT literature (Ang & Slaughter, 2000). Indeed, few recent works about this issue can be found in the scientific literature (Shropshire & Kadlec, 2012; Joseph et al., 2015).

In this scenario, it is essential to better understand the reasons that lead the IT professional to leave the area, as there is a shortage of adequately trained IT professionals to work in the productive sector in several countries (Ramos & Joia, 2014; Joia & Mangia, 2017). Besides, for organizations the cost of losing and replacing well-trained IT professionals is very high (Fu & Chen, 2015). Thus, the enhanced understanding of this issue can help organizations focus their efforts on the most critical factors to IT professionals turnover intention.

Based on the foregoing, this study seeks to identify and classify, in order of importance, the reasons why IT professionals leave this area for another, in their companies or elsewhere, by answering the following research question: What is the ranking, by order of relevance, of the factors to IT professional turnover intention?

**Theoretical References**

**IT Professional Career**

Individuals may view their careers and professional success based on two paradigms, namely the career accomplishment paradigm, or the career advancement paradigm (Greenhaus et al., 2008; Lee et al., 1997; Ng & Feldman, 2007). The career accomplishment paradigm used to be associated with technical areas – involving success due to peer recognition – as well as disregard to growth in the hierarchical structure of the organization, which makes this paradigm almost unintelligible for people outside the technical community. Conversely, for the career advancement paradigm, success accrues from the achievement of higher authority and growth positions within the power hierarchy of the organization (Greenhaus et al., 2008; Ng & Feldman, 2007; Zabusky & Barley, 1996).

For Lee at al. (1997) and Ituma and Simpson (2009), the reasons why IT professionals leave the IT area (or fail to do so) lie in the way they perceive professional success. According to Zabusky and Barley (1996) and Lee et al. (1997), IT professionals geared to the career accomplishment paradigm are less prone to leave the IT area than the IT professionals geared to the career advancement paradigm.

Furthermore, for some authors, professionals who transfer from a functional area to another probably have a certain degree of dissatisfaction with their former professional areas. Sundry causes for this were identified by several authors: job/family conflict (Adams et al., 1996; Messersmith, 2007), higher perceived workload (Moore, 2000), work exhaustion (Mangia, 2013; Moore, 2000; Mangia & Joia, 2015; Armstrong et al., 2015) and general dissatisfaction with the area (Carayon et al., 2006; Mangia, 2013; Mangia & Joia, 2015; Joia & Mangia, 2017).

Besides, authors such as Brown (2006), Mangia (2013), Martins (2001), Ramos and Joia (2011, 2014), Mangia and Joia (2015) and Joia and Mangia (2017) argue that IT professionals transfer to other careers in order to acquire new experience, learn new abilities and, consequently, maintain their employability potential in the job market.

Ramos and Joia (2011) set forth that the area within IT in which the IT professional works (development, infrastructure, support, governance, etc.) is also an antecedent for IT professional turnover intention, revealing differences in this issue in accordance with the IT area. These authors also point out that this turnover may be associated with a midlife crisis, corroborating the study of Kanfer and Ackerman (2004).

Other factors that may influence the IT professional turnover intention are: prior and conscious preparation for this turnover (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005; Mangia, 2013; Stevens, 1992; Mangia & Joia, 2015; Mangia & Joia, 2017), identification of the professional with the IT career (Armstrong et al., 2015), the gender of the professional (Weisberg & Kirschenbaum, 1993; Trauth et al., 2012 and Clayton et al., 2012), and the threat of professional obsolescence (Joseph & Ang, 2001; Fu, 2011; Joseph et al., 2015).
Critical Factors to IT Professionals Turnaway Intention

Based on the above, some critical factors (CFi) to IT professionals turnaway intention can be found in the extant literature, being consolidated below:

(CF1): Pursuit of professional growth (Turner & Baroudi, 1986; Katz & Allen, 1997; Lee et al., 1997; Karahanna & Watson, 2006; Ramos & Joia, 2011, 2014; Mangia, 2013; Mangia & Joia, 2015; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF2): Dissatisfaction with the heavy workloads to which they have been subjected to (Moore, 2000; Mangia, 2013; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF3): More commitment to their companies than to the IT knowledge field (Zabusky & Barley, 1996; Lee et al., 1997; Reich & Kaarst-Brown, 1999; Ramos & Joia, 2011, 2014; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF4): Motivation by the career advancement paradigm rather than the career accomplishment paradigm (Lee et al., 1997; Ituma & Simpson, 2009; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF5): Conflicts related to family vs. work (Adams et al., 1996; Messersmith, 2007; Dinger et al., 2010; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF6): Acquisition of non-IT-related skill sets via new experiences to improve their chances in the job market (Martins, 2001; Brown, 2006; Ramos & Joia, 2011, 2014; Mangia, 2013; Mangia & Joia, 2015; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF7): Development of non-IT-related managerial skills via executive education courses (Stevens, 1992; Mainheiro & Sullivan, 2005; Mangia, 2013; Mangia & Joia, 2015; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF8): Exhaustion related to their work (Moore, 2000; Shropshire & Kadlec, 2012; Mangia, 2013; Mangia & Joia, 2015; Armstrong et al., 2015; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF9): Midlife crisis (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004; Ramos & Joia, 2011, 2014; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF10): The IT field in which they work (development, infrastructure, support, etc.) (Ramos & Joia, 2011, 2014; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF11): IT professionals gender (Weisberg & Kirschenbaum, 1993; Stewart et al., 2007; Clayton et al., 2012; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF12): Dissatisfaction with the IT area in general (Carayon et al., 2006; Mangia, 2013; Mangia & Joia, 2015; Joia & Mangia, 2017).
(CF13): The need for continuous updating of their knowledge and skills to deal with the threat of obsolescence (Joseph & Ang, 2001; Fu, 2011; Joia & Mangia, 2017);
(CF14): Low commitment to the IT career (Armstrong et al., 2015; Joia & Mangia, 2017).

Method

For this research, the Delphi-based method was used. According to Okoli and Pawlowski (2004), the Delphi method has proved to be effective and popular in the Information Systems (IS) research area mainly to identify and prioritize problems for consequent managerial decision-making. Indeed, in comparison with other traditional methods, the Delphi approach is considered to be the most adequate method for rigorous research involving experts and stakeholders (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004). Therefore, the Delphi method is adequate to be applied in this study as it allows researchers to confirm the opinion of experts regarding the aforementioned critical factors, to collect new ones proposed by them, as well as calculate the ranking of the factors associated with the IT professional career turnaway phenomenon according to a cohort of experts (Skinner et al., 2015; Prado, 2016).

According to Rowe and Wright (1999), the classical Delphi method comprises four key characteristics: i) Anonymity of the participants: allowing them to express their opinions freely without being subjected to social pressures, in order to have their depositions evaluated on their merits rather than by virtue of who proposed the idea within the group; ii) Iteration: allowing the participants to refine their former ideas according to the evolution obtained in each round of the method; iii) Controlled Feedback: informing participants about the perspective of the other participants and offering them the opportunity to clarify or change their points of view; iv) Statistical Aggregation of the Group's Responses: aiming at the interpretation of the data obtained.
In the first round, the researchers prepare an initial questionnaire and send it to the experts, who must answer it individually, in general via quantitative answers supported by justified qualitative information. According to Estes and Kuespert (1976), the quantitative answers will then be tabulated, thereby receiving simple statistical treatment, with the results being delivered back to the participants for the next round. In the event that there are qualitative data (justifications and opinions) related to the quantitative questions, the researchers must also list them.

According to Skulmoski et al. (2007), there is a continuum representing the degree of focus or openness of those questionnaire questions, namely the questions might be either typically broad and open-ended or more focused and structured. The former option is more likely to get a broader range of responses. Yet, the tradeoff is that more data is likely to be collected with broad, open-ended questions requiring more time consuming analysis. Based on that, one decided to apply the latter approach, unveiling in the first round of the Delphi technique the abovementioned critical factors to IT professional turnaway intention, yet leaving room for new critical factors to be also proposed by the experts.

After analyzing the first-round outcomes, the researchers decide on the need to incorporate new questions for the next round. In every further round, the questions will be repeated, and the participants must reassess their answers according to the consolidated answers and justifications obtained in the immediately preceding round. It is necessary to undertake at least two rounds of exchange to characterize the use of the Delphi method (Skulmoski et al., 2007).

The universe of this research incorporated IT professionals who had thought on abandoning the IT area at some point of their professional life, such that they could contribute – via their experience in the IT area – to answers to the questionnaire, as the Delphi method demands that qualified professionals be included (Skulmoski et al., 2007).

The sample was defined by accessibility and typicity aiming to have at least 30 participants involved prior to the final round of the method (Skulmoski et al., 2007). Thus, 36 IT professionals were contacted, of whom 35 agreed to take part in the Delphi panel.

As already said, for the first round of the method, a questionnaire was developed based on the aforementioned critical factors to IT professionals turnaway intention (CFi). In this questionnaire, statements were presented in order to be classified according to the respondent’s degree of agreement, a five-point Likert-type scale being used – varying from “fully disagree” (lower limit) to “fully agree” (upper limit). The questionnaire was made available to the 35 participants of the Delphi panel, by electronic media, from 09/15/2016 to 09/22/2016.

After the first-round data collection was concluded, the objective answers were tabulated, being subsequently submitted to straightforward statistical treatment. Thereafter a new questionnaire was elaborated to be sent to the respondents in the second round, together with the consolidated results accrued from the first round of the panel. According to the method, for the second round, questions already presented in the first round could be included, suppressed or modified.

For the second-round questionnaire, the respondents were asked to rank the tabulated turnaway intention antecedents obtained in the first round on an ascending scale from 1 to 14, according to their relevance – where 1 corresponds to the item of highest relevance and 14 to the item of lowest relevance, the number of hypotheses being 14.

The new questionnaire was then submitted to the same 35 respondents of the first round via electronic media from 10/08/2016 to 10/14/2016.

After concluding the second-round data collection, the data were analyzed. The trade-off was then ascertained between performing a new panel round and the potential gain to be achieved by doing this (Schmidt, 1997). It was therefore decided to wind up the panel in the second round as a representative and consensual result had been achieved by the expert group on this issue, which led to the disclosure of the final results.
From the first-round experts’ answers regarding the antecedents of IT professionals turnaway intention, the average of each antecedent was calculated based on a scale ranging from 1 to 5 (where 1 = fully disagree; 2 = partially disagree; 3 = neither agree or disagree; 4 = partially agree; 5 = fully agree). Following this, the averages obtained from the ranking of these antecedents were generated.

The ranking was presented, in the second round, to the respondents in a decreasing order of average, whereby they were asked to develop their own rankings related to the relevance of the antecedents to the turnaway intention. Based on the data obtained in this second round, an average classification for each antecedent was obtained, thereby resulting in a new ranking. For this, the classifications of all antecedents were added, with the corresponding average value being calculated by taking into account all respondents.

In order to verify whether the ranking obtained in the second round indicated convergence according to the view of the group, the Kendall agreement coefficient or W of Kendall was calculated (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004). According to Schmidt (1997) and Prado (2016), the value of W varies from zero to one, where zero means that there is no consensus and one indicates a perfect consensus, thereby providing a guideline for interpreting the value of this coefficient.

In the case under analysis (degree of freedom of 13 as there are 14 antecedents under analysis), any chi-square distribution value higher than 40.87 allows W to be classified as extremely significant (p-value lower than 0.001) (Schmidt, 1997; Prado, 2016).

Following that, the classifications accrued from the two rounds were compared. Consequently, the Kendall correlation factor was calculated, commonly referred to as the Kendall Tau coefficient. This coefficient is used to measure the ordinal association between two variables, being thus an order correlation measure. The Kendall Tau coefficient stresses the relative sorting of the items instead of the difference between the classifications (Schmidt, 1997). The closer this value is to one, the closer the consensus between the rankings, indicating thus a suitable concordance level between them and that the sorting stage can be considered as concluded. Therefore, the average rankings for each item were used to calculate the final ranking of the concluded Delphi panel (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004).

**Results**

Of the 35 respondents, 27 were male (77.1%) and 8 were female (22.9%). The average age of the group was 49.2 years old, the lowest age being 30 years and the highest age being 60 years. Regarding their professional experience, the group had an average of 26.2 years of experience in the IT area, the least experienced having 12 years while the most experienced had 38 years of experience in the area. These higher figures were expected as only professionals with greater experience in the IT area that could effectively bring valuable contributions about the subject under research were invited to take part in the Delphi panel.

**First Round of the Delphi Technique**

The objective answers collected in the first round were tabulated so as to receive simple statistical treatment. The average of each antecedent was calculated as explained before and a ranking of the antecedents was then generated from the averages obtained. Table 1 depicts the complete ranking for this first round with the respective averages.

The “desire of acquisition of non-IT related skill sets via new experiences to improve the chances in the job market” antecedent received the highest average (4.09), with 80% of agreement within the group and only 14.28% of disagreement, corresponding to the most relevant item, according to the group, for the IT professionals turnaway intention.

In second place is the “Motivation by the career advancement paradigm rather than the career accomplishment paradigm” antecedent with an average of 3.94, with 80% of agreement within the group, as well as 17.15% of disagreement within same. Besides, in the third place is the item “More committed to their companies than to the IT knowledge field,” with an average of 3.68, 58.83% of agreement and 23.53% of neither agreement nor disagreement within the group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Critical Factors to IT Professionals Turnaway Intention</th>
<th>Average (1 to 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Desire of acquisition of non-IT related skill sets via new experiences to improve the chances in the job market (CF6).</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivation by the career advancement paradigm rather than the career accomplishment paradigm (CF4).</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More committed to their companies than to the IT knowledge field (CF3).</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pursue of professional growth (CF1).</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction, in general, with the IT area (CF12).</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to heavy workloads (CF2).</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to exhaustion with the work (CF8).</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Turnaway intention is related to the IT field (CF10).</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Previous and conscious managerial development (CF7).</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Need of continuous updating of knowledge and skills to deal with the obsolescence threat (CF13).</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to work-family conflicts (CF5).</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Low commitment with the IT career (CF14).</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Midlife crisis (CF9).</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gender (CF11).</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. First Round Ranking**

In turn, the least relevant antecedent in this round is “Gender,” which obtained the lowest average (1.73), being placed in the last position of the ranking, with 75.76% of disagreement within the group and only 12.12% of agreement. It was preceded by “Midlife crisis” (13th position in the ranking, with an average of 2.46 and 54.29% of disagreement within the group) and “Low commitment to the IT career” (12th position, with an average of 2.57 and 60% of disagreement within the group).

**Second Round of the Delphi Technique**

Based on the results accrued from the second round of the Delphi technique, the average ranking for each antecedent was obtained, according to Table 2. For this, the classifications obtained for each antecedent in the second round were added, the average value then being calculated considering all respondents.

In the case under analysis (degree of freedom of 13 as there are 14 antecedents under analysis), any value higher than 22.36 allows W to be classified as significant, as the p-value is lower than 0.05 (level of confidence of 95%). Besides, any chi-square distribution value higher than 40.87, allows W to be classified as extremely significant (p-value lower than 0.001).

Thus, in order to verify whether the ranking obtained in the second round indicated convergence according to the view of the group, the Kendall agreement coefficient or W of Kendall was calculated, namely 0.541. Besides, one calculated the chi-square distribution value and the p-value, namely respectively 246.331 and 0.000, to assess the statistical significance of the value of W. Therefore, the value of W can be classified as
extremely significative, as the chi-square distribution value is much higher than 40.87 and the p-value is lower than 0.001 (Schmidt, 1997; Prado, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Round Ranking</th>
<th>Critical Factors to IT Professionals Turnaway Intention</th>
<th>Classification Averages in the Second Round (1 to 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Desire to acquire non-IT related skill sets via new experiences to improve opportunities in the job market (CF6).</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivation by the career advancement paradigm rather than the career accomplishment paradigm (CF4).</td>
<td>4.6857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More committed to their companies than to the IT knowledge field (CF3).</td>
<td>5.6571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pursuit of professional growth (CF1).</td>
<td>3.1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction, in general, with the IT area (CF12).</td>
<td>3.5143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to heavy workloads (CF2).</td>
<td>6.8286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to work exhaustion (CF8).</td>
<td>7.3429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Turnaway intention is related to the IT field (CF10).</td>
<td>7.1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Previous and conscious managerial development (CF7).</td>
<td>8.3714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Need for continuous updating of knowledge and skills to deal with the threat of obsolescence (CF13).</td>
<td>7.5429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to work-family conflicts (CF5).</td>
<td>9.2571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Low commitment to the IT career (CF14).</td>
<td>10.8286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Midlife crisis (CF9).</td>
<td>12.0857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gender (CF11).</td>
<td>13.3429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Classification Averages in the Second Round

Following that, the classifications accrued from the two rounds were compared. Consequently, the Kendall correlation factor was calculated, being 0.868, which indicates an adequate level of concordance between the two rankings (Schmidt, 1997; Prado, 2016), which points out to the end of the Delphi panel.

The new classification averages lead to the final ranking as presented in Table 3.

Conclusions

The final objective of this research is to identify, by means of a Delphi-based approach, the main motivations for IT professionals to leave this area for another functional area, within or outside the companies at which they worked. Thus, one can list, in a decreasing order of relevance, the following factors to the turnaway intention of IT professionals: pursuit of professional growth (CF1); desire of acquisition of non-IT related skill sets via new experiences to improve chances in the job market (CF6); motivation by the career advancement paradigm rather than the career accomplishment paradigm (CF4); dissatisfaction, in general, with the IT area (CF12); commitment to their companies rather than to the IT area (CF3); dissatisfaction with the IT area due to heavy workloads (CF2); the IT field to which they are linked (CF10);
dissatisfaction with the IT area due to work exhaustion (CF8); need for continuous updating of knowledge and skills to deal with the threat of obsolescence (CF13); previous and conscious managerial development for this turnaway (CF7); dissatisfaction with the IT area due to work-family conflicts (CF5); low commitment to the IT career (CF14); midlife crisis (CF9); and gender (CF11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Round Ranking</th>
<th>Critical Factors to IT Professionals Turnaway Intention</th>
<th>First Round Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pursuit of professional growth (CF1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Desire of acquisition of non-IT related skill sets via new experiences to improve chances in the job market (CF6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motivation by the career advancement paradigm rather than the career accomplishment paradigm (CF4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction, in general, with the IT area (CF12)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>More committed to their companies than to the IT knowledge field (CF3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to heavy workloads (CF2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Turnaway intention is related to the IT field (CF10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to work exhaustion (CF8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Need for continuous updating of knowledge and skills to deal with the threat of obsolescence (CF13)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Previous and conscious managerial development (CF7)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the IT area due to work-family conflicts (CF5)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Low commitment to the IT career (CF14)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Midlife crisis (CF9)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gender (CF11)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Second Round Ranking

Research Limitations

As with any scientific work, this paper also presents some limitations as set forth below.

This research used the Delphi method, which is based on successive rounds until an adequate agreement level within the respondent group is achieved. As the involvement of a higher number of experts would render this investigation unfeasible, the selection of respondents was done in a non-random way by using a convenience sample.

Moreover, specific characteristics of the companies where the respondents work was not considered in this study, such as pay, benefits, development plans and other policies and practices related to personnel management.

In sum, the Information Technology area is currently highly relevant for companies in general. However, in order to accomplish its objectives, the IT area needs skilled professionals in an amount compatible with
the respective demand, it therefore being necessary that the topic of IT professional turnaway intention continues to be investigated by Academia and taken into consideration by organizations, governments and IT professionals to the same extent.

REFERENCES


