

What Seals the I-Deal?

Exploring the Role of Employees' Behaviors and Managers' Emotional Responses

Yasin Rofcanin (corresponding author)

Lecturer in Management, Marketing & Organization

University of Essex, Essex Business School

E-Mail: yasin.rofcanin@essex.wbs.ac.uk

Tina Kiefer

Professor of Organizational Behavior

University of Warwick, Warwick Business School

E-Mail: Tina.Kiefer@wbs.ac.uk

Karoline Strauss

Associate Professor, Management Department

ESSEC Business School, Cergy, France

E-Mail: Karoline.strauss@essec.edu

Requests for reprints should be addressed to Yasin Rofcanin, University of Essex, Essex Business School

E-Mail: yasin.rofcanin@essex.wbs.ac.uk

What Seals the I-Deal?

Exploring the Role of Employees' Behaviours and Managers' Emotions

Abstract

Idiosyncratic deals (I-deals) are work arrangements between an employee and a manager, aimed at meeting the employee's specific work-related needs (Rousseau, 2005). Studies to date have focused on the effects of successful I-deal negotiations, but have paid little attention to what determines whether negotiated I-deals are also obtained. We propose that managers play a crucial role in this process, and explore the role of managers' emotions in translating negotiation into obtainment. We suggest that I-deals are more likely to be obtained when managers feel more positive and less negative about an employee's I-deal process in the aftermath of the negotiation. We then aim to determine what shapes managers' emotions about the I-deal process. Given that I-deals are intended to be beneficial for the entire team (Rousseau, 2005) we expect that managers feel more positive about the I-deal process of employees who engage in socially connecting behaviours following their I-deal negotiation. In contrast, managers feel more negative about the I-deal process of employees who engage in socially disconnecting behaviours. Results from a two-wave study of employees and their managers supported our hypotheses. Our findings contribute to research on I-deals by distinguishing between the negotiation and obtainment of I-deals, and by highlighting the role of managers' emotions in translating negotiated I-deals into obtainment and the importance of employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following I-deal negotiations.

Key Words: I-deals, socially connecting behaviours, socially disconnecting behaviours, emotions, managers.

Practitioner Points:

1. I-deals are individually negotiated work agreements between an employee and an employer about parts of their jobs or specific tasks. Previous research has predominantly focused on the negotiation of I-deals.
2. Yet, negotiated I-deals may not always materialize. How managers feel about the I-deal process of employees in the aftermath of the negotiation is a crucial factor in translating successfully negotiated I-deals into obtained I-deals.
3. When managers feel more positive and less negative about the I-deal process, they are more likely to facilitate the obtainment of employees' deals.
4. Because I-deals are supposed to benefit the entire team, managers' emotions about the I-deal process are influenced by employees' behaviours following the negotiation. Managers are likely to feel more positive about an employee's I-deal process if he/she displays socially connecting behaviours and more negative when the employee disconnects from others in the aftermath of I-deal negotiations.

Introduction

As a result of rising competition (Benko & Weisberg, 2007), labour market dynamism (Greenhaus, Callanan, & Godshalk, 2010), and changes in employees' work preferences (Glassner & Keune, 2012; Guest & Rodrigues, 2015), organisations can no longer apply a one-size-fits-all approach to their human resource management (HRM) practices. As collective agreements for employees decline (De Leede, Looise, & Van Riemsdijk, 2004), organisations are increasingly stressing the importance of employees taking charge of their career development (Greenhaus et al., 2010). Negotiating idiosyncratic deals (I-deals) is one way in which individuals can shape their own careers (Anand, Vidyarthi, Liden, & Rousseau, 2010; Rousseau, Ho, & Greenberg, 2006).

I-deals are defined as individually negotiated agreements between a subordinate and a manager. These deals extend benefits such as skill and capability development (i.e., task and work responsibility I-deals), and flexible location, schedule, and financial package deals (i.e., flexibility I-deals) to their recipients (Rosen, Slater, Chang, & Johnson, 2013; Rousseau, Hornung, & Kim, 2009). Even though I-deals are negotiated between an employee and a manager, they are intended to be beneficial for the entire team (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). Organisations use I-deals as individualized HRM practices to improve employee performance and keep their employees motivated (Bal et al., 2012; Rousseau et al., 2009). In line with this notion, studies have begun to demonstrate that employees who have successfully negotiated an I-deal also engage in positive behaviours such as helping their colleagues (Anand et al., 2010), and experience greater affective commitment (Ng & Feldman, 2012) and job satisfaction (Hornung, Rousseau, Glaser et al., 2010).

In the growing field of research on I-deals, studies to date have focused predominantly on the negotiation of I-deals (Hornung, Rousseau, Glaser, 2009; Ng &

Feldman, 2012). This omits the possibility that negotiated I-deals may not always be obtained (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015). With the exception of a recent study by Rofcanin and colleagues (2014), I-deals research to date has paid little attention to whether what was negotiated has ultimately been obtained. The question arising is: “What seals the deal?” In other words, what factors shape the process of moving from successful I-deal negotiations to obtaining the negotiated I-deal?

Managers play a critical role in this process as they often hold the power to implement the negotiated deal (Rousseau et al., 2006). Drawing on the broaden-and-build theory of emotions (Fredrickson, 1998; 2001), we argue that how managers feel about the I-deal negotiation process of employees is likely to determine the extent to which successfully negotiated I-deals will be obtained. Furthermore, building on goal congruence theory (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001), we propose that managers’ emotions regarding the process of employees’ I-deal negotiations are shaped by the extent to which employees show socially connecting or disconnecting behaviours following successful I-deals negotiation.

In exploring the aftermath of successful I-deal negotiations, this research makes three contributions to I-deals research. First, we distinguish between the negotiation and the obtainment of I-deals. This distinction is important as previous research focused the negotiation, overlooking whether and how negotiated I-deals might be obtained (Liao, Wayne, & Rousseau, 2016). We take a first step to show that I-deals can be seen as a process, composed of at least two steps: negotiation and obtainment.

Second, we emphasize the role of managers in translating negotiated I-deals into obtainment. In particular we underline how and why managers’ emotions in the aftermath of employees’ I-deal negotiation facilitate the obtainment of negotiated I-deals. This is in line

with Rousseau's (2005) argument that a theoretical understanding of I-deals necessitates the inclusion of both the recipients and the granters.

Third, we explore what determines those emotions of managers in the aftermath of I-deal negotiation. We draw on a core, yet often overlooked, assumption of I-deals theory: that these arrangements are aimed to be beneficial for the entire team (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). We highlight employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours as a way for managers to understand whether focal employees are likely to share the benefits of I-deals with co-workers. Socially connecting behaviours include helping co-workers and initiating interactions with them, while socially disconnecting behaviours involve withdrawing from co-workers and avoiding interactions with others (Kiefer & Barclay, 2012). Figure 1 depicts the proposed conceptual model. We develop our hypotheses next.

 Insert Figure 1 about here

Theory and Hypotheses

Linking negotiated to obtained I-deals: The role of managers' emotions

Research to date has built on the implicit assumption that negotiated I-deals are also obtained (Liao et al., 2016), overlooking the distinction between negotiation and obtainment. Negotiation, in some cases, may lead to smooth implementation of I-deals. Managers, for example, might commit to what they have agreed to in negotiation to avoid additional investment (e.g., time and energy) in managing the I-deal making process (Guerrero, Bentein, & Lapalme, 2014) or to avoid psychological contract breach (Ng & Feldman, 2010). However, the association between negotiation and obtainment may not always be straightforward as previously assumed, with many factors potentially influencing this association (Rofcanin et al., 2014).

In this research, we focus on managers' emotions as indication of their supportiveness for the obtainment of I-deals, and contend that managers' emotions play a crucial role in determining to what extent successfully negotiated I-deals are obtained.

Emotions refer to one's affective states, directed at a specific cause or target, which is perceived to be of relevance to the individual (Frijda, 1993). Positive emotions are usually experienced as a result of events that are conducive to one's goal achievement while negative emotions tend to be experienced following events that are perceived to hinder one's goal achievement (Lazarus, 1991). In the aftermath of I-deal negotiations, managers are likely to experience a range of positive (e.g., joy, enthusiasm) as well as negative emotions (e.g., anger, disappointment). We argue that when managers feel more positive about the employees' I-deal negotiation process, the chances to also obtain the deal increase. On other hand, when managers feel more negative about the process of an employees' I-deal negotiation process, they will be less willing to support its obtainment. This argument is based on broaden-and-build theory of emotions which suggests that positive emotions tend to be associated with approach behaviours and adaptive decisions whereas negative emotions tend to be associated with avoidance behaviours and avoidance decisions (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001)¹. Hence, in the context of this paper, we interpret granting obtainment as approach behaviour (as a consequence of managers' positive emotions in relation to the I-deals process), while avoidance signifies withdrawal from the I-deals process, resulting in lower extent of obtainment (as a consequence managers' negative emotions in relation to the I-deals process). Our first hypothesis is:

¹ We treat managers' positive and negative emotions as separate dimensions. This is in line with research which emphasizes that positive and negative emotions are independent systems with different antecedents and consequences (e.g., Barclay & Kiefer, 2014; Moors, Ellsworth, Scherer & et al., 2013).

Hypothesis 1: Managers' emotions about the process of employees' I-deal negotiation moderate the positive association between the extent of successful I-deal negotiation and the extent of obtainment of I-deals. This relationship is stronger when managers feel more positive about the process of employees' I-deal negotiation (H1a), and weaker when managers feel more negative about the process of employees' I-deal negotiation (H1b).

Employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following I-deal negotiations and managers' emotions

Above, we argue that managers' emotions about the process of employees' I-deal negotiation are likely to determine the extent of the obtainment of negotiated I-deals. The next question arising then is: What influences how managers feel about the focal employee's I-deals after negotiation? Given that emotions are shaped by the status-quo of one's goals (Barsade & Gibson, 2007), in the context of I-deals, we argue that managers' goals and (as a result) their emotions about employees' I-deals process are determined by one key yet overlooked tenet of I-deals theory: I-deals are intended to be beneficial for the entire team (Bal & Rousseau, 2015).

Following goal congruence theory (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001), we argue that how managers feel about employees' I-deal negotiation process will be influenced by employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiations. A key tenet of goal congruence theory is that the mutuality between the goals of the self and those of others influences one's subsequent attitudes, behaviours, and emotional reactions (Seong & Choi, 2014). In the context of I-deals, managers' goal in facilitating the provision of I-deals to a focal employee is to ensure that these deals are beneficial for the entire team (Bal & Rousseau, 2015). For this reason, managers will try to

understand how employees, having negotiated I-deals, will make use of them: employees may share the benefits with co-workers, which will be conducive to managers' ultimate goal (Mathieu et al., 2008).

A way for managers to understand employees' goals and see whether focal employees are likely to share the benefits of I-deals with co-workers is to observe employees' behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiations. In support of this, the study by Hornung et al., (2009) revealed that managers' provision of I-deals is positively associated with managers' observation of employees' proactive behaviours (i.e., initiative). This is plausible because employees who take initiative are expected to share the benefits of I-deals with co-workers and contribute to team efficiency. Another study by Collins, Cartwright, and Hislop (2013) demonstrated that managers are willing and happy to provide I-deals (about homeworking) to their subordinates as long as managers can observe employees' performance and ensure that they are contributing to team efficiency. Research from flexible work practices (FWPs) has shown similar results: Managers support and implement FWPs in relation to focal employees who are less likely to be disruptive for team efficiency (Kossek, Olier-Malaterre, Lee, Pichler, & Hall, 2016; Den Dulk & de Ruijter, 2008).

Building on these recent studies, we argue that managers feel more positive in the aftermath of I-deal negotiation, if the employee engages in connecting behaviours, because these behaviours indicate goal-congruence. Socially connecting behaviours reflect concern for others and are characterized by employees' self-initiated interactions that involve helping co-workers, and caring for, and socializing with them (Kiefer & Barclay, 2012). These behaviours signal to managers that these employees are concerned about co-workers' interests, and that they are likely to share the benefits of I-deals with them, contributing to team effectiveness. For example, facilitating the obtainment of career-related I-deals for

employees who are connected with, and concerned about their team members, may enhance team performance and contribute to team effectiveness (e.g., De Cremer et al., 2010).

Observing socially connecting behaviours in employees, managers are likely to infer that these deals will be beneficial for the entire team, which fits well with managers' aim in providing I-deals. Our second hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive association between employees' socially connecting behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiation and managers' positive emotions in relation to the I-deal negotiation process of employees.

Socially disconnecting behaviours reflect social alienation from co-workers and team (Kiefer & Barclay, 2012). Avoiding social interactions and withdrawing from co-workers are examples of socially disconnecting behaviours. We contend that managers are likely to react negatively to employees' socially disconnecting behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiation. Observing employees' socially disconnecting behaviours following I-deal negotiation, they may infer that the focal employee is likely to keep the benefits of I-deals only for him- or herself which is likely to harm team effectiveness (e.g., Hu & Liden, 2015) and hence hamper managers' goal achievement in relation to the provision of I-deals to the focal employee. Managers are likely to anticipate that these employees, upon their receipt of I-deals, will not share the benefits of I-deals with others in the team, and thus feel negative about the I-deal negotiation process of these employees². Our third hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 3: There is a positive association between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiation and

² Similar to managers' emotions, we treat employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours as separate dimensions because these behaviours are independent of each other, with different antecedents and consequences (Barclay & Kiefer, 2014)

managers' negative emotions in relation to the I-deal negotiation process of employees.

Method

Procedure and sample

We collected data from full-time working executive MBA (EMBA) students and their managers in Istanbul, Turkey. Admission to this EMBA program is challenging in terms of prior academic success and years of professional experience. Moreover, following graduation, EMBA students are expected to receive a promotion. These executives are therefore likely to take steps to advance their careers and ask for I-deals.

As surveys were administered in Turkish, we first translated items into Turkish (Brislin, 1986). Following this, we discussed the wording of the items with four full professors from related fields. We then pre-tested our survey with twelve Turkish doctoral students in the field of organisational behaviour. Following minor adjustments, we had our final survey back-translated by a professional translator, which is the recommended procedure to ensure face validity (Prieto, 1992).

We collected data at two time points, separated by six months. This time period is considered sufficient to investigate changes in one's work arrangements and employment conditions (Demerouti & Rispens, 2014). This time period is also in line with previous research on I-deals (Ng & Feldman, 2012). At Time 1, we sent personalized e-mails to 821 EMBA students, briefing them about the study procedure and providing them with a link to the on-line survey. We obtained 208 responses, representing a response rate of 25%. At Time 2, 130 employees participated, reflecting a response rate of 64%. Employees who only participated at Time 1 did not differ from employees who participated at both times in terms of any of the study variables or demographic variables measured.

After employees completed their surveys on-line, they provided the contact details of their manager. Managers were then contacted by one of the authors via e-mail or telephone and completed a paper-based questionnaire in their own offices. At Time 1, 103 managers provided responses and at Time 2, 46 managers participated. Our final sample consisted of 130 employees and 46 managers. On average, one manager supervised 2.82 employees (S.D. = 1.35). The range of the number of employees supervised by one manager was 1- 8.

Among employees who participated at both time points, 61% were middle-level managers, and 39 % were front-line managers. 53% were male. The average age was 29.2 years (SD = 4.6). Participants' average tenure in the organisation was 3.8 years (SD = 3.3), and average tenure in the current role was 2.5 years (SD = 2.7). Of managers who participated at both time points, 67% were male. Their average age was 34.2 (SD = 5.65). On average, managers had worked in the organisation for 5.2 years (SD = 2.3), and in their current role for 4.3 years (SD = 2.2).

Measures

Unless otherwise indicated, items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5).

Negotiation of I-Deals

We first provided the definition of I-deals by Rousseau (2005, p. 93) to the employees: *I-deals are voluntary, personalized agreements of a nonstandard nature negotiated between individual employees and their employers regarding terms that benefit each party*. Following this definition, using the six items from the I-deals scale of Rosen and colleagues (2013), we measured the extent to which employees had successfully negotiated for task and work responsibility I-deals with their managers within the past six months. An

example item was “*I have successfully negotiated for tasks that better develop my skills*” ($\alpha = .88$).

Obtainment of I-Deals

At Time 2, employees were asked to consider the time period since the last survey, which was six months. We measured the extent to which employees have obtained I-deals they had successfully negotiated for at Time 1 by rewording the items from Rosen and colleagues’ (2013) scale. Participants who answered “agree” or “strongly agree” for any of the task and work responsibility I-deal negotiation items at Time 1 were asked to indicate to which extent they had obtained these I-deals. For example, employees who agreed or strongly agreed for the item: *I have negotiated for tasks that better develop their skills* in Time 1 were presented with the corresponding item which read as follow: “*I have obtained tasks that better develop my skills*” ($\alpha = .87$).

Socially Connecting and Disconnecting Behaviours following Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation

We treated employees’ socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours as separate dimensions. At Time 1, we measured employees’ socially connecting behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiation with four items adapted from Kiefer and Barclay (2012). The original items measured employees’ socially disconnecting behaviours and we therefore re-worded the items to capture employees’ socially connecting behaviours. Participants rated the extent to which they helped co-workers or initiated social interactions with them, following their most recently negotiated I-deals. The items were: “*I connected with my co-workers*”, “*I socialized with my co-workers*”, “*I was interested in interacting with my co-workers*” and “*my co-workers noticed me in a positive way*” ($\alpha = .88$).

Using four items by Kiefer and Barclay (2012), at Time 1 we measured the extent to which employees engaged in socially disconnecting behaviours following their most recently negotiated I-deals (e.g., withdrawing from others, ignoring others). The items were: “*I withdrew from my co-workers*”, “*I isolated myself*”, “*I lost interest in interacting with my co-workers*”, and “*my co-workers ignored me*” ($\alpha = .88$).

To ensure employees’ socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiation are distinct, we conducted confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) using AMOS 19.0 with maximum likelihood estimation (Byrne, 2001). We used the suggested procedures and cut-off values (Hu & Bentler, 1999). A one-factor model displayed poor fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 334.86$, $df = 20$, $\chi^2/df = 16.74$, $p < .01$; CFI = .66; TLI = .53; RMSEA = .27). The two-factor model displayed good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 44.93$, $df = 19$, $\chi^2/df = 2.36$, $p < .01$; CFI = .97; TLI = .96; RMSEA = .08). Supporting the distinctiveness of the measures for socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours, a chi-square difference test showed that the model fit improved significantly from the one-factor to two-factor model, $\chi^2 (1, N = 208) = 289.93$, $p < .001$.

Managers’ Emotions about Employees’ I-deal Negotiation Process

At Time 2, managers were asked to think back to the most recent successful I-deal negotiation the focal employee had with him or her (*i.e., please think back to the most recent successful I-deal negotiation this employee had with you*). Then, managers were asked to state the frequency of their emotions they felt during this process (*i.e., How frequently did you feel the below during this process?*). We used ten items from Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, and Kelloway’s Emotion at Work Index (2000) to capture managers’ emotions. We selected these items to represent the high, medium, and low arousal levels of the pleasure dimension of the index. We chose “frequency” over “extent” drawing on Spector (2010) who argued

that the former is better able to capture the dynamic nature of emotions compared to the latter. In line with recent research (e.g., Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005; Bruk-Lee & Spector, 2006), we asked managers to rate how frequently they experienced five positive emotions (happy, satisfied, optimistic, relieved, joyful, $\alpha = .92$), and five negative emotions (angry, betrayed, disappointed, guilty, unhappy; $\alpha = .93$), on a scale ranging from “never” (1) to “always” (5). We treated managers’ positive and negative emotions as separate dimensions and aggregated responses to a positive emotions and a negative emotions score (e.g., Barsade & Gibson, 2007).

To ensure managers’ positive and negative emotions regarding the process of employee’s I-deal negotiation are distinct, we carried out CFA’s using AMOS 19.0 with maximum likelihood estimation (Byrne, 2001). A one-factor model showed poor fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 535.81$, $df = 35$, $\chi^2/df = 15.30$, $p < .01$; CFI = .58; TLI = .47; RMSEA = .26). The two-factor model displayed good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 80.28$, $df = 34$, $\chi^2/df = 2.36$, $p < .01$; CFI = .96; TLI = .95; RMSEA = .08). A chi-square difference test showed that the model fit improved significantly from the one-factor model to the two-factor model, supporting the distinctiveness of managers’ positive and negative emotions; $\chi^2 (1, N = 130) = 455.53$, $p < .001$.

Control Variables

We initially controlled for age, gender, tenure in the organisation, and tenure in the company for both subordinates and their managers. However, the direction and strength of our results did not change when these control variables were included in the analyses; they were thus excluded from the analyses (Becker et al., 2015).

We controlled for employees’ impression management motives because managers’ emotions about the I-deal negotiations process might have been affected by employees’

strategic behaviours, such as appearing busy most of the time. We used eleven-item scale of Rioux and Penner ($\alpha = .88$) to account for this possibility. Our results did not change when we controlled for employees' impression management motives; hence they were excluded from the analyses to achieve parsimony (Becker et al., 2015).

We controlled for leader member exchange relationship quality (i.e., LMX) because prior research on I-deals revealed that LMX is a predictor of successful I-deal negotiations (Anand et al., 2010), and of positive emotional reactions towards employees (Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, & Epitropaki, 2015). To rule out potential confounding effects, we controlled for LMX measured at Time 1, using seven items from the scale developed by Liden and Maslyn (1998). An example item is: "*My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend*" ($\alpha = .91$).

When testing the moderating effect of managers' emotions on the association between the extent of negotiation and obtainment of I-deals (H1), we controlled for employees' socially connecting and socially disconnecting behaviours³. When testing the associations between employees' socially connecting behaviours and managers' positive emotions to the process of employees' I-deal negotiation (H2), we controlled for employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' negative emotions⁴. Similarly, we controlled for employees' socially connecting behaviours and managers' positive emotions to the process of employees' I-deal negotiation when testing the associations between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' negative emotions (H3)⁵. Correlations between employees' socially connecting behaviours and managers' negative emotions about

³ H1(a) with controls $\gamma = 0.16$, $p < .01$; H1(a) without controls $\gamma = 0.16$, $p < .01$; H1(b) with controls $\gamma = -0.13$, $p < .05$; H1(b) without controls $\gamma = -0.14$, $p < .05$.

⁴ H2 with controls $\gamma = 0.26$, $p < .01$; H2 without controls $\gamma = 0.31$, $p < .001$.

⁵ H3 with controls $\gamma = 0.17$, $p < .05$; H3 without controls $\gamma = 0.22$, $p < .01$.

employees' I-deal negotiation ($r = -.26, p < .01$) and between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' positive emotions about I-deal negotiation ($r = -.17, p < .05$), suggest that, in addition to employees' socially connecting behaviours, employees' socially disconnecting behaviours might influence managers' positive emotions (vice versa for managers' negative emotions). To provide a more accurate estimate for our hypotheses, we therefore adopted this control strategy (Becker, Atinc, Breugh et al., 2015). The strength and direction of the results of our hypotheses do not change when not controlling for these variables.

Analytical Strategy

Managers rated their emotions regarding the I-deal negotiation process of employees. Due to the nested structure of data (Hox, 2002), we carried out multi-level analyses using MlwiN 2.20 (Rasbash, Browne, Healy, Cameron, & Charlton, 2000). We built two separate models for the dependent variables, using random intercept modelling. First, an intercept-only model was created, after which control variables and independent variables were entered. To control for within-group and between-group variances, we used grand-mean centred estimates for independent and control variables. We used person-mean centred estimates for the moderator variables (Hox, 2002; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002).

To evaluate whether multi-level modelling was an appropriate approach, we followed two strategies. First, we compared the intercept-only model with a model with a fixed random part at Level 2 for managers' positive and negative emotions to employees' most recent I-deal negotiation (Klein et al., 2001). The deviance statistics for managers' positive emotions ($\Delta-2*\log = 4.85, p < 0.05$) and for managers' negative emotions ($\Delta-2*\log = 31.43, p < 0.001$) indicated that a model at Level 2 fits the data significantly better than a model a model at Level 1.

Second, to estimate the percentage of variance that is attributable to managers' emotions to the process of employees' I-deal negotiation, we calculated ICC (1) values using Mlwin 2.20 (Rasbash et al., 2000). For managers' positive emotions, the ICC (1) is $= 0.23 / 1.11 = 21 \%$. For managers' negative emotions, the ICC (1) is $= 0.70 / 1.01 = 69 \%$. For the obtainment of I-deals, the ICC (1) is $= 0.04 / 0.38 = 11 \%$. These results concerning our dependent variables suggest that the use of multi-level analyses was appropriate.

Results

Table 1 displays the means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations.

 Insert Table 1 about here

Before testing our hypotheses, we conducted series of CFAs using AMOS 19.0 with maximum likelihood estimation (Byrne, 2001) to examine the factorial structures of our study constructs. We follow recommendations by Hu and Bentler (1999) and recent research (Piszczyk, 2016) to report our findings. The measurement model distinguishing among four factors, task and work responsibility I-deal negotiations, LMX, socially connecting, and socially disconnecting behaviours, all measured at Time 1, showed acceptable fit ($\chi^2 = 433.031$, $df = 183$, $\chi^2/df = 2.36$, $p < .01$; CFI = .88; TLI = .88; RMSEA = .08). This model fit the data significantly better than a model in which socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours were combined into one factor ($\chi^2 = 724.695$, $df = 186$, $\chi^2/df = 3.89$, $p < .01$; CFI = .74; TLI = .68; RMSEA = .12). The measurement model distinguishing between the three variables measured at Time 2 (obtained task and work responsibility I-deals, managers' positive and negative emotions) also showed acceptable fit ($\chi^2 = 175.090$, $df = 101$, $\chi^2/df = 1.73$, $p < .01$; CFI = .94; TLI = .92; RMSEA = .07). This model fit the data significantly better

than a competing model in which positive and negative emotions were loading onto a single factor ($\chi^2 = 363.449$, $df = 103$, $\chi^2/df = 3.52$, $p < .01$; CFI = .79; TLI = .73; RMSEA = .14).

Hypothesis 1(a) proposed that managers' positive emotions about the process of the focal employee's I-deal negotiation would moderate the association between the extent of successful I-deal negotiation and the extent of I-deal obtainment. After all control variables were entered, the interaction term between managers' positive emotions and successful task and work responsibility I-deal negotiations was significant ($\gamma = .16$, $p < .001$). Following the suggestions of Dawson (2016), we calculated simple slopes for one standard deviation above and below the mean of the moderator, managers' positive emotions about the process of the focal employee's I-deal negotiation process. The slope for higher manager positive emotions was positive and significant (gradient of simple slope = .71, $t = 2.53$, $p < .05$). The slope for lower manager positive emotions was significant (gradient of simple slope = .54, $t = 2.42$, $p < .05$). Higher positive emotions about the I-deal negotiation process thus strengthened the association between successful I-deal negotiations and the extent to which I-deals were obtained. Accordingly, Hypothesis 1(a) was supported.

Hypothesis 1(b) proposed that the association between the extent of successful I-deal negotiation and the extent of I-deal obtainment would be moderated by managers' negative emotions about the I-deal negotiation process of employees. After entering the control variables, the interaction term between managers' negative emotions and the extent of I-deal negotiations was significant and negative ($\gamma = -.14$, $p < .05$). As for H1 (a), we calculated simple slopes for one standard deviation above and below the mean of the moderator, manager's negative emotions about the focal employee's I-deal negotiation process. The slope for higher manager negative emotions was negative and significant (gradient of simple slope = $-.41$, $t = 2.01$, $p < .05$). The slope for lower manager negative emotions was not

significant (gradient of simple slope = $-.11$, $t = 0.81$, $p = 0.42$). Thus, higher levels of I-deal negotiation were associated with lower levels of I-deal obtainment when managers felt more negatively about the process of the focal employees' I-deal negotiation. Hypothesis 1(b) is thus supported (see Table 2).

 Insert Table 2 about here

Hypothesis 2 proposed that employees' socially connecting behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiation would be positively associated with managers' positive emotions about employees' I-deal negotiation process. Controlling for LMX, managers' negative emotions about the process of employees' I-deal negotiation and employees' socially disconnecting behaviours, this association was positive and significant ($\gamma = .26$, $p < .01$), providing support for our second hypothesis (see Table 3).

Hypothesis 3 proposed a positive association between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' negative emotions about the process of the respective employees' I-deal negotiation. The association between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours and managers' negative emotions about the process of the focal employee's I-deal negotiation (after controlling for LMX, managers' positive emotions about the process of the focal employees' I-deal negotiation and employees' socially connecting behaviours), was significant ($\gamma = .17$, $p < .01$). This finding supports Hypothesis 3 (see Table 3).

 Insert Table 3 about here

Discussion

Theoretical Contributions

Organisations have started to use individualized HR practices such as I-deals to meet the unique work-related needs of their employees and keep them committed to the organisation (Bal & Dorenbosch, 2015). Indeed, research has shown that organisations tend to benefit from I-deals, for instance in the form of greater affective commitment and higher levels of work performance (Anand et al., 2010). However, less is known regarding the aftermath of I-deal negotiations. This is surprising given that in theory the benefits of I-deals are supposed to arise from their obtainment, rather than the negotiation itself (Rousseau et al., 2006).

In this study, we found that the association between the extent of negotiation and obtainment of I-deals is not straightforward. When managers felt more positive, the chances for negotiated I-deals to be obtained increased; when managers felt more negative, the chances for obtainment decreased. Moreover, how managers felt about employees' I-deals was influenced by employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours in the aftermath of their most recent I-deal negotiation. Our hypotheses were supported, lending key contributions to the literature on I-deals in a number of ways.

The first contribution of this study relates to the distinction between the negotiation and obtainment of I-deals. One core characteristics of I-deals is that they are negotiated between an employee and a manager and result in an actual "deal" (Liao, Wayne, & Rousseau, 2016). Despite the acknowledgment that there is more to I-deals than the negotiation (Bal & Rousseau, 2015), previous research assumed negotiation leads to smooth implementation (Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015). In this study, we conceptualize the negotiation and obtainment of I-deals as distinctive steps. Our focus on this distinction is

important given that the benefits of I-deals are likely to be realized upon their obtainment (Bal et al., 2012). We present one of the first studies to conceptualize I-deals as composed of different phases.

The second contribution of this study relates to our focus on managers' emotions in translating negotiated I-deals into obtainment. While the implementation of I-deals is likely to be influenced by many factors (Dany, Guedri, & Hatt, 2008), our results suggest that successful implementation of I-deals is also influenced by how managers feel about employees' I-deals process. Our focus on managers' emotions regarding the process of employees' most recent I-deal negotiation contributes to research on differentiated HR practices. Research has emphasized the "sensegiving" role of managers in implementing differentiated HR practices (Mcdermott et al., 2013; Maitlis, 2005). Managers provide clues to employees about the content of HR practices and policies, including when, to whom, and why these practices can be applied (Maitlis, 2005). To employees, managers' emotions can thus serve as powerful sources of sensegiving, reflecting managers' future intentions and decisions concerning employees' differentiated HR arrangements (Macdermott et al., 2013). Our focus on managers' emotions also complements research on the role of emotions in individual decision making processes (e.g., Little, Gooty, & Williams, 2016). For example, a study by Maitlis and Ozcelik (2004) underlined the role of emotions in managers' decision making processes and revealed that employees' positive and negative emotions led to different decisions in the organisational settings.

Our third contribution relates to our focus on employee behaviours that influence how managers feel about employees' I-deal process. We proposed that managers' emotions influence the extent to which negotiated deals are obtained, and explored factors that can influence managers' emotions. Managers' goal in providing I-deals is to ensure they will

contribute to team cohesion and effectiveness; hence they try to make sense of how employees will use their I-deals upon receipt (Kelley & Michela, 1980). In the context of I-deals, understanding how I-deals will be used by employees upon their obtainment is especially important because these deals deviate from what other team members receive. While there is no research on the specific behaviours of employees that facilitate the obtainment of I-deals, a meta-analysis (Liao et al., 2016) and a review study on the contextual nature of I-deals (Bal et al., 2012) highlight that employees may utilize I-deals for different reasons. We contribute to research on I-deals by exploring how employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours, following I-deal negotiations, influenced their managers' emotions to the process of employees' I-deal negotiation. Observing employees' socially connecting behaviours following I-deal negotiations, managers may have expected the recipients of I-deals to share the benefits of their I-deals with co-workers, which is consistent with managers' goal of ensuring I-deals contribute to the effective functioning of the team.

In addition to employees' socially connecting behaviours, we also explored the association between employees' socially disconnecting behaviours in the aftermath of negotiated I-deals and managers' negative emotions about the process of these employees' most recent I-deal negotiation. Our findings suggest that managers evaluated and reacted to the socially disconnecting behaviours of employees in the aftermath of I-deal negotiations negatively. Managers might have expected that the I-dealer, upon obtainment of I-deals, will use these deals only to his or her own benefit which does not align with managers' goal of facilitating the provision of negotiated I-deals.

Further, it is noteworthy that the zero-order correlations indicated a significant negative association between managers' negative emotions and employees' socially

connecting behaviours, as well as between managers' positive emotions and employees' socially disconnecting behaviours. Managers' negative and positive emotions were also negatively related. However, these effects disappear when managers' positive and negative emotions are analysed simultaneously. Our results therefore complement research which argues that positive and negative emotions are independent of each other, with different antecedents (e.g. Barclay & Kiefer, 2014; Moors, Ellsworth, Scherer & et al., 2013).

It is worth noting that, in line with the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following their most recent I-deal negotiation might enable them to obtain their negotiated I-deals, mediating the association between the extent of successful I-deal negotiation and the extent of obtainment of I-deals. To explore this possibility, we tested two alternative models and utilized Monte Carlo Method for Assessing mediation (MCMAM)⁶. We used an on-line tool developed by Selig and Preacher (2008) to calculate the confidence intervals. In model 1, we tested the mediation of employees' socially connecting behaviours between the extent of employees' successful I-deal negotiations and the extent of obtainment of I-deals. Findings did not support the argument that employees would engage in socially connecting behaviours to seal their negotiated deals as the confidence intervals included the value of zero ($\gamma = .09 (.50)$, $p=.18$; 95% CI = [-0.009 / 0.087]). In model 2, we tested the mediation of employees' socially disconnecting behaviours between the extent of employees' successful I-deal negotiations and the extent of obtainment of I-deals. The argument that employees' negotiated I-deals would be negatively related to the obtainment of I-deals via employees'

⁶ This method is built on simulations with 20,000 iterations which relies on product-of-coefficients (ab) approach; where ab is equal to the product of a, the regression path between I-deal negotiations and employees' dis / connecting behaviours, and b, the regression path between employees' dis / connecting behaviours and obtainment of I-deals (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009). We then used the distribution of the product method (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009) to calculate confidence intervals and validate our ab coefficients. When the confidence intervals do not contain zero, it means an indirect effect is established.

socially disconnecting behaviours was also not supported, as confidence intervals included the value of zero ($\gamma = .05 (.25)$, $p=.23$; 95% CI = [-0.046 / 0.013]). These results are in line with recent research which has started to question the use of reciprocity to understand the effects of I-deal negotiations on employee behaviours (Bal et al., 2015; Conway & Coyle-Shapiro, 2015). Drawing from these findings, it might be possible that employees reciprocate only for their obtained I-deals and not for their negotiated I-deals. Future research might explicitly integrate reciprocity (e.g., felt obligation) into I-deals research and explore the effects obtained I-deals might have on the focal employees' work behaviours.

Practical Implications

I-deals are becoming strategic HRM tools to attract and retain talented employees (Bal et al., 2015; Ng & Feldman, 2012). Our results suggest that it is useful to distinguish between the extent to which I-deals are negotiated and obtained. Moreover, our results demonstrated that managers felt positive about the process of I-deal negotiation of employees who showed socially connecting behaviours. In contrast, when employees fail to connect with their co-workers, their managers may not support them in obtaining negotiated I-deals. If organisations and managers aim to use I-deals as a strategic tool to motivate and retain employees and increase their performance, they need to be transparent about how they expect these deals to be used. For employees negotiating I-deals, it has to be clear that these deals are intended to benefit the entire team, and that they are supposed to share their benefits. Accordingly, HR departments along with managers may encourage formal mechanisms such as mentoring (Nielsen, Carlson, & Lankau, 2001), coaching, and communication interventions (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001) to enhance connecting behaviours. Training and development to minimize socially disconnecting behaviours in teams will also be useful.

Limitations and future research directions

The strengths of this study include the use of a two-wave research design and data from multiple sources. However, there are also some limitations. Even though we collected data at two measurement occasions and obtained ratings from supervisors, we cannot establish causal relationships among our study variables. Longitudinal designs are needed to strengthen the causal claims in this research stream.

We explored the I-deal process from the perspectives of managers and employees. This is in line with a key concept of I-deals, that these deals result from a negotiation between a focal employee and a manager (Rousseau, 2005). However, I-deals do not unfold in a dyadic vacuum; co-workers are also important stakeholders, as they are likely to notice employees' negotiated and obtained I-deals (Greenberg et al., 2004). Beyond a focus on managers, future research is suggested to explore I-deal making process from a co-worker perspective and for example, by collecting data from co-workers regarding focal employees' I-deals, explore the conditions in which co-worker support might render I-deals beneficial for the entire team.

Our focus was not on exploring I-deals in a team context. Participants may have worked in different work teams but reported to the same manager, as would be the case in a matrix organisational structure. However, whether employees were working in the same work team or whether they were merely reporting to the same manager is important because this structural work condition influences focal employees' task interdependence with co-workers and hence imposes limitations to the manager regarding the provision of I-deals to the focal employee (Hornung et al., 2009). Future research needs to take into account these structural work conditions (i.e., task interdependence, working in the same work team or not) on the association between the extent of negotiation and obtainment of I-deals.

The idea that managers observe employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours raises the possibility that some employees may engage in impression management behaviours to influence their managers. To account for this possibility, we controlled for employees' impression management motives in testing our hypotheses. Impression management motives were not related to managers' emotions ($r = 0.02$ between impression management motives and managers' negative emotions; $r = -0.03$ between impression management motives and managers' positive emotions). Moreover, the strength and direction of our hypotheses did not change when we controlled for employees' impression management motives. These results suggest that managers' emotions about the process of employees' most recent I-deal negotiation process were not influenced by employees' impression management motives. Future research is suggested to explore motives of employees in requesting I-deals and how different motives, such as productivity or opportunity-seeking motives of employees (Liao et al., 2016) in requesting I-deals might influence managers' judgments and decisions in facilitating the provision of I-deals.

The argument that managers' emotions play an important role on the process between negotiation and obtainment of I-deals is in line with growing body of research which has started to show that managers have the power to modify existing HR practices (e.g., McDermott, Conway, Rousseau, & Flood, 2013; Stanton, Young, Bartram, & Leggat, 2010) by introducing flexibilities or re-defining HR practices, giving rise to I-deals (Alfes et al., 2013; Khilji & Wang, 2006; Nishii & Wright, 2008). Beyond a focus on managers' emotions, future research should explore how other factors might shape managers' judgments and decisions in translating negotiated I-deals into obtainment.

It is possible that managers may be inclined to provide what they have promised for because, for example, managers do not have all the information and alternatives they needed

to have to facilitate the provision of I-deals. While our findings revealed that the association between negotiation and obtainment of I-deals is not straightforward, future research might build on the concept of escalation of commitment (Brockner, 1992) to explore under which contexts (e.g., organisational, cross-cultural) managers might prefer to implement negotiated I-deals without considering other elements that might influence their judgements and decisions.

The focus of this study was on the association between the extent of successful negotiation and obtainment of I-deals. However, what is successfully negotiated may not be obtained, leading to perceptions of breach of I-deals. For future research, it will be interesting to integrate a psychological contract perspective and explore what factors hamper the obtainment of successfully negotiated I-deals and the effects that a breach of an I-deals promise may have on employees' work behaviours and attitudes.

Building on the aftermath of i-deal negotiations, future research may explore the behaviours of employees following obtainment of I-deals: whether employees share the benefits of I-deals with team members or keep the benefits I-deals only to themselves following the obtainment of I-deals. In relation to this, future research might integrate the role of co-workers and explore whether and how a focal employee's obtained I-deals benefit (or harm) co-workers in a work team. This will add clarity to one of the conceptualizations of I-deals, which is that, they are intended to be beneficial for teams (Rousseau et al., 2006).

The nature of flexibility I-deals is different from that of task and work responsibility I-deals (Rosen et al., 2013); hence, our findings cannot be generalized to all types of I-deals. Future studies need to explore different theoretical mechanisms to test and explain the unique effects of flexibility I-deals and differentiate them from task and work responsibility I-deals.

Finally, this study was conducted in a Turkish business context where paternalism is a dominant cultural value (Aycan, Shyns, Sun, Felfe, & Saher, 2013). Paternalism refers to hierarchical relationships in which managers are expected to care, protect and guide their subordinates in their work and non-work lives (Aycan et al., 2013). Hence, in such a work context employees are likely to feel comfortable in approaching their managers and negotiating for specific work arrangements like I-deals. Future research may explore the effects of different cultural values on the negotiation and obtainment of I-deals.

Conclusions

This study contributed to our understanding of the extent to which successfully negotiated I-deals are obtained. The results revealed that how managers feel about the process of employees' I-deal negotiation determines the extent to which negotiated I-deals are obtained. Furthermore, employees' socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours in the aftermath of their I-deal negotiations influenced how managers felt about the I-deal process, highlighting the importance of managers' evaluations of these behaviours.

References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Alfes, K., Truss, C., Soane, E. C., Rees, C., & Gatenby, M. (2013). The relationship between line manager behavior, perceived HRM practices, and individual performance: Examining the mediating role of engagement. *Human Resource Management Journal*, **52**, 839–859. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21512

- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behaviour on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **83**, 247–260. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.247
- Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2010). Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality. *The Academy of Management Journal*, **53**, 970–988. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2010.54533176
- Aycan, Z., Shyns, B., Sun, J., Felfe, J., & Saher, N. (2013). Convergence and divergence of paternalistic leadership: A cross-cultural investigation of prototypes. *International Journal of Business Studies*, **44**, 962–969. doi: 10.1057/jibs.2013.48
- Bal, P. M., De Jong, S. B., Jansen, P. G. W., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). Motivating employees to work beyond retirement: A multi-level study of the role of i-deals and unit climate. *Journal of Management Studies*, **49**, 306–331. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2011.01026.x
- Bal, P. M., & Dorenbosch, L. (2015). Age-related differences in the relations between individualized HRM and organizational performance: A large-scale employer survey. *Human Resource Management Journal*, **25**, 41–61. doi: 10.1111/1748-8583.12058
- Bal, P. M., Kleef, M. V., & Jansen, P. G. (2015). The impact of career customization on work outcomes: Boundary conditions of manager support and employee age. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **36**, 421–440. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.1998>
- Bal, P. M., & Rousseau, D. M. (2015). *Idiosyncratic deals between employees and organizations: Conceptual issues, applications and the role of co-workers*. Oxford, UK: Taylor & Francis Group LLC.

- Barclay, L. J., & Kiefer, T. (2014). Approach or avoid? Exploring overall justice and the differential effects of positive and negative emotions. *Journal of Management*, **40**, 1857–1898. doi: 10.1177/0149206312441833
- Barclay, L. J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Pugh, S. D. (2005). Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **90**, 629–643. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.629
- Becker, T. E., Atinc, G., Breugh, J. A., Carlson, K. D., Edwards, J. R., & Spector, P. E. (2015). Statistical control in correlational studies: 10 essential recommendations for organizational researchers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **37**, 157–167. doi: 10.1002/job.2053.
- Benko, C., & Weisberg, A. (2007). *Mass career customization: Aligning the workplace with today's nontraditional workforce*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording of translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner, & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (pp. 137–164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Brockner, J. (1992). The escalation of commitment to a failing course of action: Toward theoretical progress. *The Academy of Management Review*, **17**, 39–61. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1992.4279568
- Bruk-Lee, V., & Spector, P. E. (2006). The social stressors–counterproductive work behaviors link: Are conflicts with supervisors and coworkers the same? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, **11**, 145–156. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.11.2.145
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with Amos: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Collins, A. M., Cartwright, S., & Hislop, D. (2013). Homeworking: Negotiating the psychological contracts. *Human Resource Management Journal*, **23**, 211–225. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2012.00200.x
- Conway, N., & Coyle-Shapiro, J. (2015). Not so I-deal: A critical review of idiosyncratic-deals theory and research. In P. M. Bal, & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Idiosyncratic deals between employees and organizations: Conceptual issues, applications, and the role of coworkers* (pp. 201–245). London, UK: Psychology Press.
- Crossley, C. D., Cooper, C. D., & Wernsing, T. S. (2013). Making things happen through challenging goals: Leader proactivity, trust, and business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **3**, 540–549. doi: 10.1037/a0031807
- Dany, F., Guedri, Z., & Hatt, F. (2008). New insights into the link between HRM integration and organizational performance: The moderating role of influence distribution between HRM specialists and line managers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **19**, 2095–2112. doi: 10.1080/09585190802404320
- Dawson, J. (2016). Interpreting interaction effects. Available from <http://www.jeremydawson.com/slopes.htm>.
- De Cremer, D., Van Dijke, M., & Mayer, D. M. (2010). Cooperating when “you” and “I” are treated fairly: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **95**, 1121–1133. doi: 10.1037/a0020419
- De Leede, J., Looise, J. C., & Van Riemsdijk, M. (2004). Collectivism versus individualism in Dutch employment relations. *Human Resource Management Journal*, **14**, 1, 25–39. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2004.tb00110.x

- Demerouti, E., & Rispens, S. (2014). Improving the image of student-recruited samples: A commentary. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, **87**, 34–41. doi: 10.1111/joop.12048
- Den Dulk, L., & de Ruijter, J. (2008). Managing work-life policies: Disruption versus dependency arguments. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **19**, 1222–1236. doi: 10.1080/09585190802109986
- Eastman, K. K. (1994). In the eyes of the beholder: An attributional approach to ingratiation and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, **37**, 1379–1391. doi: 10.2307/256678
- Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, **2**, 300–319. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.300
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, **56**, 218–226. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218
- Frijda, N. H. (1993). Moods, emotion episodes, and emotions. In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 381–403). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gardner, W., & Martinko, M. J. (1998). An organizational perspective of the effects of dysfunctional impression management. In R. W. Griffin, A. O’Leary-Kelly, & J. M. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Non-violent dysfunctional behavior* (pp. 69–125). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Glassner, V., & Keune, M. (2012). The crisis and social policy: The role of collective agreements. *International Labour Review*, **151**, 351–375. doi: 10.1111/j.1564-913X.2012.00153.x

- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, **25**, 161–178. doi: 10.2307/2092623
- Green, S. G., & Mitchell, T. R. (1979). Attributional processes in leader–member interactions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, **23**, 429–458. doi: doi:10.1016/0030-5073(79)90008-4
- Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & Godshalk, V. M. (2010). *Career management* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Guerrero, S., Bentein, K. & Lapalme, M.-E. (2014). Idiosyncratic deals and high performers' organizational commitment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, **29**, 323-34.
- Guest, D. E. (2011). Human resource management and performance: Still searching for some answers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, **21**, 3–13. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2010.00164.x
- Guest, D. E., & Rodrigues, R. (2015). Career control. In H. De Vos, & B. Van der Heijden (Eds.). *Handbook of research on sustainable careers: Aims, approach and outline* (pp. 205–222). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., & Glaser, J. (2009). Why supervisors make idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, **24**, 738–764. doi: 10.1108/02683940910996770
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., Glaser, J., Angerer, P., & Weigl, M. (2010). Beyond top-down and bottom-up work redesign: Customizing job content through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **31**, 187–215. doi: 10.1002/job.625
- Hox, J. (2002). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cut off criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, **6**, 1–55. doi: 10.1080/10705519909540118
- Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2015). Making a difference in the teamwork: Linking team prosocial motivation to team processes and effectiveness. *The Academy of Management Journal*, **58**, 1102–1127. doi: 10.5465/amj.2012.1142
- Kelley, H. H., & Michela, J. L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, **31**, 457–501. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.31.020180.002325
- Khilji, S., & Wang, X. (2006). “Intended” and “implemented” HRM: The missing linchpin in strategic human resource management research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **17**, 1171–1189. doi: 10.1080/09585190600756384
- Kiefer, T., & Barclay, L. (2012). Understanding the mediating role of toxic emotional experiences in the relationship between negative emotions and adverse outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, **85**, 600–625. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2012.02055.x
- Klein, K. J., Bliese, P. D., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Dansereau, F., Gavin, M. B., Griffin, M. A., Kleysen, R. F., & Street, C. T. (2001). Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behavior. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, **2**, 248–296. doi: 10.1108/EUM0000000005660
- Kossek, E. E., Ollier-Malaterre, A., Lee, M. D., Pichler, S., & Hall, D. T. (2016). Line managers’ rationales for professionals’ reduced-load work in embracing and ambivalent organizations. *Human Resource Management*, **55**, 143–171. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21722

- Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Stevens, C. K. (2001). Goal congruence in project teams: Does the fit between members' personal mastery and performance goals matter? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **86**, 1083–1095. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1083
- Lazarus, R.S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Leslie, L. M., Manchester, C. F., Park, T.-Y., & Mehng, S. A. (2012). Flexible work practices: A source of career premiums or penalties? *The Academy of Management Journal*, **55**, 1407–1428. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.0651
- Liao, C., Wayne, S., & Rousseau, D. M. (2016). Idiosyncratic deals in contemporary organizations: A qualitative and meta-analytical review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **37**, S9–S29. doi: 10.1002/job.1959
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multi-dimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, **24**, 43–72. doi: 10.1016/S0149-2063(99)80053-1
- Little, L. M., Gooty, J., & Williams, M. (2016). The role of leader emotion management in leader-member exchange and follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, **27**, 85–97. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.08.007
- MacKinnon, D. P., & Fairchild, A. J. (2009). Current directions in mediation analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, **18**, 16–20. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01598.x
- Maitlis, S. (2005). The social processes of organizational sense-making. *The Academy of Management Journal*, **48**, 21–49. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2005.15993111
- Maitlis, S., & Ozcelik, H. (2004). Toxic decision processes: A study of emotion and organizational decision making. *Organization Science*, **15**, 375–393. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1040.0070

- Martin, R., Guillaume, Y., Thomas, G., Lee, A., & Epitropaki, O. (2015). Leader–member exchange (LMX) and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, **69**, 67–121. doi: 10.1111/peps.12100
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, **34**, 410–476. doi: 10.1177/0149206308316061
- McDermott, A. M., Conway, E., Rousseau, D. M., & Flood, P. C. (2013). Promoting effective psychological contracts through leadership: The missing link between HR strategy and performance. *Human Resource Management*, **52**, 289–310. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21529
- Moors, A., Ellsworth, P. C., Scherer, K. R., & Frijda, N. H. (2013). Appraisal theories of emotion: State of the art and future development. *Emotion Review*, **5**, 119–124. doi: 10.1177/1754073912468165
- Ng., T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2012). Idiosyncratic deals and voice behavior. *Journal of Management*, **13**, 33–45. doi: 10.1177/0149206312457824
- Nielsen, T. R., Carlson, D. S., & Lankau, M. J. (2001). The supportive mentor as a means of reducing work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **59**, 364–381. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1806
- Nishii, L. H., & Wright, P. (2008). Variability within organizations: Implications for strategic human resource management. In D. B. Smith (Ed.), *The people make the place* (pp. 225–248). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Piszczek, M.M. (2016). Boundary control and controlled boundaries: Organizational expectations for technology use at the work–family interface. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. doi: 10.1002/job.2153

- Prieto, A. (1992). A method for translation of instruments to other languages. *Adult Education Quarterly*, **43**, 1-14. doi: 10.1177/0741713692043001001
- Purcell, J., & Hutchinson, S. (2007). Front-line managers as agents in the HRM-performance causal chain: Theory, analysis and evidence. *Human Resource Management Journal*, **17**, 3–20. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2007.00022.x
- Rasbash, J., Browne, W., Healy, M., Cameron, B., & Charlton, C. (2000). *MlwiN (Version 2.1): Interactive software for multilevel analysis*. London: Multilevel Models Project, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **86**, 1306–1314. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1306
- Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T., & Strauss, K. (2014). Are we missing a link? The mediation of positive affective states between I-deals and employee outcomes. Paper presented at the 2014 Academy of Management Conference, Philadelphia, PA.
- Rosen, C. C., Slater, D. J., Chang, C. H., & Johnson, R. E. (2013). Let's make a deal: Development and validation of the ex post I-deals scale. *Journal of Management*, **39**, 709–742. doi: 10.1177/0149206310394865
- Rousseau, D. M. (2005). *I-deals: Idiosyncratic deals employees bargain for themselves*. New York, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Rousseau, D. M., Ho, V. T., & Greenberg, J. (2006). I-deals: Idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships. *The Academy of Management Review*, **31**, 977–994. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2006.22527470

- Rousseau, D. M., Hornung, S., & Kim, T. G. (2009). Idiosyncratic deals: Testing propositions on timing, content, and the employment relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **74**, 338–348. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2009.02.004
- Rousseau, D. M., & Kim, T. G. (2006). When workers bargain for themselves: Idiosyncratic deals and the nature of the employment relationship. Paper presented at the British Academy of Management Conference, Belfast, Northern Ireland.
- Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, **52**, 471–499. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.471
- Selig, J. P., & Preacher, K. J. (2008). Monte Carlo method for assessing mediation: An interactive tool for creating confidence intervals for indirect effects [Computer software]. Retrieved from <http://quantpsy.org/>
- Seong, J. Y., & Choi, J. N. (2014). Effects of group-level fit on group conflict and performance: The initiating role of leader positive affect. *Group & Organization Management*, **39**, 190–212. doi: 10.1177/1059601113517138
- Smith, K., Carroll, S., & Ashford, S. (1995). Intra- and inter-organizational cooperation: Toward a research agenda. *The Academy of Management Journal*, **38**, 7–23. doi: 10.2307/256726
- Spector, P. E. (2010). *Overview of the job-related affective well-being scale (JAWS)*. Retrieved from <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jawsover.html>
- Stanton, P., Young, S., Bartram, T., & Leggat, S. (2010). Singing the same song: Translating HR messages across management hierarchies in Australian hospitals. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **21**, 4, 567–581. doi: 10.1080/09585191003612075

- Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the job-related affective well-being scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 219–230. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.219
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review, 97*, 548–573. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.92.4.548
- Williams, H. M., Parker, S. K., & Turner, N. (2010). Proactively performing teams: The role of work design, transformational leadership, and team composition. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*, 301–324. doi: 10.1348/096317910X502494
- Wong, P. T. P., & Weiner, B. (1981). When people ask “why” questions, and the heuristics of attributional search. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*, 650–666. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.40.4.650

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations

	Variables	Means	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	LMX (T1)	3.64	0.59	(0.91)						
2	Employees' Socially Connecting Behaviours following Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T1)	3.48	0.76	0.02	(0.88)					
3	Employees' Socially Disconnecting Behaviours following Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T1)	2.01	0.92	-0.07	-0.53**	(0.88)				
4	The Extent of Successful Negotiation of I-Deals (T1)	3.75	0.92	0.28**	0.38**	-0.19*	(0.88)			
5	The Extent of Obtainment of I-Deals (T2)	4.08	0.61	0.02	0.21*	-0.14	0.21*	(0.87)		
6	Managers' Positive Emotions about the Process of Employee's Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)	3.88	0.88	0.19*	0.28**	-0.17*	0.44**	0.24**	(0.92)	
7	Managers' Negative Emotions about the Process of Employee's Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)	2.30	0.84	-0.21*	-0.26**	0.35**	-0.28**	-0.23**	-0.49**	(0.93)

Notes.

n= 130 subordinates; 46 supervisors.

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01.

Reliabilities are shown along the diagonal in parentheses.

Table 2. Multilevel estimates for the interaction between managers' emotions about the process of employee's most recent I-deal negotiation and the extent of successful negotiation of I-deals predicting the extent of obtainment of I-deals

Variables	The Extent of Obtainment of I-Deals (T2)								
	Estimate	S.E.	t	Estimate	S.E.	T	Estimate	S.E.	T
Intercept	4.07	0.06	67.08	4.08	0.05	83.45	4.04	0.05	77.76
LMX (T1)	0.23	0.11	2.09*	0.20	0.11	1.81	0.021	0.08	0.24
Employees' Socially Connecting Behaviours following Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T1)	0.15	0.08	1.88	0.08	0.07	1.14	0.09	0.07	0.19
Employees' Socially Disconnecting Behaviours following Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T1)	-0.03	0.06	0.05	-0.06	0.07	-0.93	-0.06	0.07	-0.93
The Extent of Successful Negotiation of I-Deals (T1)				0.06	0.07	0.93	0.11	0.08	1.41
Managers' Positive Emotions about the Process of Employee's Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)				0.07	0.07	1.01	0.02	0.07	0.3
Managers' Negative Emotions about the Process of Employee's Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)				-0.10	0.07	-1.42	-0.1	0.07	-1.46
The Extent of Successful Negotiation of I-Deals (T1) * Managers' Positive Emotions about the Process of Employee's Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)							0.16	0.05	3.20**
The Extent of Successful Negotiation of I-Deals (T1) * Managers' Negative Emotions about the Process of Employee's Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)							-0.14	0.06	-2.33*
-2LL	234.78			227.35			218.43		
Δ in -2LL	5.52 ^a			7.83*			24.18***		
D.F.	3			3			2		
Between-level Variance and Standard Error	0.03	(0.03)	0.02	(0.02)			0.02	(0.02)	
Within-level Variance and Standard Error	0.33	(0.05)	0.32	(0.04)			0.29	(0.04)	

Notes. ^aStatistical comparison with an intercept-only model at level 1 (not shown in the table).

For all values, gamma coefficients, their corresponding standard error and t values are reported.

n = 130 subordinates; 46 supervisors.

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001.

Table 3. Multilevel regression analyses for socially connecting and disconnecting behaviours following most recent I-deal negotiation and managers' emotions about the process of employees' most recent I-deal negotiation

Variables	Managers' Positive Emotions about the Process of Employee's I-Deal Negotiation (T2)						Managers' Negative Emotions about the Process of Employee's I-Deal Negotiation (T2)					
	Estimate	S.E.	t	Estimate	S.E.	t	Estimate	S.E.	t	Estimate	S.E.	t
Intercept	3.88	0.06	64.66	3.88	0.06	64.66	2.02	0.07	28.85	2.03	0.06	33.83
LMX (T1)	0.14	0.11	1.27	0.17	0.11	1.54	-0.14	0.11	-1.55	-0.15	0.11	-1.50
Managers' Negative Emotions about the Process of Employee's Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)	-0.51	0.08	-6.25***	-0.47	0.08	-5.87***						
Managers' Positive Emotions about the Process of Employee's Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T2)							-0.34	0.06	-5.66***	-0.33	0.06	-5.55***
Employees' Socially Connecting Behaviours following Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T1)				0.26	0.09	2.88**	-0.15	0.08	-1.87	-0.05	0.09	-0.55
Employees' Socially Disconnecting Behaviours following Most Recent I-Deal Negotiation (T1)	-0.18	0.09	2.00*	-0.12	0.08	-1.50				0.17	0.06	2.83**
-2LL	297.06			291.12			255.26			246.17		
Δ in -2LL	35.75*** <i>a</i>			5.94**			36.81*** <i>b</i>			7.11**		
D.F.	3			1			3			1		
Between-level Variance and Standard Error	0.12	(0.07)		0.11	(0.06)		0.48	(0.13)		0.44	(0.13)	
Within-level Variance and Standard Error	0.49	(0.07)		0.47	(0.07)		0.24	(0.03)		0.23	(0.03)	

Notes. *a,b* Statistical comparison with an intercept-only model at level 1 (not shown in the table).

For all values, gamma coefficients, their corresponding standard error and t values are reported.

n = 130 subordinates; 46 supervisors.

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

Figure 1. Conceptual Model