

I-Deals in Context:

A Summary and Critical Review of I-Deals Literature around the Globe

S. Arzu Wasti
Sabancı University

Nevra Cem Ersoy
Izmir University of Economics

Berrin Erdogan
Portland State University
University of Exeter

Citation: Wasti, S. A., Ersoy, N. C., & Erdogan, B. (2022). I-deals in context: A summary and critical review of i-deals literature around the globe. In S. Anand and Y. Rofcanin (Eds). *Idiosyncratic deals at work: Exploring individual, organizational, and societal perspectives.* (pp. 257-307). London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

I-Deals in Context:

A Summary and Critical Review of I-Deals Literature around the Globe

Abstract

Understanding the full implications of i-deals for employees and organizations requires explicit consideration of the country-level context in which they are granted and implemented. In this chapter, we critically reviewed the empirical literature on i-deals to assess the extent of contextualization and to summarize the insights gleaned from studies that discussed influences such as the societal culture, labor market characteristics, labor laws and economic prosperity on i-deals. Our review revealed that about half of the articles in fact did not incorporate national or societal variables at all. About one-third were generalizability studies, which did not propose explicit hypotheses regarding contextual variables but often incorporated them to interpret the findings. Only a minority of studies developed a priori hypotheses or explicitly problematized the country-level characteristics of their study setting for a better understanding of i-deals. Nonetheless, the evidence points to fruitful future research directions such as the meaning, content, prevalence, targets and implications of i-deals in different contexts.

Keywords: culture, cross-cultural, societal context, idiosyncratic deals, i-deals

I-Deals in Context:

A Summary and Critical Review of I-Deals Literature around the Globe

Idiosyncratic deals, or i-deals, are voluntary and individualized arrangements that are negotiated between an employee and an employer (Rousseau, Ho, & Greenberg, 2006). These deals are customized to meet employees' specific needs and are intended to be beneficial for the organization as well, by allowing an organization to attract, retain, and motivate talent that would otherwise have been unavailable. The prevalence of i-deals suggests that employment terms are no longer standard and generic, but are differentiated across the organization at least in certain contexts. Mainstream research shows that supervisors believe i-deals would motivate the individual and result in higher performance, help them achieve higher levels of work-life balance, and can be a way of fulfilling otherwise unfulfilled obligations of the organization to the employee (Anand, Vidyarathi, Liden, & Rousseau, 2010; Anand, Hu, Vidyarathi, & Liden, 2018; Hornung, Rousseau, & Glaser, 2009). Further, i-deals may provide organizations with an expanded pool of highly qualified employees, as in the case of allowing employees to work beyond retirement (Bal, De Jong, Jansen, & Bakker, 2012).

Understanding the full implications of i-deals for employees, work groups, and organizations requires explicit consideration of the context in which they are granted and implemented. The legal, cultural, and economic context in which i-deals are negotiated will affect their prevalence, motivational value, and the potential backlash that may emerge through coworker reactions. Specifically, the very concept of i-deals assumes that employment relationships are negotiable. Rousseau (2001) referred to this idea as the "zone of negotiability." She observed that in countries like the United States (US), United Kingdom (UK), and New Zealand, very few aspects of employment conditions are legally prescribed, allowing

organizations and individuals significant leeway in negotiating the terms and conditions of employment. In contrast, she noted that France and Belgium constitute the other end of the spectrum, where many aspects of employment has less flexibility and less room for negotiation, and countries such as India and Mexico show characteristics in between. Government regulations, industry norms about employment, and prevalence of unions constitute some of the reasons why there may be constraints on i-deal use at a country level. Similarly, societal culture may facilitate or hinder how acceptable and common i-deals are likely to be. For example, it is plausible that in collectivistic cultures where ingroup harmony is given priority over individual achievement, employees will experience more discomfort with the idea of differentiated work arrangements, and prefer more uniform treatment of employees (e.g., Anand et al., 2010). Despite the importance of these country- or societal-level constraints or affordances, research on i-deals has tended to focus on individual and group level influences, neglecting an explicit study and discussion of the macro context-related factors in relation to the meaning, prevalence and implications of i-deals for employees and organizations.

In this chapter, we critically review the empirical literature on i-deals with an eye toward country- or societal-level contextual factors that are likely to vary across national borders. The management/organizational behavior research emerging from the US has been repeatedly criticized for being non-contextual, i.e., for failing to explicate the implications of the cultural and institutional context in which the investigated organizations are embedded (e.g., Rousseau & Fried, 2001). Moreover, much of the management/organizational behavior research originating outside of the US is reflective of a “pseudo etic” approach, which refers to the treatment of US theories, constructs and measures to be etic (universal), and to their unquestioning application in other societal contexts (Kim, 2001). While this approach can facilitate the identification of

universals guiding human behavior and the comparison of such universals, there is increasing criticism that a pseudo etic approach limits researchers to Western constructs of uncertain cross-cultural relevance and hinders the study of important emic (culture-specific) constructs (e.g., Katigbak, Church, Guanzon-Lapeña, Carlota & del Pilar, 2002). These concerns have resulted in calls for indigenization of research pertaining to human behavior to make them contextually appropriate (Tsui, 2004).

In sum, research traditions across the board have not encouraged a greater appreciation or investigation of the cultural and institutional context that is crucial for a complete understanding of i-deals. Therefore, the main purpose of this systematic review is to assess the extent of contextualization in the i-deals research and to summarize the insights gleaned from the relatively more contextualized studies. We are particularly interested in pointing out possible country- or societal-level influences such as the societal culture, labor market characteristics, labor laws, and the economic prosperity over emerging findings. In the following section, we present the sample of studies that constituted our review and the coding scheme that was developed to assess the issues outlined above. Next, we present the results of our evaluation and conclude with recommendations for future work on i-deals.

Method

Sample

The search, which covered the period till November 2020, was restricted to English-language journals currently indexed in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI) using the keywords idiosyncratic deals and i-deals. This criterion allowed a conservative evaluation of methodological rigor and broad selection of journals. Given

our focus, theoretical studies and literature reviews were eliminated from the sample, which resulted in a total of 74 articles, one of which was a meta-analysis.

Article Coding

All articles were initially coded for their reference information as well as whether they were single-country, multi-country (data collected from different countries but not comparatively analyzed), comparative, or mixed (combination of different countries) sample studies, which countries were investigated, and their substantive i-deals research topic (the construct itself, antecedents and/or outcomes).

To evaluate the extent of contextualization in the articles, we focused on issues pertaining to research design, sampling, and instrumentation (Wasti & Önder, 2009). In terms of research design, we evaluated whether and to what extent any national or societal-level variables (e.g., societal culture, labor market, labor laws, economic prosperity) were incorporated to the theorization of the study. It should be noted that the context, operationalized as such, can inform the research questions or the measures of single-country studies as well. In terms of sampling, we assessed if the sampling was convenience based or purposive, i.e., whether the studied countries were justified on substantive grounds in a theory-guided fashion (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). Finally, our assessment regarding instrumentation pertained to studies that used a scale developed in another country context. The use of imported scales raises concerns about construct bias, as they may not be covering all aspects relevant to the construct in the new culture (Cheung & Leung, 1998). Yet, there are often practical reasons to use an existing instrument. Hence, in addition to assessing whether there were attempts to develop contextually sensitive scales, we evaluated whether imported instruments were tested in terms of their cross-cultural validity.

The specific codes that were applied are presented below. We also took extensive notes for each coding dimension as well as for an overall evaluation.

Approach to cross-cultural research design. All articles were examined to see whether the (national/cultural) context of the study setting was explicitly incorporated to the research questions or design. Specifically, articles were classified into one of the following five categories: Low contextualization articles were studies with no or passing mention of the national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting (e.g., societal culture, labor market, labor laws, economic prosperity), studies that simply mentioned that the study context is different than mainstream research, or those that only noted the findings may not be generalizable, without elaborating in what ways. Generalizability articles were studies with no explicit hypotheses based on national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting, but with an explicit aim to test generalizability or studies with ex post facto incorporation of national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting to interpret findings. Qualitative studies that identified national or societal characteristics in their findings were also categorized in this group. Theory-driven articles advanced hypotheses based on based on national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting. Derived etic articles were studies that adapted imported theories or measures to better suit the local context by incorporating culture/context-specific theories or measures. Finally, high contextualization studies were articles that explicitly problematized the national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting for a better understanding of the phenomenon.

Sampling of culture/country. If an article explicitly justified the choice of the sample on the basis of cross-cultural theory or institutional characteristics, or explained that the sample

constituted a meaningful test of generalizability, the sampling of culture/country was coded as purposive. Otherwise, it was coded as convenience sampling.

Instrumentation. All articles were first inspected to see whether satisfactory or acceptable reliability information was provided regarding the i-deals scale. Comparative studies were assessed in terms of whether they included covariance structure analysis, or some surrogate for it as a means for ascertaining conceptual equivalence across samples. Single-country articles were coded for the validation information they contained on the i-deals scale. Possible coding options for articles using imported scales were that there was no information, reference was provided for validation in the original source language, reference was provided for validation in the local language, or that validation analyses were conducted and satisfactorily reported.

Results

The Appendix presents all the articles and a summary of their associated codes. Before presenting the results of our analysis, some general observations are worthy of reporting. Only two studies were comparative with purposive sampling (Hornung, Rousseau, Glaser, Angerer, & Weigl 2010; Ng & Feldman, 2015). Bal and Vossaert's (2019) scale development article had three studies with Dutch samples and a final study combining UK, US, European, and Asian samples. Kelly, Rofcanin, Las Heras, Ogbonnaya, Marescaux, and Bosch (2020) combined samples from Chile and Columbia; Gascoigne and Kelliher (2018) combined Dutch and British interviewees in their qualitative study. Secondly, the samples represented a wide variety of countries from around the world, namely, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Columbia, El Salvador, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, India, Italy, Kenya, Netherlands, Philippines, South Korea, Switzerland, Taiwan, Turkey, UK, US, and Vietnam. The majority of the samples were from China, Germany, Netherlands, US, and Vietnam. Finally, of the 74

studies that were examined, one was a meta-analysis, one was an experimental vignette, eight were interview studies, and the remaining vast majority were survey-based studies.

Table 1 presents a summary of the articles in terms of their approach to contextualization. The findings with respect to research design indicate that about half of the articles (51%) are “Low contextualization” articles that do not incorporate national or societal-level variables at all, despite the availability and increased awareness of cultural theories, and calls for more contextualized research (e.g., Gelfand, Aycan, Erez, & Leung, 2017; Rousseau & Fried, 2001). Note that this approach is not limited to research emanating from white, educated, industrialized, rich and democratic (WEIRD; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010) countries (e.g., Germany, Netherlands, US). Studies from countries like China, India, Kenya, and Vietnam have also derived their research questions, models and measures from the mainstream literature, without explicating their significance to their own setting. As a case in point, Wang, Liu and Shalley’s (2018) study of Chinese employees begins by discussing the popularity of i-deals in the US without a reference to their relevance in the Chinese context. In many of these studies, a passing mention is made to the study context, sometimes only in the methods section.

Insert Table 1 here

Table 1 shows that 36% of all articles were generalizability studies, which refer to studies that note that the study context is different (culturally, institutionally or economically) than those covered in the mainstream literature or speculate on the role of their study context ex post, but do not advance hypotheses as to how these differences may play out. The generalizability studies covered a wide range of countries (including Australia, Belgium, China, El Salvador, France, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Kenya, Netherlands, Philippines, South Korea, Switzerland, Vietnam, Turkey, UK, and US).

A few of these studies simply noted that the study context is different than the mainstream literature, and cautioned for generalizability. However, most were more cognizant about context. For instance, some studies in the generalizability group noted the specific characteristics of their study context to be relevant to their research question by reference to the extant literature. For instance, Rofcanin, Las Heras, Bal, van der Heijden, and Erdogan (2018) proposed and found that servant leadership, which they argued was more prevalent in Southeast Asia, contributed to managers' using their i-deals for their subordinates' benefits in the Philippines. They also noted that their findings from the high in-group collectivist and uncertainty avoidant Philippines may not generalize to other contexts. Similarly, Las Heras, van der Heijden, de Jong, and Rofcanin (2017) mentioned that El Salvador was an appropriate setting to study caregiving responsibilities and schedule i-deals, as it is characterized by collectivism and segregated gender roles. Likewise, Luu's (2017) study from Vietnam explored i-deals in public organizations noting that public organizations have greater organizational constraints, such as centralization and bureaucracy compared with private organizations, and that this was more the case in Vietnam, whose shift from central planning to market orientation is incomplete.

Several generalizability studies interpreted their findings in light of the study context. For example, Lee, Bachrach, and Rousseau (2015) argued that their study conducted in South Korea represents a conservative test of i-deals initiation as collectivism may act as a constraint due to employees' concern for group-level outcomes. Similarly, Anand and her colleagues (2018) also noted that the effects of i-deals on LMX and subsequently on citizenship behaviors may be attenuated in India, where individualized work arrangements run counter to collectivistic norms. Rofcanin, Kiefer, and Strauss (2017) discussed that in their study context, namely Turkey, paternalism was the dominant leadership style, which may have facilitated employees'

approaching their managers for i-deals. As a final example, Guerrero and Challiol-Jeanblanc (2016) argued that employee relations are less individualized in France, which in turn may contribute to greater organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) when one receives i-deals.

Some studies introduced context-specific speculations *ex post facto*, typically to explain unsupported hypotheses or unexpected findings. For example, Marescaux, De Winne, and Sels (2019) noted that the strong collective bargaining tradition in Belgium may have constrained individual negotiations for i-deals but amplified complaints in response to coworker i-deals. Across US and German samples, Hornung and colleagues (2010) found that LMX influenced negotiation of task i-deals similarly in both countries. However, factors related to hierarchy (e.g., job level) were only significant in Germany, which led the authors to propose that the high level of power distance in Germany vis-à-vis the US, that is the higher degree to which unequal distribution of power is normalized may hinder bottom up negotiation of task ideals.

Finally, in the only meta-analytic study in this review, Liao and colleagues (2016) combined US, Dutch and German samples as Western, and Chinese, Indian and South Korean samples as Eastern to assess the cross-cultural generalizability of i-deals antecedents and outcomes. Their findings showed that i-deals had similar relations to leader-member exchange (LMX), perceived organizational support (POS), job satisfaction, and proactive personality in both regions, and neither tenure nor education was significant in either region. However, they observed a strong relation to commitment and turnover in the Eastern sample, whereas i-deals did not predict commitment in the Western sample. In addition, while no relation was observed between age and i-deals in the Eastern sample, it was negatively related in the Western sample. In contrast, being female had no relation to i-deals in the Western sample, but a negative relation in the Eastern sample. It should be noted that the meta-analysis was based on a small number of

studies (e.g., two studies on turnover intentions); yet, it is suggestive regarding the role of cultural or institutional factors.

Table 1 also shows that although the percentage of theory-driven studies which develop a priori hypotheses with respect to national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting is rather low (5%). Nonetheless, these studies have investigated i-deals in contexts that provide an informative contrast to North America (namely, China and Vietnam) and question the boundary conditions of mainstream findings by drawing on constructs such as collectivism-individualism, paternalism, and Confucianism. Specifically, Luu and Djurkovic (2019) found that paternalistic leadership has a stronger influence on the i-deals of employees in Confucian societies such as Vietnam. Ng and Feldman's (2015) comparative study showed that reciprocity norms were a stronger mediator between i-deals and voice behavior in collectivist China than individualist US. Lee and Hui (2011) showed that Chinese employees who endorsed individualism to a greater extent were more likely to strike *ex ante* i-deals, despite cultural norms that may render this timing less appropriate compared to *ex post* i-deals. Finally, Liu, Lee, Hui, Kwan, and Wu (2013) found that organization-based self-esteem was a stronger mediator between i-deals and employee outcomes for employees who endorsed higher levels of individualism. In contrast, for employees with low levels of individualism, the mediating role of POS was stronger.

Our review also indicated that only two studies (3%) were derived etic studies, meaning that they had adapted mainstream i-deals theory to their particular setting. Both of these studies were conducted in China and evoked in-group collectivism and Chinese traditionalism for a better understanding of i-deals in the Chinese context. Specifically, Tang and Hornung (2015) noted that i-deals, as work role adjustments, are entangled with family life in the Chinese context. In particular, they observed that work time has priority over personal and even family

time, but primarily because a successful career brings honor and prosperity to the family (Redding, 1990). Huo, Luo, and Tam (2015) showed that i-deals elicited the highest level of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) from Chinese employees with low traditionalism and high perceived visibility of i-deals with the expectation that they would also earn i-deals. In contrast, high traditionalists facing the same circumstances exhibited lower levels of OCB.

Finally, five studies (7%) were coded as high contextualization studies in that the research question was explicitly context-driven and explored the influence of the national or societal-level characteristics on i-deals. These studies were from Australia, Netherlands, UK, and US. All these studies were very much couched in their local i.e., WEIRD circumstances, with reference to societal trends of increasing individualism, declining role of trade unions, and aging populations. For instance, with reference to the UK context, Atkinson and Sandiford (2016) noted the lack of research on flexible work arrangements specific to older workers vis-à-vis working parents. In particular, they proposed that older workers may benefit from arrangements with respect to their work-role, such as taking up less demanding roles. Similar concerns regarding how to attract older workers through individualized HRM was also expressed by Bal and Dorenbosch (2015) with respect to the Netherlands. Interestingly, none of these studies focused on understanding the implications of societal culture from an indigenous perspective. It should also be noted that more than half (60%) of these studies were qualitative, which no doubt contributed to the richness of contextual information.

We also examined the articles with respect to sampling and instrumentation. Although many studies were not particularly informative regarding the role of cultural or the institutional context, they were contributory in terms of providing further validation evidence for mainstream scales, in particular those by Hornung, Rousseau and Glaser (2008), Rosen, Slater, Chang and

Johnson (2013) and Rousseau and Kim (2006). The reported reliability and validity information was largely satisfactory, although there were a few instances where the reliability was lower than .70, often due to use of fewer items (Hornung et al., 2009; Lee & Hui, 2011; Ng & Feldman, 2015; Wang, Wang, Yao, Hsu, & Lawler, 2019). Most of the articles conceptualized i-deals as development opportunities and flexibility regarding time and work location. Finally, mirroring the large percentage of low contextualization studies, the sampling strategy used in the reviewed studies was predominantly convenience sampling. In fact, only 27% of the studies used purposive sampling, meaning they associated the characteristics of their study context to their research question (e.g., Las Heras et al., 2017; Luu & Djurkovic, 2019).

Discussion

On the occasion of the centennial issue of the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Gelfand et al. (2017) traced the development of cross-cultural research in industrial and organizational psychology/behavior by noting the advances over time. The studies that equated culture with nation and were exploratory in terms of how, why and when culture might play a role in explaining organizational outcomes were described as representing an earlier, currently outdated phase of cross-cultural organizational psychology/behavior. It seems that the cross-cultural i-deals research is still in the very early phases, with a strong need to conduct additional research in this area. We see this as an important omission and a missed opportunity. In this section, we will share our observations regarding the treatment of macro-context variables in studies of i-deals and identify themes for future research. We summarize some of these ideas in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 here

Meaning of I-Deals Around the World

An important concern in cultural research is to explore universal (i.e., etic) as well as culturally embedded (i.e., emic) constructs (Gelfand et al., 2017). Perhaps one of the main conclusions of our review is that even though the overarching context did not play a key role in study design and methodology, the fact that researchers were able to study i-deals in diverse settings and show that it was related to important outcomes of interests suggests that i-deals may be a meaningful construct of interest, and a potentially useful practice across countries. In other words, there seem to be notable similarities in how managers and employees construe and react to i-deals across the world.

That said, future research may nonetheless benefit from an exploration as to whether i-deals manifest emic or culture-specific operationalizations as well. Although our review provides strong evidence for the usefulness of the mainstream i-deals scales, there is always the possibility that an imported instrument is “underinclusive” even if it yields a structure identical to that found in the original culture (van de Vijver & Leung, 2001). Future research can challenge the meaning or construal of i-deals in various contexts. In particular, in many countries around the world, employees have to negotiate for things that WEIRD countries take for granted (Rousseau, 2005). For instance, in countries with relatively less munificent social benefits or suboptimal infrastructure, employees may negotiate for i-deals relevant to basic livelihood or family support. Along the same lines, in high power distance cultural contexts, employees may seek i-deals that may increase their access to top management or involvement in strategic decisions.

Furthermore, what makes employees “worthy” of i-deals is likely to be context-specific (Rousseau, 2005). For instance, neotraditional countries (e.g., ex-communist or developing countries; Pearce, Branyiczki, & Bigley, 2000) tend to be low trust contexts, which may encourage the provision of i-deals to foster loyalty, rather than performance. Relatedly,

collectivist cultures tend to uphold loyalty over fairness or individual performance (e.g., Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998; Haidt & Kesebir, 2010), which again may generate i-deals geared towards empowering trustworthy in-group members. Finally, as noted by Rousseau (2005), contexts characterized by lack of formal performance appraisal, or systematic employee development makes it difficult to keep legitimate i-deals distinct from favoritism. Considering that neotraditional countries or emerging economies typically have weak human resources management systems, the question as to what makes an i-deal legitimate or shady as a function of the context emerges as an important dilemma. Thus, a potentially fruitful venue for future i-deals research involves an in-depth exploration of the construct across contexts.

National Context May Shape the Prevalence of I-Deals

It is particularly important to pay explicit attention to some of the fundamental assumptions underlying i-deals in order to recognize that there may be variation across societies in the receptiveness to i-deals and therefore prevalence of i-deals. Bal and Lub (2016) underlined that i-deals are based on the assumption that individuals have bargaining power in the employment relationship, the terms of the employment relationship are negotiable, and that they have the potential to distinguish themselves from others. We agree with these observations, and contend that these assumptions may not always be meaningful, requiring researchers to develop models more suitable to the context.

The notion that employment terms are individually negotiable may be more valid in some contexts than others. Parker, Van den Broeck, and Holman (2017) predicted that i-deals would be more common in contexts where unions are disappearing, because i-deals may provide to individuals what unions may be providing in different contexts. By the same token, we may expect to see a larger percentage of employees who are able to successfully negotiate i-deals, or

even attempt to negotiate an i-deal in countries where unions are more precarious and less prevalent. Similarly, the absence of i-deals may simply indicate that those benefits are already available to everyone in that particular context. As a case in point, Conway and Coyle-Shapiro (2016) noted that flexibility i-deals may not be so important in countries such as the UK where part time work is already a legally guaranteed entitlement.

As with the observation regarding the decline of the unions, much of the i-deals research is fueled by the societal changes experienced in WEIRD countries (e.g., aging, telecommuting). It seems that a parallel analysis can be offered for other country contexts, which may be experiencing other societal or economic imperatives that might necessitate the provision of i-deals. Rousseau (2005) has argued that i-deals are sometimes created in response to past distributive injustices such as budget cuts that halt a promotion or an educational opportunity. It is possible that emerging economies are chronically inclined to renege on such promises and are more inclined to devise remedial i-deals. Emerging economy contexts also have difficulty developing and retaining human capital (Ready, Hill, & Conger, 2008). In such contexts, talent management and retention may be highly contingent on the provision of i-deals. A nation's business context with respect to mix of industries and employment concentration across sectors further influences employer responsiveness to worker requests (Rousseau, 2005). Countries with high levels of government employment or staid industries can be expected to be less responsive to individual bargaining than countries with a more dynamic private sector or a greater percentage of entrepreneurial ventures.

In addition to economic circumstances or institutional constraints, our review suggests that cultural values and norms, as reflected in leadership styles or organizational cultures, may influence the prevalence of i-deals. Specifically, Rofcanin and his colleagues (2017; 2018) have

argued that servant or paternalist leadership styles, which are more common in collectivist cultures, may be conducive to the negotiation of i-deals. Likewise, individualist cultures may also offer greater opportunity for such negotiations (e.g., Wang & Long, 2018). More generally, future research may advance our understanding of i-deals by incorporating cultural variables such as performance orientation, uncertainty avoidance, gender egalitarianism (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) and tightness-looseness, which is defined as the strength of social norms and the degree of sanctioning within societies (Gelfand et al., 2011). For instance, looser as opposed to tighter societies may be more likely to condone variance in employment contracts. In addition to prevalence, what is perhaps more interesting to explore is the different circumstances that influence the initiation of i-deals as well as the different motivations that inform their negotiation across cultural contexts. For instance, employees in high power distance cultures may be less likely to broach such possibilities to their supervisors out of a concern to observe norms regarding respect for authority. On the other hand, when a society's norms promote equality and downplay differences, employees may be similarly reluctant to initiate i-deals (Rousseau, 2005).

National Context May Shape How Employees React to I-Deals

There is reason to expect that the degree to which i-deals contribute to employee motivation, retention, and commitment may show variation depending on cultural or other macro influences. As a case in point, Liao et al.'s (2016) meta-analysis suggested that the relationship between i-deals, commitment, and turnover was significant only in Eastern cultures (China, India, and S. Korea) as opposed to Western cultures (U.S., Germany, and the Netherlands). This may be because the successful negotiation of i-deals may generate different psychological mechanisms in different contexts. For example, Liu et al. (2013) showed that for employees high

in collectivism, i-deals triggered social exchange mechanisms, whereas among individualistic employees, it was associated with self-enhancement. In fact, in different cultural contexts, employees may interpret i-deals differently. In high power distance cultures, employees may particularly appreciate i-deals as signs of their high quality relationship with their supervisors (Anand et al., 2018). In collectivistic cultures, employees may interpret an i-deal as a signal that the organization cares about the needs of the employee, which may engender social exchange processes resulting in higher levels of commitment to the organization and higher desire for reciprocation. In contrast, in individualistic cultures, employees may regard the i-deals as the organization needing them and as a signal of their market value, which may have weaker effects on commitment and the desire for reciprocation.

Even when the effects of i-deals on employee attitudes and behaviors are comparable, the specific mechanisms shaping employee reactions to i-deals may vary. For example, in collectivistic cultures, i-deals may facilitate higher levels of performance and retention by nurturing employees' sense of belongingness, whereas in individualistic cultures they may aid performance and retention by contributing to employees' sense of status and esteem. In other words, even when i-deals are equally effective across cultures, the reason for their effectiveness may show cultural variation, suggesting that an exploration of the mediating mechanisms across different cultural contexts is warranted.

National culture may also have implications for how employees react to the different distributions of i-deals in their work groups. Vidyarthi et al. (2016) examined the implications of relative i-deals, or employees' within group standing with respect to i-deals. Their study showed that having a higher level of i-deals relative to the average person on the team was advantageous for employee performance. At the same time, the positive effects of relative status were more

positive in organizations with cultures characterized by low levels of team orientation. We might expect similar effects for cultures that are individualistic. Specifically, having i-deals that are better or more favorable to the individual may serve the individual more in cultures high in individualism, whereas such favorable standing relative to one's team members may attract backlash in cultures high in collectivism. In other words, national culture may shape the implications of i-deals configurations for individuals and groups.

National Context May Shape How Coworkers React to I-Deals

An important future theme for research is an examination of how coworkers and observers react to i-deals negotiated by others. The effectiveness of i-deals depends on whether the individual benefits received from the i-deals are greater than the costs experienced through factors such as coworker backlash. For example, to the degree to which coworkers withhold help and support as a result of the focal employee's receipt of i-deals, the net benefit to the individual and organization may be minimal. Further, to the degree to which coworker backlash results in reduced benefits at the group level such as loss of group cohesion, the provision of i-deals may be highly problematic for individuals, groups, and organizations.

Research conducted in Western settings suggests that i-deals may have some benefits for coworker relationships. For example, Guerrero and Challiol-Jeanblanc (2016) showed that individuals who received i-deals perceived higher levels of OBSE, and reciprocated by helping their coworkers. However, these results are likely to be context bound, and they may be different in contexts where differentiation represents the exception rather than the norm. In contexts where egalitarian norms are more powerful, focal employees may experience higher levels of embarrassment as opposed to pride, which may result in withdrawing from their interactions with coworkers (Rousseau, 2005). Similarly, in collectivist cultures, employees may find it difficult to

be the recipient of special treatment at their peers' expense (Anand et al., 2010). These prevailing norms may also have implications as to how to measure i-deals. For instance, Anand et al. (2010) opted to measure i-deals by asking the managers rather than the employees themselves, as they were concerned that Indian employees might downplay i-deals. As a result, the cultural context is likely to matter a great deal in understanding and studying how i-deals affect interpersonal relationship dynamics.

Garg and Fulmer (2017) have theorized that coworker reactions to i-deals held by others should depend on the personal impact of such deals on themselves, and on whether they believe that the i-deal is deserved by the recipient. Their model explicitly recognizes the role of organizational norms around differentiation, with norms disallowing differentiation predicted to make i-deals less acceptable to coworkers. It is possible to make similar predictions with respect to the role of national culture. For example, collectivism is associated with an endorsement of the equality norm (Leung & Iwawaki, 1988), suggesting that in collectivistic cultures, coworkers may demonstrate more negative reactions to i-deals when they find out about them.

Because reactions to coworker i-deals are likely to depend on how individuals conceptualize what is fair, cultural values, and norms regarding definitions of fairness will play a role in understanding coworker reactions to i-deals. Research on cultural differences suggests that how individuals define what is fair depends on cultural values. For example, research shows that distributing rewards based on age may be regarded as more fair in Japan as opposed to Australia (Kashima, Siegal, Tanaka, & Isaka, 1988). Hence, coworkers may have less negative reactions and show less tendency for backlash when i-deals are awarded to older and perhaps more senior members of their group, as opposed to a high potential employee who is new to the organization.

National Context May Shape Organization-Level Benefits of I-Deals

Research linking i-deals to firm level outcomes are sparse. Still, it is important to consider labor market and other country level influences when examining the nature of the relationship between i-deals and organization level outcomes. For example, Bal and Dorenbosch (2014) showed in a study of over 5,000 organizations in Netherlands that firm-level availability and use of i-deals were related to firm-level outcomes. They also showed that these results were moderated by the percentage of older workers in the organization such that, in firms with a larger percentage of older workers, the use of flexibility i-deals were more strongly and negatively related to sickness absence. These findings may be extrapolated to country level effects such that in countries with an aging population, flexibility i-deals may become more impactful for firm level outcomes.

Conclusions

As the i-deals literature develops a greater sensitivity towards context, it is important to benefit from discussions in the broader fields of cultural psychology and organizational behavior with respect to sound methodology. For instance, with respect to comparative studies, there are many useful guidelines as to how to build multilevel models that incorporate nation- or culture-level variation to account for societal differences in organizational practices and employee attitudes (e.g., Fischer, 2009; Gelfand, Leslie, & Fehr, 2008). For single-country studies, the recent calls for high-quality indigenous research have been complemented with sound recommendations regarding how to conduct context-embedded or context-specific research (e.g., Tsui, 2004).

The greater interest in culture-sensitive research has also alerted scholars to the empirical evidence that shows substantial within-nation or intraregional divergence in cultural values due

to differences like geographic and climactic patterns, immigration history, or differential rates of economic development (e.g., Dheer, Lenartowicz, Peterson, & Petrescu, 2014). Accordingly, equating culture with nationality is being increasingly questioned. Finally, with growing intercultural contact and recognition that culture is not only a national-level variable, it has been argued that it may be more accurate to treat individuals as cultural mosaics, who are comprised of many different cultural references (e.g., nationality, profession, gender, exposure to different cultures) and retrieve these references according to the situation (e.g., Chao & Moon, 2005). Compared to traditional approaches, these dynamic views of culture have served better with respect to explicating the behaviors of biculturals, expatriates, and immigrants (Leung & Morris, 2015). As workplaces around the world become increasingly multicultural, we anticipate that the i-deals research will naturally evolve to reflect these concerns.

References

- Anand, S., Hu, J., Vidyarthi, P., & Liden, R.C. (2018). Leader-member exchange as a linking pin in the idiosyncratic deals - performance relationship in workgroups. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29, 698-708.
- Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P., Liden, R. C., & Rousseau, D.M. (2010). Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 970-988. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.54533176>.
- Atkinson, C., & Sandiford, P. (2016). An exploration of older worker flexible working arrangements in smaller firms. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26, 12-28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12074>.
- *Bal, P.M. (2017). Why do employees negotiate idiosyncratic deals? An exploration of the process of i-deal negotiation. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 42, 2-18.
- *Bal P. M., & Boehm S. A. (2019). How do I-deals influence client satisfaction? The role of exhaustion, collective commitment, and age diversity. *Journal of Management*, 45, 1461-1487. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317710722>
- *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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2011.01026.x>
- Bal, P. M., & Dorenbosch, L. (2014). Age-related differences in the relations between individualised HRM and organisational performance: A large-scale employer survey. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25, 41-61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12058>.

- Bal, M., & Lub, X. D. (2016). Individualization of work arrangements: A contextualized perspective on the rise and use of i-deals. In M. Bal & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Current issues in work and organizational psychology. Idiosyncratic deals between employees and organizations: Conceptual issues, applications and the role of co-workers* (pp. 9-23). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bal, M., & Vossaert, L. (2019). Development of an i-deals motivation and management measure. *Journal of Personnel Psychology* 18, 201-215. <https://doi.org/10.1027/18665888/a000236>.
- *Broschak, J. P., & Davis-Blake, A. (2006). Mixing standard work and nonstandard deals: The consequences of heterogeneity in employment arrangements. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 371–393. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.20786085>
- *Brzykcy, A., Boehm, S., & Baldrige, D. (2019). Fostering sustainable careers across the lifespan: The role of disability, idiosyncratic deals and perceived work ability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 112, 185-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.02.001>.
- *Çalışkan, E., & Torun, A. (2019). Individualized HR practices and idiosyncratic deals (I Deals) and the expected positive individual and organizational outcomes. *Istanbul Business Research*, 48, 36-63. <https://doi.org/10.26650/ibr.2019.48.0016>.
- Chao, G. T., & Moon, H. (2005). The cultural mosaic: A meta-theory for understanding the complexity culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1128-1140. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1128>.
- Cheung, F. M., & Leung, K. (1998). Indigenous personality measures: Chinese examples. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 233–248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198291012>.

- Conway, N., & Coyle-Shapiro, J. A-M. (2016). Not so i-deal: A critical review of idiosyncratic-deals theory and research. In: M. Bal and D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Idiosyncratic deals between employees and organizations: Conceptual issues, applications and the role of co-workers*. (pp. 36-64). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- *Davis, A.S., & Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2018). Reciprocity matters: Idiosyncratic deals to shape the psychological contract and foster employee engagement in times of austerity. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 29, 329-355.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21327>.
- *De Menezes, L.M. & Kelliher, C. (2016). Flexible Working, Individual Performance, and Employee Attitudes: Comparing Formal and Informal Arrangements. *Human Resource Management*, 56, 1051-1070. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21822>.
- *De Vos, A., & Cambré, B.(2016). Career management in high-performing organizations: A set theoretic approach. *Human Resource Management*, 56, 501-518.
- Dheer, R., Lenartowicz, T., Peterson, M. F., & Petrescu, M. (2014). Cultural regions of Canada and United States: Implications for international management research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 14, 343–384.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595814543706>.
- *Ding, C. G., & Chang, Y. W. (2019). Effects of task and work responsibilities idiosyncratic deals on perceived insider status and the moderating roles of perceived overall justice and coworker support. *Review of Managerial Science*, 14, 1341-1361.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-019_00335-6.
- Doney, P. M., Cannon, J. P., & Mullen, M. R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national

culture on the development of trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23, 601–620.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/259297>.

Fischer, R. (2009). Where is culture in cross cultural research? An outline of a multilevel research process for measuring culture as a shared meaning system. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 9, 25-49.

Garg, S., & Fulmer, I. (2017). Ideal or an ordeal for organizations?: The spectrum of co-worker reactions to idiosyncratic deals. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 7, 281-305.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386617733136>.

*Gascoigne, C., & Kelliher, C. (2018). The transition to part-time: How professionals negotiate ‘reduced time and workload’ i-deals and craft their jobs. *Human Relations*, 71, 103-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726717722394>.

*Gajendran, R. S., Harrison, D. A., & Delaney-Klinger, K. (2015). Are telecommuters remotely good citizens? Unpacking telecommuting's effects on performance via i-deals and job resources. *Personnel Psychology*, 68, 353–393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12082>

Gelfand, M. J., Aycan, Z., Erez, M., & Leung, K. (2017). Cross-cultural industrial organizational psychology and organizational behavior: A hundred-year journey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 514–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000186>.

Gelfand, M. J., Leslie, L. M. & Fehr, R. (2008). To prosper, organizational psychology should... adopt a global perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 493-517.

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... & Aycan, Z. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332, 1100-1104. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1197754>.

- *Guerrero, S., Bentein, K., & Lapalme, M.E. (2017). Idiosyncratic deals and high performers' organizational commitment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29, 323–334.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9316-7>.
- Guerrero, S., & Challiol-Jeanblanc, H. C. (2016). Idiosyncratic deals and helping behavior: The moderating role of i-deal opportunity for co-workers. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 31, 433-443. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-015-9421-x>.
- *Guerrero, S., & Challiol-Jeanblanc, H. C. (2017). Ex ante i-deals, perceived external prestige and turnover intentions. *Personnel Review*, 46, 1199-1212. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2015-0271>. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2015-0115>.
- *Guerrero, S., & Challiol-Jeanblanc, H.C. (2017). Networking and development idiosyncratic deals. *Career Development International*, 22, 816-828. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-01-2017-0017>.
- *Guerrero, S., & Challiol-Jeanblanc, H.C., Veilleux, M. (2016). Development idiosyncratic deals and career success. *Career Development International*, 21, 19-30.
- Haidt, J., & Kesebir, S. (2010). Morality. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (p. 797–832). John Wiley & Sons Inc.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470561119.socpsy002022>.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61-83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., & Glaser, J. (2008). Creating flexible work arrangements through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 655-664.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.655>.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., & Glaser, J. (2009). Why supervisors make idiosyncratic deals:

- Antecedents and outcomes of i-deals from a managerial perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24, 738-764. <https://doi.org/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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.625>
- *Hornung, S., Rousseau, D.M., Weigl, M., Müller, A., & Glaser, J. (2014). Redesigning work through idiosyncratic deals. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23, 608-626. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.740171>.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Huo, W.W., Luo, J. L., & Tam, K. L. (2015). Idiosyncratic deals and good citizens in China: The role of traditionality for recipients and their coworkers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25, 3157-3177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.919949>
- Kashima, Y., Siegal, M., Tanaka, K., & Isaka, H. (1988). Universalism in lay conceptions of distributive justice: A cross-cultural examination. *International Journal of Psychology*, 23, 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207598808247752>.
- Katigbak, M. S., Church, A. T., Guanzon-Lapeña, M. A., Carlota, A. J., & del Pilar, G. H. (2002). Are indigenous personality dimensions culture specific? Philippine inventories and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.89>.
- *Katou, A. A., Budhwar, P. S., & Dhiman, M. C. (2020). The moderating effects of

transformational leadership and self-worth in the idiosyncratic deals - employee reactions relationship: A study of Indian hospitality industry. *Personnel Review*, 49(7), 1399-1418.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2019-0596>.

*Katou, A. A., Budhwar, P.S.& Patel, C. (2020). Idiosyncratic deals in less competitive labor markets: testing career i-deals in the Greek context of high uncertainties. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-28.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1759672>

Kelly, C., Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Ogbonnaya, C., Marescaux, E., & Jose Bosch, M. (2020). Seeking an "i-deal" balance: Schedule-flexibility i-deals as mediating mechanisms between supervisor emotional support and employee work and home performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 118.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103369>.

Kim, U. (2001). Culture, science and indigenous psychologies: An integrated analysis. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *Handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 51–76). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Kimwolo, A. & Cheruiyot, T. (2019). Intrinsically motivating idiosyncratic deals and innovative work behaviour. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 11, 31-47.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-05-2017-0038>.

*Kossek, E., Ollier-Malaterre, A., Lee, M., Pichler, S., & Hall, D. (2016). Line Managers' Rationales for Professionals' Reduced-Load Work in Embracing and Ambivalent Organizations. *Human Resource Management*, 55, 143-171.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21722>.

*Kong, D.T., Ho, V.T. & Garg, S. (2020). Employee and Coworker Idiosyncratic Deals:

- Implications for Emotional Exhaustion and Deviant Behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 164, 593-609. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4033-9>.
- Las Heras, M., Rofcanin, Y., Bal, P. M., & Stollberger, J. (2017). How do flexibility ideals relate to work performance? Exploring the roles of family performance and organizational context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38, 1280-1294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2203>.
- Las Heras, M., Van der Heijden, B., De Jong, J., & Rofcanin, Y. (2017). 'Handle with care': The mediating role of i-deals in the relationship between supervisors' care-giving responsibilities and employee outcomes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27, 335–349. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12160>
- *Lai, L., Rousseau, D. M., & Chang, K. T. T. (2009). Idiosyncratic deals: Coworkers as interested third parties. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94 , 547–556. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013506>.
- Lee, C., & Hui, C. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of idiosyncratic deals: A frame of resource exchange. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 5(3), 380-401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11782-011-0136-1>
- *Lee, B-Y., Kim, T-Y., Gong, Y., Zheng, X., & Liu, X. (2020). Employee well-being attribution and job change intentions: The moderating effect of task idiosyncratic deals. *Human Resources Management*, 59 ,327–338. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21998>.
- Lee, J. Y., Bachrach, D. G., & Rousseau, D. M. (2015). Internal labor markets, firm-specific human capital, and heterogeneity antecedents of employee idiosyncratic deal requests. *Organization Science*, 26, 794-810. <https://doi.org/10.1287/2014.0955>.

- Lee, C., & Hui, C. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of idiosyncratic deals: A frame of resource exchange. *Frontiers in Business Research in China*, 5, 380-401.
<https://doi10.1007/s11782-011-0136>.
- *Lemmon, G., Westring, A., Michel, E. J., Wilson, M. S., & Glibkowski, B.C (2016). A cross-domain exploration of performance benefits and costs of idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 23, 440-455. DOI: 10.1177/1548051816645748
- Leung, K., & Iwawaki, S. (1988). Cultural collectivism and distributive behavior. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19, 35-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002188019001003>
- Leung, K., & Morris, M.W. (2015). Values, schemas, and norms in the culture-behavior nexus: A situated dynamics framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46, 1-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.66>.
- *Liao, C., Wayne, S., & Rousseau, D.M. (2014). Idiosyncratic deals in contemporary organizations: A qualitative and meta-analytical review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, 9-29.
- *Liao, C., Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., & Meuser, J. D. (2017). Idiosyncratic deals and individual effectiveness: The moderating role of leader-member exchange differentiation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28, 438–450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.014>.
- Liao, C., Wayne, S., & Rousseau, D.M. (2016). Idiosyncratic deals in contemporary organizations: A qualitative and meta-analytical review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, 9-29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1959>.
- Liu, J., Lee, C., Hui, C., Kwan, H. K., & Wu, L. Z. (2013). Idiosyncratic deals and employee outcomes: The mediating roles of social exchange and self-enhancement and the moderating role of individualism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 832-40.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032571>.

- *Liu, F., & Zhou, K. (2020). Idiosyncratic deals and creative deviance: the mediating role of psychological entitlement. *R&D Management*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12430>.
- Luu, L. T., & Djurkovic, N. (2019). Paternalistic leadership and idiosyncratic deals in a healthcare context. *Management Decision*, 57, 621-648. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-06-2017-0595>.
- Luu, L. T. (2017). Administrative error control: The role of value-based HR practices, i-deals and organizational politics. *International Public Management Journal*, 20, 648-674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2016.1269858>.
- *Luu, L. T. (2016). Organizational ambidexterity, entrepreneurial orientation, and i-deals: The moderating role of CSR. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135, 145-159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2476-1>.
- *Luu, L.T., & Rowley, C. (2016). The relationship between cultural intelligence and i-deals: Trust as a mediator and HR localization as a moderator. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 24, 908-931. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-03-2015-0848>.
- *Luu, L.T., & Rowley, C. (2015). From value-based human resource practices to i-deals: software companies in Vietnam. *Personnel Review*, 44(1), 39-68. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2013-0151>.
- *Lukseyte, A., & Spitzmueller, C. (2016). When are overqualified employees creative? It depends on contextual factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, 635–653. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2054>. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2054>.

- Marescaux, E., & De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2019). Idiosyncratic deals from a distributive justice perspective: Examining co-workers' voice behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *154*, 263-281. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3400-7>.
- *Morf, M., Bakker, A., & Feierabend, A. (2019). Bankers closing idiosyncratic deals: Implications for organisational cynicism. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *29*, 585-599. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12245>
- *Neirotti, P., Raguseo, E., & Gastaldi, L. (2019). Designing flexible work practices for job satisfaction: the relationship between job characteristics and work disaggregation in different types of work arrangements. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, *34*, 116-138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12141>.
- *Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). Idiosyncratic deals and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *76*, 419- 427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.10.006>
- *Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2012). Breaches of past promises, current job alternatives, and promises of future idiosyncratic deals: Three-way interaction effects on organizational commitment. *Human Relations*, *65*, 1463–1486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712453472>.
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2015). Idiosyncratic deals and voice behavior. *Journal of Management*, *41*, 893–928. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312457824>.
- *Ng, T. W. H., & Lucianetti, L. (2016). Goal striving, idiosyncratic deals, and job behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*, 41–60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2023>.
- *Ng, T. W. H. (2017). Can idiosyncratic deals promote perceptions of competitive climate, felt ostracism, and turnover? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *99*, 118–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.01.004>

- *Ostrom, J.K., Pennings, M., & Bal, P.M. (2016). How do idiosyncratic deals contribute to the employability of older workers?. *Career Development International*, 21(2), 176-192. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2015-0112>.
- Parker, S. K., Van den Broeck, A., & Holman, D. (2017). Work design influences: A synthesis of multilevel factors that affect the design of jobs. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11, 267-308. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0054>.
- Pearce, J. L., Branyiczki, I., & Bigley, G. A. (2000). Insufficient bureaucracy: Trust and commitment in particularistic organizations. *Organization Science*, 11, 148-162.
- Ready, D. A., Hill, L. A., & Conger, J. A. (2008). Winning the race for talent in emerging markets. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(11), 62-70. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.2.148.12508>.
- Redding, S. G. M. (1990). An empirical study of overseas Chinese managerial ideology. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 629-641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207599008247917>.
- *Rofcanin, Y., Berber, A., Koch, S., & Sevinc, L. (2016). Job crafting and i-deals: A study testing the nomological network of proactive behaviors. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(22), 2695–2726. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1091370>
- Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T., & Strauss, K. (2017). What seals the i-deal? Exploring the role of employees' behaviours and managers' emotions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 90, 203-224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12168>.
- Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Bal, M., van der Heijden, B. & Erdogan, D. (2018). A

- trickle-down model of task and development i-deals. *Human Relations*, *71*, 1508-1534.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726717751613>.
- *Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Jose Bosch, M., Stollberger, J., & Mayer, M. (2020). How do weekly obtained task i-deals improve work performance? The role of relational context and structural job resources. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1833858>.
- *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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310394865>.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2001). Idiosyncratic deals: Flexibility versus fairness. *Organizational Dynamics*, *29*, 260–273. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(01\)00032-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(01)00032-8).
- Rousseau, D. M. (2005). I-deals, idiosyncratic deals employees bargain for themselves. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Rousseau, D. M., & Fried, A. Y. (2001). Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *11*, 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.78>.
- Rousseau, D. M., Ho, V. T., & Greenberg, J. (2006). I-deals: Idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*, 977-994.
<https://doi.org/102307/20159261>
- *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*(3), 338–348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.02.004>.

- Rousseau, D. M., & Kim, T. (2006). *Idiosyncratic deals: How negotiating their own employment conditions affects workers' relationships with an employer*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the British Academy of Management, Oxford, UK.
- Tang, Y. P., & Hornung, S. (2015). Work-family enrichment through I-deals: Evidence from Chinese employees. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 30, 940-954.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-02-2013-0064>
- *Townsend, K., McDonald, P., & Cathcart, A. (2017). Managing flexible work arrangements in small not-for-profit firms: The influence of organisational size, financial constraints and workforce characteristics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14, 2085-2107.<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1136671>.
- Tsui, A. S. (2004). Contributing to global management knowledge: A case for high quality indigenous research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 21, 491-513.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:APJM.0000048715.35108.a7>.
- Wang, S. H., Liu, Y., & Shalley, C. E. (2018). Idiosyncratic deals and employee creativity: The mediating role of creative self-efficacy. *Human Resource Management*, 57, 1443-1453.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21917>
- Wang, L.L., & Long, L. R. (2018). Idiosyncratic deals and taking charge: The roles of psychological empowerment and organizational tenure. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46, 1437-1448. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7084>.
- Wang, P., Wang, S., Yao, X., & Hsu, I., & Lawler, J. (2019). Idiosyncratic deals and work to family conflict and enrichment: The mediating roles of fit perceptions and efficacy beliefs. *Human Resource Management Journal* 29, 600-619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12246>.

Wasti, S. A., & Önder, Ç. (2009). Commitment across cultures: Progress, pitfalls, and propositions. In H. Klein, T. E., Becker, and J. P. Meyer (Eds.), *Commitment in organizations: Accumulated wisdom and new directions*. (pp. 309-343). New York: Routledge Academic.

van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

van de Vijver, F. J. R. & Leung, K. (2001). Personality in cultural context: methodological issues. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 1007-1031. [https://doi.org/ 10.1111/1467-6494.696173](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.696173).

*Vidyarthi, P., Chaudhry, A., Anand, S., & Liden, R.C. Flexibility i-deals: how much is ideal? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29, 246-265. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-07-2012-0225>.

Vidyarthi, P. R., Singh, S., Erdogan, B., Chaudhry, A., Posthuma, R., & Anand, S. (2016). Individual deals within teams: Investigating the role of relative i-deals for employee performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 1536-1552. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000145>.

Table 1
Approach to Cross-Cultural Research Design

	Low contextualization	Generalizability	Theory-driven	Derived etic	High contextualization
Comparative	0	1	1	0	0
Mixed	1	1	0	0	0
Multi-country	0	1	0	0	0
Single-country	36	22	3	2	5
Total	37 (51%)	25 (34%)	4 (5%)	2 (3%)	5 (7%)

Note. The numbers represent the number of articles and the percentages are provided in parentheses. The meta-analytic study by Liao, Wayne and Rousseau (2014) is not included in the calculations.

Low contextualization: Studies with no or passing mention of the national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting (e.g., societal culture, labor market, labor laws, economic prosperity); studies that simply note the study context is different than mainstream research; studies that note the findings may not be generalizable

Generalizability: Studies with no explicit hypotheses based on national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting, but with an explicit aim to test generalizability; studies with ex post facto incorporation of national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting to interpret findings; qualitative studies that identify the relevance of national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting

Theory-driven: Studies advancing theoretical hypotheses based on national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting

Derived etic: Studies adapting imported theories and methods to better suit the local context by incorporating culture/context-specific or culture/context-salient theories or measures

High contextualization: Studies that problematize the national or societal-level characteristics of the study setting for a better understanding of the phenomenon

Table 2
Summary Ideas for Future Research

Topic	Ideas
Measurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the currently used measures do an adequate job capturing the entire domain of i-deals in different contexts? • Do the measures of i-deal show measurement equivalence in different cultural contexts? • Are there emic dimensions of i-deals that have been neglected in the extant literature?
Antecedents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What makes employees worthy of i-deals in different contexts? • What cultural, economic or legal factors affect the initiation or the prevalence of i-deals? • How do societal or demographic trends affect different types of i-deals that are negotiated?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What cultural, economic or legal influences shape employee reactions to i-deals? • Does culture shape the mechanisms by which i-deals affect employee attitudes and behaviors? • Do i-deals similarly affect organizational outcomes in different cultural or institutional contexts? • Does culture influence how and why employees react to how their i-deals compare to those of their coworkers?
Coworker reactions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does culture affect how coworkers react to others' i-deals? • Are i-deals perceived to be differentially fair depending on cultural variation?

Appendix

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Journal of Management	Bal, P.M., & Boehm, S.A.(2019)	How do i-Deals influence client satisfaction? The role of exhaustion, collective commitment, and age diversity	Germany	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Not reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Management Studies	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	Netherlands	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Academy of Management Journal	Broschak, J.P., & Davis-Blake, A. (2006)	Mixing standard work and non-standard deals seals: The consequences of heterogeneity in employment arrangements	US	Survey	Employment arrangement heterogeneity was assessed by Blau's index(1977)	NA	NA	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Istanbul Business Research	Çalışkan, E., & Torun, A.(2019)	Individualized HR practices and idiosyncratic deals (I-deals) and the expected positive individual and organizational outcomes	Turkey	Interview	-	-	-	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Human Resource Management	De Menezes, L.M. & Kelliher, C. (2016)	Flexible working, individual performance, and employee attitudes: Comparing formal and informal arrangements	UK	Survey	single item	NA	NA	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Human Resource Management	De Vos; A.,& Cambré, B.(2017)	Career management in high-performing organizations: A set-theoretic approach	Belgium	Survey	Bal et al. (2012)	NA	NA	Convenience	Low contextualization	None

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Review of Managerial Science	Ding, C.G. & Chang, Y. W. (2019)	Effects of task and work responsibilities idiosyncratic deals on perceived insider status and the moderating roles of perceived overall justice and coworker support	Taiwan	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Personnel Psychology	Gajendran, Harrison & Delaney_-Klinger (2015)	Are telecommuters remotely good citizens? Unpacking telecommuting's effects on performance via i-deals and job resources	US	Survey	One item i-deals as Tele-commuting (Thatcher & Zhu, 2006) telecommuting intensity (Golden & Veiga, 2005)	NA	NA	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Business and Psychology	Guerrero, S., Bentein, K., & Lapalme, M.E.(2014)	Idiosyncratic deals and high performers' organizational commitment	Canada	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Personnel Review	Guerrero, S., & Challiol-Jeanblanc, H (2017)	Ex ante i-deals, perceived external prestige and turnover intentions	France	Survey	Rousseau et al. (2009)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Career Development International	Guerrero, S. Challiol-Jeanblanc, H & Veilleux, M.(2016)	Development idiosyncratic deals and career success	France	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Career Development International	Guerrero, S., & Jeanblanc, H.C. (2017)	Networking and development idiosyncratic deals	France	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Psychological Reports	Hornung, S., Glaser, J., Rousseau, D.M., Angerer, P., & Weigl, M.(2011)	Employee-oriented leadership and quality of working life: Mediating roles of idiosyncratic deals	Germany	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Applied Psychology	Hornung, S., Rousseau, D.M., & Glaser, J (2008)	Creating flexible work arrangements through idiosyncratic deals	Germany	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Managerial Psychology	Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., & Glaser, J. (2009)	Why supervisors make idiosyncratic deals: antecedents and outcomes of i-deals from a managerial perspective	Germany	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Acceptable	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology	Hornung, S., Rousseau, D.M., Weigl, M., Müller, A., & Glaser, J.(2014)	Redesigning work through idiosyncratic deals	Germany	Survey	Hornung et al. 2010	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Vocational Behavior	Kelly, C., Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Ogbonnaya, C., Marescaux, E., & Jose Bosch, M.(2020)	Seeking an “i-deal” balance: Schedule-flexibility i-deals as mediating mechanisms between supervisor emotional support and employee work and home performance	Chile and Colombia	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Business Ethics	Kong, D.T., Ho, V.T., & Garg, S (2020)	Employee and coworker idiosyncratic deals: Implications for emotional exhaustion and deviant behaviors	US	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Journal of Applied Psychology	Lai, L., Rousseau, D.M., & Chang, K.T.T.(2009)	Idiosyncratic deals: Coworkers as interested third parties	US	Survey	Lai et al. (2009)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Human Resource Management	Lee, B.Y., Kim, T.Y., Gong, Y., Zheng, X., & Liu, X. (2020)	Employee well-being attribution and job change intentions: The moderating effect of task idiosyncratic deals	China	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies	Lemmon, G., Westring, A., Michel, E. J., Wilson, M. S., & Glibkowski, B.C (2016)	A cross-domain exploration of performance benefits and costs of idiosyncratic deals	US	Survey	Rousseau (2005)	Satisfactory	Not reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Leadership Quarterly	Liao, C., Wayne, S.J., Liden, R. C., & Meuser, J.D.(2017)	Idiosyncratic deals and individual effectiveness: The moderating role of leader-member exchange differentiation	US	Survey	Hornung et al. (2014)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
R&D Management	Liu, F., & Zhou, K.(2020)	Idiosyncratic deals and creative deviance: The mediating role of psychological entitlement	China	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Organizational Behavior	Luksyte & Spitzmueller (2015)	When are overqualified employees creative? It depends on contextual factors	US	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Not reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Journal of Business Ethics	Luu, T.L. (2016)	Organizational ambidexterity, entrepreneurial orientation, and I-deals: The moderating role of CSR	Vietnam	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Human Resource Management Journal	Morf, M., Bakker, A., & Feierabend, A. (2019)	Bankers closing idiosyncratic deals: Implications for organisational cynicism	Switzerland	Survey	Hornung et al (2010)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Vocational Behavior	Ng, T.W.H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010)	Idiosyncratic deals and organizational commitment	US	Survey	Rousseau et al. (2009)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Human Relations	Ng, T.W.H., & Feldman, D. C. (2012)	Breaches of past promises, current job alternatives, and promises of future idiosyncratic deals: Three-way interaction effects on organizational commitment	US	Survey	Ng and Feldman (2010)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Organizational Behavior	Ng, T. W.H., & Lucianetti, L.(2016)	Goal striving, idiosyncratic deals, and job behavior	Italy	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Vocational Behavior	Ng,T.W.H. (2017)	Can idiosyncratic deals promote perceptions of competitive climate, felt ostracism, and turnover?	Hong Kong	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Journal of Management	Rosen, C. C., Slater, D. J., Chang, C-H., & Johnson, R. E. (2011)	Let's make a deal: Development and validation of the ex post I-deals scale	US	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Vocational Behavior	Rousseau, D.M., Hornung, S., & Kim, T.G. (2009)	Idiosyncratic deals: Testing propositions on timing, content, and the employment relationship	US	Survey	Rousseau, Hornung & Kim (2009)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Personnel Review	Luu, T.L., & Rowley, C.(2015)	From value-based human resource practices to i-deals: software companies in Vietnam	Vietnam	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Managerial Psychology	Vidyarathi, P., Chaudhry, A., Anand, S., & Liden, R.C.(2014)	Flexibility i-deals: How much is ideal?	India	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Journal of Applied Psychology	Vidyarathi, P.R., Singh, S., & Erdogan, B., Chaudhry, A., Posthuma, R., & Anand, S. (2016)	Individual deals within teams: Investigating the role of relative i-deals for employee performance	India	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal	Wang, L.L., & Long, L. R. (2018)	Idiosyncratic deals and taking charge: The roles of psychological empowerment and organizational tenure	China	Survey	Ng and Feldman (2010)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None
Human Resource Management	Wang, S. H., Liu, Y., Shalley, C. E.(2018)	Idiosyncratic deals and employee creativity: The mediating role of creative self-efficacy	China	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Low contextualization	None

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Leadership Quarterly	Anand, S.Hu, J., Vidyarthi, P. & Liden, R.C. (2018)	Leader-member exchange as a linking pin in the idiosyncratic deals: Performance relationship in workgroups	India	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Collectivism
Academy of Management Journal	Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P., Liden, R. C., & Rousseau, D.M.(2010)	Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality	India	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Collectivism
New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations	Bal, M. (2017)	Why do employees negotiate idiosyncratic deals? An exploration of the process of i-deal negotiation	Netherlands	Interview	NA	NA	NA	Convenience	Generalizability	Legislation, labor agreements
Journal of Personnel Psychology	Bal, M., & Vossaert, L.(2019)	Development of an ideals motivation and management measure	Netherlands, UK, US, Europe and Asia samples	Scale development study	Bal & Vossaert (2019)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	None
International Journal of Human Resource Management	Bayazit, Z.E., & Bayazit, M. (2019)	How do flexible work arrangements alleviate work-family-conflict? The roles of flexibility i-deals and family-supportive cultures	Turkey	Survey	Hornung, Rousseau and Weigl et al. (2009)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	Collectivism, performance orientation, institutional collectivism, uncertainty avoidance
Journal of Vocational Behavior	Brzykcyca, A. Z., & Stephan A., Boehma, D. & Baldrige, C. (2019)	Fostering sustainable careers across the lifespan: The role of disability, idiosyncratic deals and perceived work ability	Germany	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	Legislation

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Human Relations	Gascoigne, C. & Kelliher, C. (2018)	The transition to part-time: How professionals negotiate “reduced time and workload” i-deals and craft their jobs	Netherlands and UK	Interview	NA	NA	NA	Convenience	Generalizability	Legislation
Journal of Business and Psychology	Guerrero & Challiol-Jeanblanc, H. (2016)	Idiosyncratic deals and helping behavior: The moderating role of i-deal opportunity for co-workers	France	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Less individualized nature of work relations
Journal of Organizational Behavior	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	Germany and US	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Power distance
International Human Resource Management	Katou, A.A., Budhwar, P.S., & Patel, C (2020)	Idiosyncratic deals in less competitive labor markets: testing career i-deals in the Greek context of high uncertainties	Greece	Survey	Rousseau et al (2009), Hornung et al (2014)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	High uncertainty (economic crisis)
Personnel Review	Katou, A. A., Budhwar, P. S., & Dhiman, M. C.(2020)	The moderating effects of transformational leadership and self-worth in the idiosyncratic deals – employee reactions relationship A study of Indian hospitality industry	India	Survey	Rousseau et al. (2009) Hornung et al. (2014)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	National differences in zone of negotiability

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
International Journal of Innovation Science	Kimwolo, A. A., & Cheruiyot, T. (2019)	Intrinsically motivating idiosyncratic deals and innovative work behaviour	Kenya	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Importance of family values, rareness of labor specialization
Human Resource Management	Kossek, E., Ollier-Malaterre, A., Lee, M., Pichler, S., & Hall, D. (2016)	Line managers' rationales for professionals' reduced load work in embracing and ambivalent organizations	US and Canada	Interview	NA	NA	NA	Convenience	Generalizability	Norms and public policy systems regarding career flexibility
Journal of Organizational Behavior	Las Heras, M. Rofcanin, Y. Bal, P. M., & Stollberger, J (2017)	How do flexibility i-deals relate to work performance? Exploring the roles of family performance and organizational context	El Salvador	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	None
Human Resource Management Journal	Las Heras, M., Van der Heijden, B., De Jong, J., & Rofcanin, Y (2017).	Handle with care [®] : The mediating role of schedule i-deals in the relationship between supervisors' own caregiving responsibilities and employee outcomes	El Salvador	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	Collectivism and segregated gender roles
Organization Science	Lee, J. Y., Bachrach, D. G., & Rousseau, D.M. (2015)	Internal labor markets, firm-specific human capital, and heterogeneity antecedents of employee idiosyncratic deal requests	S. Korea	Survey	Lee, Bachrach, & Rousseau (2015)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	Collectivism

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Journal of Organizational Behavior	Liao, C., Wayne, S., & Rousseau, D.M.(2014)	Idiosyncratic deals in contemporary organizations: A qualitative and meta-analytic review	US, Germany, Netherlands (West) and China, India, S. Korea (East)	Meta analytical review	Reviewed all the scales	NA	NA	Convenience	Generalizability	East versus West comparison
International Public Management Journal	Luu, T. L. (2017)	Administrative error control the role of value based HR practices, i-deals and organizational politics	Vietnam	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	Transition from a centrally-planned economy
Journal of Business Ethics	Marescaux, E., De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2019)	Idiosyncratic deals from a distributive justice perspective: Examining co-workers' voice behavior	Belgium	Experimental vignette study	NA	NA	NA	Convenience	Generalizability	Strong collective bargaining tradition
New Technology, Work and Employment	Neirotti, P., Raguseo, E., & Gastaldi, L. (2019)	Designing flexible work practices for job satisfaction: the relationship between job characteristics and work disaggregation in different types of work arrangements	Italy	Survey	Golden & Veiga (2005)	Satisfactory	Not reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Individualism-collectivism
International Journal of Human Resource Management	Rofcanin, Y., Berber, A., Koch, S., & Sevinc, L.(2016)	Job crafting and I-deals: a study testing the nomological network of proactive behaviors	Turkey	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	Power distance, high uncertainty avoidance; non-Western context, emerging economy

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Human Relations	Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Bal, M., van der Heijden, B. & Erdogan, D.(2018)	A trickle-down model of task and development i-deals	Philippines	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	Ingroup collectivism, uncertainty avoidance
European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology	Rofcanin, Y., Las Heras, M., Bosch, M.J., Stollberger, J., & Mayer, M.(2020)	How do weekly obtained task i-deals improve work performance? The role of relational context and structural job resources	Turkey	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Paternalism
Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology	Rofcanin, Y., Kiefer, T., & Strauss, K.(2017)	What seals the I-deal? Exploring the role of employees' behaviours and managers' emotions	Turkey	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Generalizability	Paternalism
International Journal of Organizational Analysis	Luu, T.L., & Rowley, C.(2016)	The relationship between cultural intelligence and i-deals: Trust as a mediator and HR localization as a moderator	Vietnam	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Emerging economy, collectivism
Human Resource Management Journal	Wang, P., Wang, S., Yao, X., I-C, Hsu & Lawler, J. (2019)	Idiosyncratic deals and work to family conflict and enrichment: The mediating roles of fit perceptions and efficacy beliefs	China	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Acceptable	Reported	Convenience	Generalizability	Collectivism
Frontiers of Business Research in China	Lee, C., & Hui, C. (2011)	Antecedents and consequences of idiosyncratic deals: A frame of resource exchange	China	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Unsatisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Theory-driven	Individualism

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Journal of Applied Psychology	Liu, J., Lee, C., Hui, C., Kwan, H.K., & Wu, L. Z.(2013)	Idiosyncratic deals and employee outcomes: The mediating roles of social exchange and self-enhancement and the moderating role of individualism	China	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Convenience	Theory-driven	Individualism
Journal of Management	Ng, T.W.H., & Feldman, D. C. (2015)	Idiosyncratic deals and voice behavior	China and US	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Acceptable	Reported	Purposive	Theory driven	Individualism-collectivism
International Human Resource Management	Huo, W.W. Luo, J.L., & Tam, K. L. (2015)	Idiosyncratic deals and good citizens in China: the role of traditionality for recipients and their coworkers	China	Survey	Rousseau & Kim (2006)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Derived etic	Chinese traditionalism
Management Decision	Luu, T. T., & Djurkovic, N. (2019)	Paternalistic leadership and idiosyncratic deals in a healthcare context	Vietnam	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Derived etic	Paternalism
Journal of Managerial Psychology	Tang, Y.P., & Hornung, S. (2015)	Work-family enrichment through I-Deals: evidence from Chinese employees	China	Survey	Hornung et al. (2008)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	Derived etic	Ingroup collectivism
Human Resource Management Journal	Atkinson, C., & Sandiford, P. (2016)	An exploration of older worker flexible working arrangements in smaller firms	UK	Interview	NA	NA	NA	Purposive	High contextualization	National trends regarding aging
Human Resource Management Journal	Bal, P.M., & Dorenbosch, L. (2014)	Age-related differences in the relations between individualised HRM and organisational performance: A large-scale employer survey	Netherlands	Survey	Single item	NA	NA	Purposive	High contextualization	National trends regarding aging

Journal	Author(s) & Year	Title of the Article	Sample(s)	Research Method	Ideals Scale	Reliability Evidence	Validity Evidence	Sampling of Culture	Cultural Approach	Cultural/ Contextual Dimensions Invoked
Human Resource Development Quarterly	Davis, A.S., & Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2018)	Reciprocity matters: Idiosyncratic deals to shape the psychological contract and foster employee engagement in times of austerity	UK	Interview	NA	NA	NA	Purposive	High contextualization	National public sector funding cuts
Career Development International	Oostrom, J.K., Pennings, M., & Bal, P.M.(2016)	How do idiosyncratic deals contribute to the employability of older workers?	Netherlands	Survey	Rosen et al. (2013)	Satisfactory	Reported	Purposive	High contextualization	National trends regarding aging
International Journal of Human Resource Management	Townsend, K., McDonald, P., & Cathcart, A.(2017)	Managing flexible work arrangements in small not-for-profit firms: the influence of organisational size, financial constraints and workforce characteristics	Australia	Interview	NA	NA	NA	Purposive	High contextualization	Small non-profit organizations in the national regulatory context

Note.

NA= Not applicable