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SUMMARY

Adopting a multilevel perspective, this study proposed servant leadership as an antecedent to idiosyncratic deals (i-deals) at the individual and group levels (e.g., group median i-deals). Drawing from social cognitive theory, I hypothesized that i-deals positively relate to self-efficacy and that group median i-deals relate positively to group potency. Further, i-deals and self-efficacy were hypothesized to sequentially mediate the positive effect of servant leadership on individual performance, while the positive relationship between servant leadership and group performance was hypothesized to be mediated by group median i-deals and group potency sequentially. The hypothesized relationships were supported by data collected from 189 employees and their managers working in 45 groups of a Chinese manufacturing company.
PREFACE

I organize the dissertation into six chapters. Chapter I is an introductory chapter that discusses my research purposes and focus. In Chapter II, I review the current literature on i-deals, such as the history and conceptualization of this construct, its relationships with related constructs, and the extant empirical evidence on its nomological network. Chapter III is theory and hypothesis development of the current study. Specifically, the role of servant leadership as an antecedent to i-deals is hypothesized. I also introduce a new perspective on intermediate mechanisms that explain the effect of i-deals on individual and group performance based on social cognitive theory. In Chapter IV, I describe the method that has been used to test the hypothesized relationships, while the results are presented in Chapter V. Lastly, in Chapter VI, I discuss the findings of the current study, implications on managerial practices, and directions for future research in the area of i-deals.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Idiosyncratic deals, or i-deals, are a form of personalized employment arrangements negotiated between employees and their employers that benefit both parties (Rousseau, 2005). The increasing use of i-deals is not only attributed to the reduction in collective bargaining (Farber & Western, 2000) and increased competition for talented employees (Michaels, Handfield-Jones, & Axelrod, 2001), but also to greater initiative among employees in negotiating preferred work arrangements (Belkin, 2007; Freeman & Rogers, 1999). Distinct from dysfunctional person-specific employment practices (e.g., favoritism, unauthorized arrangements), i-deals are a proactive means that employees take to modify elements of their employment package and an innovative strategy the employer may employ to retain and motivate employees (Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau, Ho, & Greenberg, 2006). Typically, i-deals are initiated by employees and negotiated between employees and their managers (Rosen, Slater, Chang, & Johnson, 2013; Rousseau et al., 2006). The content of i-deals include flexible work schedules, customized task assignments, personalized compensation packages, and special career development opportunities (Hornung, Rousseau, Weigl, Müller, & Glaser, in press; Rosen et al., 2013; Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau et al., 2006).

Prior research on i-deals has demonstrated the positive impact of i-deals on a variety of favorable employee attitudes and behaviors, including but not limited to job satisfaction (Rosen et al., 2013), organizational commitment (Ng & Feldman, 2010; Liu, Lee, Hui, Kwan, & Wu, 2013; Rosen et al., 2013), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; Anand, Vidyarthi, Liden, & Rousseau, 2010), voice behavior (Ng & Feldman, in press), and proactive behavior (Liu et al., 2013). One of the earlier empirical studies on i-deals (Rousseau & Kim, 2006) revealed that
employees with more developmental i-deals had higher levels of perceived organizational support (POS). Collecting data from two time points in a U.S. sample of 375 managers, Ng and Feldman (2010) demonstrated that i-deals related positively to employee organizational commitment, especially for older workers who had low core self-evaluations (i.e., individuals’ trait-like characteristics that reflect their fundamental evaluations about themselves and beliefs about their abilities to succeed; Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997). Examining a broader set of antecedents and consequences of i-deals, Rosen et al. (2013) found in an employed business undergraduate student sample that task and work responsibilities i-deals were positively related to job satisfaction and three forms of organizational commitment (i.e., affective, continuance, and normative). The positive relationships between task and work responsibilities i-deals and job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and normative organizational commitment were further verified in a sample of 196 employees in professional and retail/service industries (Rosen et al., 2013). Recently, evidence supporting the importance of i-deals from samples that are outside the U.S. has started to accumulate. In a sample of 462 supervisor-subordinate dyads from three state-owned enterprises in China, Huang and Niu (2009) found that employees who obtained more developmental i-deals were more likely to be committed to the organization, feel satisfied about their jobs, and be more willing to engage in OCB (i.e., discretionary behaviors that in the aggregate promote the effective functioning of the organization; Organ, 1988). Further, Anand and colleagues (2010) revealed that developmental i-deals were more strongly related to OCB for employees with a lower exchange relationship with their manager or teammates. The sample of this study consisted of five software design and development organizations in India.
The importance of i-deals to critical employee outcomes across cultures warrants an explanation of 1) when i-deals are likely to be created and 2) how they exert influences on outcomes. The main purpose of the current study is to contribute to the i-deals research by enhancing our understanding of the nomological network of i-deals.

First, the question of when i-deals are likely to be created investigates antecedents of i-deals. Because managers are the ones who have the authority to grant employees i-deals, initial research on the antecedents of i-deals has focused on the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX; dyadic exchange relationships between supervisors and subordinates) relationships (Hornug, Rousseau, Glaser, Angerer, & Weigl, 2010; Hornung et al., in press; Rosen et al., 2013). Rosen et al. (2013) and Hornung, Rousseau, et al. (2010) both revealed that a high quality LMX relationship was positively related to employees’ success in negotiating special work arrangements related to special tasks, flexible work schedules, and customized compensation packages. However, only one study has examined the impact of leadership styles on the creation of i-deals (Hornug, Rousseau, Glaser, Angerer, & Weigl, 2011). Leadership styles are defined as behavior patterns that leaders exhibit when influencing followers’ activities (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). In a two-wave study of a German hospital sample, Hornung and colleagues (2011) showed that employees were more likely to obtain a customized flexible work schedule and professional development opportunities from managers who were rated high on leader consideration. We still know little about how i-deals are affected by leadership styles, as manifested in leaders’ behavior.

Ever since the transition from the trait approach to leadership studies of behavioral and style theories of leadership, it has been shown that leadership styles are instrumental in the understanding of managerial effectiveness (Yukl, 2002). Amongst various leadership styles,
researchers have demonstrated that servant leadership is related to follower outcomes above and beyond dominant leadership theories, including transformational leadership and LMX (Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden, & Hu, 2014; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Peterson; Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Peng, 2011). Servant leaders put followers’ needs first and are committed to developing followers to their fullest potential (Greenleaf, 1970; Liden et al., 2008). In fact, one of the major differences between servant leadership and transformational leadership is that these two leadership styles influence outcomes through distinct mechanisms. In a series of three studies, including two experimental designs and one field sample of 200 employees, van Dierendonck and colleagues (van Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, de Windt, & Alkema, in press) revealed that although both servant leadership and transformational leadership were positively related to organizational commitment and work engagement, servant leadership exerted its influences mainly through satisfying follower needs, while transformational leaders worked to enhance their perceived leadership effectiveness. This critical difference highlights servant leadership as a leadership style that emphasizes putting aside self-interest to serve others rather than focusing on maximizing one’s own effectiveness. Consistent with the idea that i-deals fulfill employees’ personal needs and enhance employee performance and development, I expect servant leadership to be positively related to the creation of follower i-deals. The first purpose of the current study, therefore, is to examine servant leadership as an antecedent to i-deals.

Second, the question of how i-deals influence outcomes aims to uncover intermediate mechanisms through which i-deals exert their effects on outcomes. Past research on the processes through which i-deals influence employee outcomes has primarily been based on two theoretical perspectives, the job design perspective and the social exchange theory perspective.
Studies adopting the job design perspective have shown that job characteristics, such as job complexity, job control (Hornung, Rousseau, & Glaser, 2010), and job autonomy (Hornung, Glaser et al., 2010; Hornung et al., in press) mediate the relationship between i-deals and employee initiative, job performance, engagement, and/or job satisfaction. In addition to the job design approach, evidence has been shown in support of the social exchange theory perspective. Ng and Feldman (in press) demonstrated that employees’ flexible work role orientation, social networking behavior, and organizational trust mediated the relationship between i-deals and voice behavior with two samples of managers and professionals in the U.S. and China. Liu et al. (2013) confirmed an alternative social exchange mediating mechanism from flexibility and developmental i-deals to employee affective commitment and proactive behavior via POS. These findings based on job design and social exchange perspectives have provided us with important information on the effect of i-deals on employee outcomes. However, neither changes in specific job characteristics nor the sense of felt obligation implied by a social exchange perspective has considered one of the most important factors that motivates and regulates human behavior—self-influence (Bandura, 1986, 2005).

The agency perspective of social cognitive theory posits that human beings are agentic, proactive, self-organizing, self-regulating, and self-reflecting (Bandura, 2005). As Bandura (2009: 179) suggested, “Among the mechanisms of self-influence, none is more focal or pervading than belief in one’s personal efficacy.” Defined as individuals’ beliefs in their ability to complete job tasks, self-efficacy is central to the agentic perspective of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 2001, 2006). Indeed, employees’ motivation to act will be realized unless they believe that they are capable of producing desired outcomes. In the context of i-deals, no matter what the initial cause for employees with i-deals to enhance their performance (e.g., favorable
changes to job characteristics or perceived support from the supervisor/organization), employees need to feel that they have the capabilities to perform well. Thus, the second purpose of my research is to examine self-efficacy as an intermediate mechanism that transmits the effect of i-deals on employee job performance.

In addition to enriching the current understanding of antecedents of i-deals and intermediate mechanisms through which i-deals influence outcomes, the current study also aims to bring the focus of i-deals research from the individual level to multilevel theory and research. The extant i-deals research has largely taken an individual-level perspective, except for only a few exceptions (Anand, 2012; Bal, De Jong, Jansen, & Bakker, 2013). There is a need for a nomological network of i-deals from a multilevel perspective (Bal et al., 2013), because i-deals have social and organizational implications that go beyond individual employees and the manager-employee dyad (Rousseau, 2005). In the current study, I focus on the extent to which levels of i-deals within a work group influences group dynamics and group outcomes. In particular, drawing on social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997, 1998), I propose that the average level of i-deals within a work group influences group members’ shared belief in their collective capacity to be effective, i.e., group potency, (Guzzo, Yost, Campbell, & Shea, 1993), which is positively related to group performance. In addition, group potency that is shared by group members also affects individual group members’ perceived self-efficacy positively.

The current study is designed to contribute to the literature in three ways. First, employing a multilevel perspective, this study theorizes that i-deals influence outcomes at both the individual and group levels. Second, it adopts a social cognitive perspective to explain how i-deals promote individual and group performance through enhanced individual self-efficacy and group potency, respectively, which extends prior research that focuses on social exchange and
job design perspectives. Third, the current study contributes to the integration of leadership and work arrangement research by showing the connection between servant leadership and i-deals at two levels. The hypothesized model is presented in Figure 1.

-----------------------------------------------

Insert Figure 1 about here

-----------------------------------------------
CHAPTER II

I-DEALS: CONCEPTUALIZATION AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Standardized employment arrangements refer to “work done on a fixed schedule—usually full-time—at the employer’s place of business, under the employer’s control, and with the mutual expectation of continued employment” (Kalleberg, Reskin, & Hudson, 2000, p. 258). Nonstandard work arrangements, on the other hand, lack one or more elements defined in standardized employment arrangements (Broschak & Davis-Blake, 2006). Traditionally, standardization in human resource (HR) management, especially employment arrangements, has been assumed to be the basis of workplace fairness and thus, is widely adopted by the employer (Greenberg, Roberge, Ho, & Rousseau, 2004). Because of such standardization, employees with similar jobs are expected to have similar work arrangements. Recently, employees have started to show greater initiative in negotiating personalized arrangements in their work. According to a Harris Interactive poll, 92 percent of younger workers desire flexible work schedules; they are more comfortable of expressing what they want and expect from the company and are more likely to leave the company when do not find tasks appealing (Belkin, 2007; Freeman & Rogers, 1999). At the same time, the employer has been more willing to engage in negotiations with individual employees because of the increase in talent competition (Michaels et al., 2001). The competition for talent continues even during economic downturn (e.g., a European firm raided JP Morgan in March, 2009). Greater individualization has received more attention in HR management practices and research (Rousseau, 2005). Rousseau (2001) has discussed many examples of practices designed to individualize the workplace. For example, veteran employees may negotiate more choice in their job tasks than newer employees. An employee who is hired during a competitive labor market can ask for a higher salary than those who are hired earlier. A
designer negotiates educational leave to advance his/her skills. A manager shifts to working from home certain days a week after birth of a child. All of these special deals are personalized based on individuals’ needs, reflecting idiosyncratic work arrangements.

**Definition and Types of I-Deals**

In Rousseau’s (2005) seminal book, she coined the term idiosyncratic deals, or i-deals to describe individualized work arrangements discussed above. Specifically, i-deals are “voluntary, personalized agreements of a nonstandard nature negotiated between individual employees and their employers regarding terms that benefit each party” (Rousseau et al., 2006, p. 978). There are four defining features of i-deals (Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau et al., 2006). First, individual negotiability of employment contracts is the central tenet of i-deals. As opposed to more conventional employment where the employer sets the terms of employment, i-deals allow employees to proactively shape their employment contracts. Second, granting i-deals to group members leads to heterogeneity in terms of work arrangements in the same work group. There may be two reasons for this. On the one hand, because employees have different needs, the type of work conditions negotiated will vary among employees. On the other hand, some employees are more successful than others in negotiating i-deals, which will also result in within-group heterogeneity with respect to i-deals. These differential work arrangements among employees can potentially jeopardize group fairness and is believed to be a major challenge in using i-deals (Greenberg et al., 2004). Third, i-deals are created to benefit both employees and the employer. Employees are able to satisfy their needs upon the customization of their employment arrangements. The employer, through the process of granting employees i-deals to satisfy their needs, is likely to be more successful in attracting, motivating, and retaining top talent. I-deals also may increase the match between individual characteristics and job content, enhancing
employee productivity and benefitting the employer. Fourth, the scope of i-deals varies among employees. The scope of i-deals is the extent to which an individual’s work arrangements contain idiosyncratic elements that are different from that of her coworkers. An employee can have a very standardized employment package that is almost the same as others, except for one or two idiosyncratic elements. Alternatively, he/she might customize his/her entire employment contract with the employer so that her work arrangements are entirely distinct from that of her colleagues.

I-deals are typically negotiated between an employee and his/her manager and can take many forms based on their timing and content (Rousseau, 2005). In terms of timing, i-deals can be classified into ex ante i-deals and ex post i-deals. Ex ante i-deals are created during the recruitment process before someone is hired. On the contrary, ex post i-deals are negotiated after employees are on the job. In practice, ex post i-deals occur more often than ex ante ones, resulting in more research attention on ex post i-deals (Rosen et al., 2013; Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau et al., 2006). In addition to timing, i-deals can also be categorized by their content, which refers to particular arrangements or resources involved in the i-deal. Rousseau and colleagues (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010; Rousseau & Kim, 2006), in multiple hospital samples, suggested that flexibility i-deals, developmental i-deals, workload-reduction i-deals and task i-deals are commonly occurring idiosyncratic arrangements. Flexibility i-deals refer to customized work arrangements that allow employees to schedule their work so as to accommodate their needs. Developmental i-deals are special opportunities that employees use to expand their knowledge and skills in order to advance their careers. Workload-reduction i-deals are work arrangements that employees negotiate to reduce their work demands and hours. Task i-deals represent “arrangements that individuals negotiate to create or alter their own job’s
content” (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010: 188). Building on prior research, Rosen and colleagues (2013) added to schedule flexibility i-deals and task i-deals, location flexibility i-deals (i.e., special work arrangements that allow employees to work at a place that is outside the office) and financial incentives i-deals (i.e., customized compensation arrangements that fit individual needs). In a diverse sample of professional and retail/service employees the i-deals content identified by Rosen and colleagues shared some similarities with Rousseau and colleagues’ pioneering work, such that schedule flexibility and task and work responsibility i-deals overlapped with two dimensions of i-deals (i.e., flexibility and tasks) in Rousseau and colleagues’ typology (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010; Rousseau & Kim, 2006), supporting the commonality of these i-deals dimensions in various contexts.

I-Deals and Related Constructs

In order to further clarify the conceptualization of i-deals, it is important to understand the similarities and distinctions between i-deals and related employment phenomena. A comparison of i-deals and related constructs can help clarify the conceptualization of i-deals and its uniqueness and explicate the relationships between i-deals and related constructs. In this section, I highlight that i-deals can resemble, but are distinct from, dysfunctional person-specific employment practices. In addition, the relationships between i-deals and job crafting, psychological contracts, LMX, POS, and workplace flexibility will be discussed.

First, i-deals are distinct from dysfunctional person-specific employment practices such as favoritism and unauthorized arrangements. The very fundamental assumption of i-deals is that mutual benefits between employees and the employer are agreed upon during the i-deal negotiation. This is distinct from favoritism and unauthorized arrangements, which only serve self-interests and erode trust and workplace justice (Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau et al., 2006). The
A distinction between i-deals and dysfunctional person-specific employment practices highlights the potential of i-deals to be legitimate and fair from the perspective of third parties as well as the principals.

Second, i-deals share many conceptual similarities with job crafting but are distinct. Job crafting is defined as “physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work” (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001, p. 179). Both job crafting and i-deals recognize the interplay between job content and individual psychological dynamics and reflect employees’ predisposition toward proactivity and personal initiative. Hornung, Rousseau, et al. (2010) suggested that i-deals and job crafting can be viewed as work design approaches that are distinct from the traditional top-down job design process (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). However, job crafting and i-deals are distinct in two aspects. First, job crafting allows employees to make cognitive changes to how they approach their jobs. Employees may redefine themselves at work and/or interpret the meaning of work differently (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). On the contrary, i-deals are about objective modifications made to one’s employment arrangements only. Second, when crafting their jobs, employees are allowed to make physical changes to job content without the approval from the manager, which can possibly generate problems when employees act in ways the employer has sanctioned (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010). In contrast, i-deals do not rely on employees’ total discretion. Instead, i-deals are created based on negotiations between an employee and the employer (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010; Rousseau, 2005). The negotiation allows for the satisfaction of employees’ needs while ensuring that arrangements remain functional and meet organizational goals (Hornung et al., in press).

A third construct that is often confused with i-deals is psychological contract. A psychological contract is “individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an
exchange agreement between individuals and their organization” (Rousseau, 1995, p. 9). Two employees working on the same job might have very distinct perceptions about the exchange relationships they have with the employer (Rousseau, 2001). However, such differences in perceptions do not necessarily involve actual deviations in employment arrangements. I-deals, however, are not perceptual. Differences in i-deals between two employees reflect distinctions in actual work arrangements. On the one hand, employees can develop distinct psychological contracts because of their idiosyncratic work arrangements (Rousseau, 1995; Rousseau et al., 2006). On the other hand, a psychological contract can also influence whether an employee asks for an i-deal, because he/she believes it should be part of the employment relationship (Ng & Feldman, 2010, 2012). Therefore, psychological contracts and i-deals are related yet distinct constructs.

Fourth, the relationship between i-deals and LMX needs to be discussed. I-deals are endemic to high quality leader-member exchange relationships, or LMX (for a recent review of LMX, see Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012), which provide members greater latitude in shaping their work roles compared to their low LMX counterparts. Thus, LMX is positively related to the incidence of i-deals (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010; Rosen, Slater, Chang, & Johnson, in press). However, the legitimacy of individualized work roles created through high quality LMX may be eroded when the basis of LMX is favoritism. If such legitimacy is ensured, successful negotiations of i-deals can enhance the exchange relationship between leader and member. Anand and colleagues (2010) found that i-deals were helpful in motivating employees with low LMX to engage in OCBs, a finding suggesting that i-deals may arise even in low LMX relationships, and contribute to the improvement of the exchange relationship.
Fifth, i-deals are related to but different from POS, which is defined as employees’ “beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being” (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). On the one hand, given that i-deals fulfill needs of the employee, those who successfully negotiate i-deals perceive that the organization is supportive (Liu et al., 2013; Rousseau & Kim, 2006). On the other hand, the perception that the employer is supportive carries the message that employee needs are likely to be satisfied, encouraging employees to ask for an i-deal. Therefore, POS can be both a precursor and a consequence of successfully negotiated i-deals.

Lastly, i-deals, especially flexibility i-deals, can be confused with workplace flexibility, which refers to a flexible work environment consisting of an array of organizations-sponsored programs (e.g., flextime, shifts between part-time and full-time work, job sharing, and flexible leaves) (Goodstein, 1994). Workplace flexibility can reduce the negotiation for certain deals. Specifically, the flexibility promoted in organization-sponsored programs can satisfy some of employees’ differing needs, making certain i-deals less necessary. At the same time, i-deals can be a means by which firms implement flexibility policies (Hornung et al., 2009). This is particularly the case where a supervisor acts as an organizational representative to approve employees’ requests of flexibility. Policies supporting workplace flexibility also can convey the employer’s willingness to accommodate employees’ needs, thus encouraging the negotiation of special work arrangements that are not available through organization-sponsored programs.

**Theoretical Foundation**

To date, two major theoretical perspectives have been introduced to position i-deals within the broader context of human resource management: the social exchange perspective and the job design perspective. Initially, i-deals theory was grounded in social exchange theory
(Rousseau et al., 2006). The central tenet of social exchange theory is that individuals tend to reciprocate favors with partners in a relationship, even when not otherwise required to do so (Blau, 1964). The central promise of social exchange theory can be applied to the context of i-deals. When employees successfully negotiate i-deals with their manager, they tend to feel obligated to reciprocate through positive work attitudes and behaviors, which will ultimately benefit the manager. Also explicated in i-deals theory is that employees can negotiate i-deals with multiple partners in the organization (e.g., HR, upper management). Thus, according to the target similarity model (Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner, 2007), employees’ reciprocation may differ depending on their negotiation partners. In addition, from the employer’s perspective, i-deals can be a way to reciprocate an employee’s contributions. In short, social exchange theory serves as a theoretical foundation that explains the reason why employers grant i-deals to some employees and why employees with i-deals respond in certain ways. Supporting the social exchange perspective, Ng and Feldman (in press) found that employees’ organizational trust mediated the relationship between i-deals and voice behavior with two samples of managers and professionals in the U.S. and China. Liu and colleagues (2013) confirm a similar social exchange mechanism via POS.

Another main theoretical perspective has adopted a job design framework and viewed i-deals as a bottom-up approach to work design (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010). Traditionally, job design takes a top-down approach, such that management or human resources of an organization conduct systematic analyses of jobs and set up tasks in a way that they believe will motivate employees (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Yet a major limitation of this approach is that such jobs do not consider the job holder’s unique individual characteristics and individual needs (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010). Considering the interplay between job content and individual
psychological dynamics (Roberts & Glick, 1981), researchers have taken a bottom-up approach to studying how employees may craft their jobs individually by altering job content and/or relational boundaries to increase the meaningfulness of their jobs and to satisfy personal needs. This bottom-up approach to job design is referred to as job crafting (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Although job crafting takes into account individual employees’ proactivity and initiatives, it may generate problems such that employees’ discretionary behaviors may be unauthorized and eventually result in the employer’s objection (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010). Therefore, there are limitations in both the conventional top-down approach to job design and bottom-up approach of job crafting. I-deals stand as a remedy to overcome these limitations. As a unique type of bottom-up job design, i-deals are created through employees’ proactive negotiation with the employer regarding job content based on their individual characteristics (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010; Rousseau, 2005). Such a negotiation process ensures that satisfying individual employees’ needs does not sacrifice the employer’s interest. Therefore, I contend that i-deals are an optimal approach to bottom-up job design.
CHAPTER III
THEORY AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT
Servant Leadership and Individual I-Deals

As a bottom-up job design strategy that allows for the customization of job elements for individuals, i-deals derive from employee proactivity in striving to find fit between their personal needs and strengths and work characteristics (Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010; Hornung et al., in press). The emphasis of employees’ initiative in making changes to their work arrangement is consistent with the agency perspective in social cognitive theory, such that people are agentic, proactive, self-organizing, self-regulating, and self-reflecting (Bandura, 2005). Indeed, the greater attention that has been paid to individual proactivity at work has led to the development of bottom-up job design research (e.g., i-deals and job crafting). However, i-deals are distinct from other employment-related concepts that also recognize human agency, defined as individuals’ capacities to influence the nature and quality of life events (Bandura, 2001). Of particular importance is the difference between i-deals and job crafting, which refers to physical and cognitive changes that employees make in their tasks, relational boundaries, or other work conditions (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). While i-deals ensure a mutual benefit to employee and employer by involving employees as well as the employer in the i-deal creation process (Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau et al., 2006), job crafting does not require the employer’s approval of changes employees make to their jobs, with the possibility of harming the employer’s interests remaining. This difference between i-deals and job crafting demonstrates an advantage of i-deals, such that modifications to work arrangements can be accomplished without sacrificing the employer’s interests. Also, it calls attention to understanding the role of the employer in the i-deal negotiation and creation process.
As described in Chapter II, employees typically initiate the i-deal negotiation with their managers in order to obtain special arrangements regarding their work schedule/location flexibility, career development opportunities, tasks, and even compensation packages (Rosen et al., 2013; Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau et al., 2006). As organizational representatives, managers have the authority to decide whether to grant employee i-deals and, therefore, play an important role in determining whether employees’ i-deal negotiations are successful or not. The creation of an i-deal lies in managers’ appreciation of employees’ proactivity in asking for an i-deal. Further, a successful i-deal negotiation depends on not only managers’ awareness of employees’ needs and talents but also managers’ willingness to serve their subordinates and to develop them to their fullest potential. In addition, managers’ understanding of the organization and its goals makes sure that special arrangements are created in ways that the employer has sanctioned. Hence, employees are most likely to obtain i-deals when managers appreciate their proactivity and are willing to provide accommodations to satisfy their needs.

The leader behaviors described above enhance the chances that the i-deal request would be approved. I contend that servant leadership is well suited to the i-deal negotiation process. Introduced by Greenleaf (1977) as a leadership style that is distinct from traditional leadership approaches, servant leadership puts a strong emphasis on setting aside leaders’ self-interest for the betterment of others, especially followers. Greenleaf asserted that a truly effective leader is one who serves his/her followers. Based on a thorough review of prior taxonomies of servant leadership, Liden and colleagues (2008) theoretically identified and empirically supported seven dimensions in a rigorous scale development study. Subsequent research has widely adopted this taxonomy of servant leadership (e.g., Hu & Liden, 2011; Liden, Wayne, et al., in press; Peterson et al., 2012; Schaubroeck et al., 2011). The seven dimensions are as follows.
• *Emotional healing* features servant leader behavior that shows sensitivity to others’ affective and emotional concerns. Leaders with a high level of emotional healing cares about others’ well-being and take time to understand others on a personal level, especially immediate followers. Thus, followers tend to feel comfortable seeking help from the leader.

• *Creating value for the community* describes servant leaders’ conscious, genuine concern for helping the community. By being actively involving in community activities and giving back to the community, servant leaders demonstrate that helping others is their genuine interest.

• *Conceptual skills* refer to servant leaders’ knowledge of the organization and its goals, the work group and tasks at hand. Servant leaders can tell when something work-related is going wrong and can effectively think through complex work problems, offering creative solutions. Possessing high conceptual skills enable servant leaders to effectively support and assist followers.

• *Empowering* emphasizes servant leader behavior that encourages and facilitates immediate followers. Thus, followers have the authority and freedom in identifying and solving problems, making important decisions, and determining when and how to complete work tasks.

• *Helping followers grow and succeed* explicates servant leaders’ genuine concern for immediate followers’ career growth and development. Servant leaders make followers’ career development a priority by providing followers opportunities to develop new skills. They understand followers and make sure that followers’ career goals are achieved and needs are fulfilled.
• *Putting subordinates first* highlights servant leaders’ clear actions and words that show that satisfying followers’ work needs is a priority. Practicing this principle, servant leaders often sacrifice their own interests to serve others’ needs, especially those of immediate followers.

• *Behaving ethically* underscores servant leaders’ honesty and high ethical standards. Valuing honesty more than profits, servant leaders interact openly, fairly, and honestly with others, especially immediate followers.

Servant leadership is promising to the understanding of leadership impacts on i-deals for several reasons. First, servant leadership is more holistic than other leadership approaches that only focus on single dimensional aspect of leadership (Liden, Panaccio, et al., in press). For example, ethical leadership, defined as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005: 120), represents only one component of the seven dimensions in servant leadership (e.g., *behaving ethically*). Second, compared with dominant approaches to leadership (i.e., transformational leadership, LMX, initiating structure/consideration), servant leadership has been demonstrated to explain additional variation in follower outcomes (Dinh et al., 2014; Neubert, Kacmar, Carlson, Chonko, & Roberts, 2008; Liden, Panaccio, et al., in press; Liden et al., 2008; Peterson et al., 2012; Schaubroeck et al., 2011). Third, more importantly, it has been found that the uniqueness of servant leadership lies in its central tenet, such that servant leaders care for others’ needs and put others’ interests ahead of their own. For example, although transformational leaders show individual consideration for subordinates, they do so in order to promote their own leadership effectiveness (van Dierendonck et al., in press). This is
distinct from servant leaders, who genuinely serve their followers, even at the sacrifice of their own interests. Indeed, van Dierendonck and colleagues found that servant leaders enhanced follower organizational commitment and work engagement by fulfilling followers’ needs. Therefore, servant leadership is conducive to employees’ negotiation of i-deals.

Servant leaders’ strong focus on serving followers’ needs may send a signal to followers that asking for certain accommodation and adjusting work arrangements is supported. According to the agentic perspective of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2006, 2008), people exercise proxy agency through social mediated influence. When they do not have the necessary resources and authority, they will turn to other people who have such authority and resources to achieve desired outcomes (Baltes, 1996; Brandtstädter, & Baltes-Götz, 1990; Ozer, 1995). On the other hand, social cognitive theory rejects that agency means people have total free will in determining their functioning. Instead, it posits that the triadic reciprocal determination rule governs human functioning such that intrapersonal, behavioral, and environmental factors operate dynamically and reciprocally (Bandura, 1986). In the context of i-deals, when followers perceive that the leader has a genuine concern for their growth and success and makes the satisfaction of their needs a priority, the likelihood to exercise proxy agency is enhanced. Consequently, they will feel more comfortable being proactive and communicating their needs to the leader with an aim to obtain desired work arrangements. Therefore, followers working with a servant leader are expected to be more likely to negotiate for i-deals. On the contrary, when the leader does not engage in servant leadership, followers are less likely to expect that their requests of i-deals will be granted. The likelihood that followers will act on proxy agency is reduced, which in turn, lowers the likelihood that someone will ask for an i-deal from the leader.
In addition to followers’ greater likelihood of initiating an i-deal negotiation when working with a servant leader, I propose it is more probable that servant leaders will grant i-deals to their followers. Because proxy agency is socially mediated, it brings in other parties between one’s intentions and the attainment of desired outcomes. Inherent to i-deals is the involvement of leaders in the process of i-deal negotiation. As an important player in the creation of i-deals, leaders have substantive impact on the extent to which followers’ desired outcomes will be realized. As aforementioned, servant leaders are attentive to followers’ needs, desires, goals, abilities, and potential and assume the responsibility to bring out the best in their followers (Liden et al., 2008; van Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leaders possess task knowledge and problem solving skills to help followers and are sensitive to followers’ difficulties at work and personal setbacks. They put their followers first, help followers grow and succeed, and are empowering (Liden et al., 2008). Therefore, servant leaders are willing to listen to followers’ needs regarding the customization of follower work arrangements (i.e., i-deals), providing them with flexible work schedules, special task assignments, and career development opportunities. Indeed, they act on their knowledge of followers and adjust their leader behavior accordingly (Liden, Panaccio, et al., in press). Thus, I expect that servant leaders are more likely to grant i-deals to followers. In sum, I hypothesize that servant leadership is positively related to i-deals at the individual level.

_Hypothesis 1. Servant leadership is positively related to individual i-deals._

**Servant Leadership and Group Median I-Deals**

The group leader usually has multiple followers within a work group. “The servant leader forms unique relationships with each follower, and these relationships enable the servant leader to focus followers’ motivation and behavior, modifying the application of the servant
leader dimensions to each particular case. The servant leader can thereby draw out the best from each follower by providing tailored attention to each follower’s needs” (Liden, Panaccio, et al., in press: 21). As servant leaders serve the needs of their followers and bring out their potential, they should be willing to negotiate and consider unique i-deals with each follower, satisfying their needs and developing each of them. Therefore, the more a group leader exhibits servant leader behaviors, the higher the average level of i-deals in the group. Thus, I expect servant leadership to be positively related to the overall level of i-deals in a group.

It is noteworthy that i-deals at the group level have configural unit properties such that the operationalization of i-deals at the group level does not require agreement among individual responses on i-deals (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). Such configural unit properties of i-deals at the group level has an influence on what group-level indicator is appropriate to represent the overall i-deals within a group. Similar to group member abilities, demographic characteristics, and leader-member exchange relationships, the overall i-deals at the group level can be directly aggregated to the group level, without searching for agreement among individual i-deals (Liden, Erdogan, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2006). This is also consistent with the additive composition model put forth by Chan (1998), which specifies group-level constructs to be a straightforward summation of individual counterparts. In the case when agreement is not required, representing group-level constructs by taking group mean can be problematic (Liden et al., 2006). The ambiguity of relying on the group mean is due to its sensitivity to outliers. Kozlowski and Klein (2000) thus recommended avoiding the use of group mean if agreement is not expected. Because of the nature of i-deals and the inappropriateness of group mean, I chose group median as a group-level indicator of i-deals.

_Hypothesis 2. Servant leadership is positively related to group median i-deals._
**Individual I-Deals and Self-Efficacy**

The recognition and emphasis of human agency in social cognitive theory conspicuously distinguishes it from behavioral theories which view human functioning as solely reactive (Bandura, 2008). As Bandura (1986: 25) argued, “what people think, believe, and feel affects how they behave.” Such agentic capabilities enable people to have influences over the course of events. In the context of i-deals, employees’ initiation and negotiation of i-deals with their managers manifest the premise of social cognitive theory such that people are agentic, proactive, self-organized, self-reflecting, and self-regulating organisms (Bandura, 1986, 2001). Thus, employees’ initiating an i-deal negotiation is a proactive self-directed action that aims to impact work conditions.

In regard to human agency, social cognitive theory also posits that people engage in active self-reflection (Bandura, 1986). Specifically, it is believed that individual self-directed actions in turn have impacts on the actor such that “personal effects resulting from self-directed actions further identify oneself as the recipient experiencing the effects” (Bandura, 2008: 90). Indeed, as a proactive means of intentionally changing one’s work arrangements, the i-deal negotiation serves as a self-directed action that may impact employees’ self-evaluation and self-reflection.

Central to the agentic perspective of social cognitive theory is the concept of self-efficacy, which refers to “people’s beliefs about their capabilities to produce effects” (Bandura, 1994). Embedded within a broad network of sociocognitive factors, perceived self-efficacy serves as a foundation for motivation and actions pertinent to human functioning (Bandura, 2009). As people actively negotiate i-deals and conduct self-reflection based on the outcome, their perceived efficacy is affected. Successes positively contribute to the establishment of a
robust belief in one’s personal efficacy, while failures disconfirm efficacy beliefs. When
individuals are able to successfully negotiate special deals and make changes to their work
arrangements as intended, they reinforce their recognition of oneself as an agent, enhancing their
beliefs in their capacities to exert influences at work. As Bandura (1994) suggested, guided
mastery is a powerful means to instill in people a robust sense of control. Indeed, the experience
of successful initiation and negotiation of i-deals provides employees with a sense of control
over their work. The sense of control over work enhances one’s belief in completing his/her
tasks (Wood & Bandura, 1989). In contrast, if someone fails to obtain desired modifications to
their work arrangements, he/she will question his/her capabilities at work, lowering his/her
efficacy.

On the surface, it seems that social cognitive theory argues for a duality of self as agent in
proactively influencing the environment and as object in self-reflectivity. However, such duality
does not mean an ontological partition of the self. Instead, it represents a shift in the perspective
viewing the self and interpreting the meaning of agent. “One is just as much an agent reflecting
on oneself as in acting on the environment” (Bandura, 2008: 91). Thus, I expect employees’
proactive negotiation of i-deals to be related to their self-reflection of the efficacy belief.

In addition to the negotiation experience in general, specific content customized in i-deals
is conducive to the enhancement of individual self-efficacy. As described in Chapter II, in terms
of content, i-deals can be classified into several categories such as task i-deals, flexibility i-deals,
and career and developmental i-deals. Being able to work on personalized tasks that match
individual abilities, skills, and interests raises one’s confidence in accomplishing his/her work
(Gist & Mitchell, 1992). In addition, unique development opportunities designed to enhance an
employee’s work skills directly contribute to one’s beliefs about the capacity he/she has to
perform well in the job. This is in accordance with social cognitive theory that the acquirement of new skills and abilities contributes to one’s self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). Also, a flexible work schedule reduces tension and stresses one might experience. One of the major sources of efficacy belief is individual emotional states. People rely partly on their emotional states in evaluating their capabilities such that stresses and tension undermine one’s efficacy belief. Thus, a reduced level of negative emotions is positively related to individual self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982, 1994, 2009). Thus flexibility should positively contribute to employee perceived self-efficacy. In sum, a positive relationship between i-deals and self-efficacy is expected.

Hypothesis 3. I-deals are positively related to self-efficacy.

Group Median I-Deals and Group Potency

People do not live in vacuum, nor do they function as isolates. In an organizational context, work groups, or teams, are most common and are defined as “collectives who exist to perform organizationally relevant tasks, share one or more common goals, interact socially, exhibit task interdependencies, maintain and manage boundaries, and are embedded in an organizational context that sets boundaries, constrains the team, and influences exchanges with other units in the broader entity” (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003, p. 334). Organizing using work groups manifests the reality that people do not work in absolute autonomy. Instead, many of the desirable outcomes can only be accomplished through a course of interdependent actions that require collaborative efforts (Bandura, 2000). Thus, when people work in groups, they operate collectively, in addition to being unique individuals.

The nature of teamwork as well as the boundaries and interactions between groups provide meanings for members such that group members see themselves and are seen by others outside the group as a social entity (Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Guzzo & Dickson, 1996; Sundstrom,
DeMeuse & Futrell, 1990). The social interaction among employees working in the same group enables them to observe how other group members are treated and allows them to share perceptions about the work environment (Klein, Conn, Smith, & Sorra, 2001). Social cognitive theory posits that human agency transcends the individual level. It is the collective agency that people share that helps unite individuals and achieve the outcomes that are not achievable by a single person (Bandura, 2000). Indeed, conceptions of human agency should not be confined to the individual level. As a collective agency, people working together share their beliefs about their capacities (Bandura, 1986). Group members’ shared beliefs about their capabilities to be effective is referred to as group potency (Gully, Incalcaterra, Joshi, & Beaubien, 2012). Group potency is not a simple summation of individual self-efficacy. Instead, group potency is an emergent group-level attribute that is pertinent to how group members interact, coordinate, and synergize dynamics. When these shared observations and perceptions are favorable, unity of effort will be achieved within group members and distributed tasks among members will be coordinated (Bandura, 2008).

When viewed collectively at the group level, the central tendency of i-deals within a group (i.e., group median i-deals) provides members with a sense of the overall level of control they have. According to social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), individuals obtain information through vicarious experience. Observing group members succeed enhances a group’s shared beliefs that they possess the capabilities to be successful, while the experience of observing group members fail negatively affects a group’s shared evaluation of their capacities to be effective (Bandura, 1994). In groups with high median i-deals, members share the observation that, on average, members have a high level of control within the group. This information is positively factored into members’ shared cognitive processes, which form their beliefs of how
capable they are as a group. Also when group median i-deals are high, group members share the cognition that their voices are heard and ideas are considered by the leader, which helps them become confident in their abilities and experience higher potency (Guzzo et al., 1993). On the contrary, a low level of group median i-deals may result in group members' shared cognition that members in the group have little control over the environment, which negatively affects group potency. Thus, I argue that group median i-deals are likely to affect members’ shared belief of their collective capacity to exert effort and achieve desired group outcomes spanning tasks and situations.

**Hypothesis 4.** *Group median i-deals are positively related to group potency.*

**Group Potency and Self-Efficacy**

The coexistence of group functioning alongside with individual functioning does not represent a dualism. In social cognitive theory, the seemingly different focus of individual versus collective agency operates interdependently (Bandura, 2000). People in groups not only see themselves as individuals but also incorporate group membership into their definition of self (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). As social cognitive theory posits, motivation processes can be contagious (Bandura, 1997). Affiliating with a group of people who are capable of accomplishing group tasks enhances one’s belief that he/she can also possess the capability and become successful through comparable actions. On the contrary, belonging to a group of people sharing doubts in their capacities and anticipating failures undermines one’s own efficacy and effort (Bandura, 1994).

Indeed, members are more likely to believe that they are capable of performing their tasks when they belong to groups that are believed to be effective (Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, & Rosen, 2007). In a sample of 602 police officers from 54 stations in Taiwan, Chen and
Kao (2011) found that shared beliefs about the overall competency of police stations enhanced police officers’ personal efficacy levels. Krause, Stark, and Mandl (2009) also suggested that perceived collective capabilities may have a “halo effect” on perceived self-efficacy. Group potency shared by members may help individuals become resilient and enhance individual confidence in challenging situations. Thus, shared perceptions of potency play an important role in group members’ competence beliefs, motivation, goals, and effort (Lindsley, Brass, & Thomas, 1995). I thus expect a cross-level direct effect of group potency on self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 5. Group potency is positively related to self-efficacy.

Mediating Roles of I-Deals and Self-Efficacy

The central role of self-efficacy to social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) lies in its positive influence over human functioning. Perceived self-efficacy is pivotal to the self-regulation process because it affects individual motivation and actions through a goal system (Bandura, 2009). People with high efficacy think strategically and optimistically, while their low efficacy counterparts think erratically and pessimistically (Bandura, 2000). Levels of self-efficacy perceived by individuals play an important role in determining what anticipatory scenarios they construct and rehearse. When individuals perceive high levels of self-efficacy, the success scenarios they envision positively guide and support their performance. Yet when self-efficacy is low, people do not believe in their capacities to succeed and, therefore, tend to construct failure scenarios that negatively affect their actual performance (Bandura, 1994). According to Bandura, individuals are more comfortable working on tasks where their efficacy is high, because people are less willing to put effort toward tasks that they do not believe desired outcomes will be attained. Further, self-efficacy is closely related to effort expenditure and persistence such that individuals with higher efficacy are more likely to exert effort and be
persistent. Empirical evidence has confirmed that self-efficacy enhances employees’ performance even after controlling for their abilities and past performance (Bandura & Locke, 2003; Locke, Frederick, Lee, & Bobko, 1984). Results based on the synthesis of a large number of empirical studies have also confirmed this relationship (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Therefore, self-efficacy is positively related to individual performance.

As servant leadership theory posits, servant leaders instill a high level of confidence in followers that promote follower performance (Liden et al., 2008). Indeed, servant leadership has been found to be positively related to employee in-role performance (Liden et al., 2008; Schaubroeck et al., 2011). Further, in a longitudinal sample consisting of data obtained from multi-source from 7 multinational corporations, Walumbwa and colleagues (2010) showed that the positive effect of servant leadership on individual outcomes was mediated by self-efficacy. In Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 3, I propose that servant leaders may enhance individual self-efficacy through a process of granting i-deals, not only because servant leaders are willing to grant customized work arrangements in an i-deal negotiation, but also because followers are more likely to act on their proxy agency and ask for i-deals when they are working with servant leaders. Hypothesis 3 further theorizes that being able to initiate and create i-deals contributes to one’s self-efficacy. Thus, servant leaders provide followers with successful experiences of i-deal creation that, in followers’ self-reflection, enhance perceived efficacy. Considering Walumbwa and colleagues’ findings and Hypotheses 1 and 3 in the previous section, i-deals and self-efficacy are expected to sequentially explain the effect of servant leadership on individual performance.

Hypothesis 6. I-deals and self-efficacy sequentially mediate the positive relationship between servant leadership and employee in-role performance.

Mediating Roles of Group Median I-Deals and Group Potency
Although the shared belief of collective efficacy is a group-level emergent state, its function is similar to individual efficacy (Bandura, 1997, 1998). The higher the group potency, the more effective the exercise of collective agency (Bandura, 2010). By sharing beliefs in their collective efficacy, group members determine how to use resources in their collective actions, how much effort they should exert as a group, how persistent they need to be when facing adversity, and how resilient they can be when encountering discouragement. When group potency is high, members share the belief that their group can be effective in achieving desired outcomes spanning tasks and situations. The enhanced belief regarding collective capabilities to be effective help group members pool their knowledge, skills, and resources together to act in concert to produce desired outcomes (Bandura, 2000; Gully et al., 2002). Thus, members of a group can achieve unity of effort and coordinate a variety of tasks.

Group potency fosters groups’ motivation to work on group tasks, promotes groups’ persistence in performance accomplishments, and enhances groups’ resilience when facing obstacles (Bandura, 2000). This strong belief in collective capacity directly promotes group task performance. Experimental studies have attested the positive relationship between group members’ shared beliefs about their capacities and group performance by manipulating different levels of collective agency (Durham, Knight, & Locke, 1997; Earley, 1994; Prussia & Kinicki, 1996). The positive relationship between group potency and group performance was also supported in empirical field studies where shared beliefs about group capacities were naturally developed (Guzzo et al., 1993; Howell & Shea, 2006; Hu & Liden, 2011; Jex & Bliese, 1999; Lindsley, Mathieu, Heffner, & Brass, 1994) and was confirmed in meta-analytic reviews (Gully et al., 2002; Stajkovic, Lee, & Nyberg, 2009).
The effect of servant leadership on group-level outcomes is evidenced in past research (Ehrhart, 2004; Hu & Liden, 2011; Schaubroeck et al., 2011). In particular, in a sample of 304 employees working in 71 teams of 5 banks in China, Hu and Liden (2011) demonstrated that group potency mediated the relationship between servant leadership and group performance. Indeed, servant leaders discuss and consider unique needs of each follower within the group. As proposed in Hypothesis 2, servant leaders allow for a high level of i-deals within the group. The high overall tendency of i-deals observed by group members is subsequently factored into their shared cognition about their capabilities to exert influences at work. As a collective, group members are more willing to invest in their group tasks and become more persistent and resilient in the face of impediments, which is consistent with the prediction in Hypothesis 4 that median level of i-deals in a group is positively related to group potency. Therefore, considering Hu and Liden’s findings and Hypotheses 2 and 4 previously theorized, I expect the relationship between servant leadership and group performance to be mediated by group median i-deals and group potency sequentially.

_Hypothesis 7. Group median i-deals and group potency sequentially mediate the relationship between servant leadership and group performance._
CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Sample and Procedure

Testing of the hypothesized multilevel model requires a sample that has a nested structure. A typical multilevel research design in an organizational setting utilizes samples with employees doing interdependent jobs in work groups. Limiting the sample to within one organization ensures that work groups share organizational characteristics that may otherwise affect the relationships hypothesized in the model. In addition, at least a 60% within-group response rate should be reached before one can rely on data aggregated based on individual responses to represent group-level variables (Liden et al., 2006). With such sample requirements in mind, I approached the CEO of a Chinese manufacturing company located in one of the four original Special Economic Zones in the southeast region of China. I explained my general research purpose and received strong support from the CEO. In addition to having a nested structure in the data, a unique requirement of the sample was that work group managers should be able to grant i-deals to their subordinates, because no within- or between-group variation would exist if managers were not allowed to modify subordinates’ work arrangements. Based on the discussion with the HR Director, I focused on work groups in the functional areas of product development, information technology, sales, purchasing, administration, and planning within the company, where managers had the authority to provide customized work arrangements (i.e., flexible work schedules, personalized task assignments, and special career development opportunities). Employees working at the assembly line were not included due to the lack of authority their managers have in making changes to employees’ work arrangements.
The research protocol with the proposed data collection procedure and endorsement from the company was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Upon the receipt of approval (# 2013-0425), I proceeded to recruit participants to collect data. Data for the current investigation were obtained by surveying employees and their managers. Employees and managers filled out surveys on-site during their paid working hours. They completed the surveys separately, with employee data collected three weeks prior to the administration of manager surveys. All of the invited employees and managers worked full-time. In order to enhance the response accuracy, I was present to administer surveys and answer questions from participants.

Invitations were sent to 215 employees and their corresponding managers in 45 work groups. A total of 189 employees (response rate = 88%) and their managers (response rate = 100%) from 45 work groups completed the survey. Employees provided responses to servant leadership, i-deals, self-efficacy and group potency. Group managers evaluated employee in-role performance and group performance. Group sizes ranged from 3 to 10, with a mean of 4.78 ($SD = 1.89$). All groups in the final sample met the minimum within-group response rate of 60% (Liden et al., 2006), with a range between 67% and 100%. 30.2% of the employees were female; 65.6% were male; and 4.2% did not provide their answers. The average employee age, organizational tenure, job tenure, and tenure with the manager were 33.34 ($SD = 6.57$), 5.50 ($SD = 4.85$), 9.45 ($SD = 6.73$), and 3.20 ($SD = 3.01$) years, respectively. In terms of employees’ educational levels, 14.9% of them had a degree of high school or below, 16.4% had an associate’s degree, 59.8% had a bachelor’s degree, 5.8% had a master’s degree or above, and 3.1% did not respond.

**Measures**
All response scales were on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from $1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $7 = \text{strongly agree}$. Higher scores indicate higher standing on a particular variable. Survey questions were first translated to Chinese and then back-translated to English using Brislin’s (1980) recommended procedures.

**Servant leadership.** Servant leadership was measured with the seven items from Liden et al. (in press). This servant leadership measure captures all seven dimensions identified in Liden and colleagues’ (2008) article. Specifically, the items for each dimension were “My manager can tell if something work-related is going wrong” (*conceptual skills*); “My manager makes my career development a priority” (*helping subordinates grow and succeed*); “I would seek help from my manager if I had a personal problem” (*emotional healing*); “My manager emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community” (*creating value for the community*); “My manager puts my best interests ahead of his/her own” (*putting subordinates first*); “My manager gives me the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way that I feel is best” (*empowering*); and “My manager would NOT compromise ethical principles in order to achieve success” (*behaving ethically*). Overall Cronbach’s alpha of this scale was .92. Consistent with the model in Figure 1, servant leadership was aggregated to the group level and was operationalized as a group-level construct in the analysis.

**I-deals.** I-deals were measured with the nine-item scale from Hornung et al. (in press). The scale has three dimensions, career i-deals, task i-deals, and flexibility i-deals. Respondents were asked to consider ex-post hire i-deals as noted in the instructions: “Individuals can have employment arrangements that differ from their coworkers (e.g., different schedules or job duties). Please rate whether you have asked for and successfully negotiated any of the following with your supervisor in your current position.” Three items for *career i-deals* were, “personal
career development opportunities,” “career options that suit my personal goals,” and “ways to secure my professional advancement.” Three items for task i-deals were, “job tasks that fit my personal interests,” “job tasks that fit my personal strengths and talents,” and “personally motivating job tasks.” And the items for flexibility i-deals were, “a work schedule suited to me personally,” “a work schedule customized to my personal needs,” and “extra flexibility in starting and ending my work day.” Overall Cronbach’s alpha of this scale was .93.

**Group median i-deals.** Group median i-deals were calculated by taking the median of individual i-deals scores from each group.

**Self-efficacy.** Employees reported self-efficacy on three items from Jones (1986). The three items were used to measure the self-efficacy dimension in the empowerment scale (Spreitzer, 1995). A sample item is, “I am confident about my ability to do my job.” Overall Cronbach’s alpha of this scale was .82.

**In-role performance.** Group managers provided evaluations of their subordinates’ in-role performance using five items adapted from the scale in Tsui, Pearce, Porter, and Tripoli (1997). A sample item is, “Compared with other employees, this employee’s quality of work is much higher.” Cronbach’s alpha was .92 for this scale.

**Group potency.** Three items from Guzzo and colleagues’ (1993) measure were used to assess group potency. The three items were used to assess the group potency dimension in the team empowerment scale (Kirkman, Rosen, Tesluk, & Gibson, 2004). A sample item is, “My group has confidence in itself.” Overall Cronbach’s alpha of this scale was .88. Group potency was aggregated to the group level and was operationalized as a group-level construct in the analysis.
**Group performance.** Group performance was evaluated by group managers using the four items from Gibson, Cooper, and Conger (2009). An example item was, “This group is consistently a high performing group.” Cronbach’s alpha of this scale was .81.

**Control variables.** At the individual level, I controlled for the effect of employee dyad tenure with the manager (i.e., the amount of time employees had worked with their manager) on in-role performance. Group members’ average dyadic tenure was controlled for at the group level on group performance.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

To examine whether the measurement model captured distinct constructs as anticipated, I ran an array of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) using Mplus 7 with the default settings (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). Following the conventional approach to evaluating CFA models, fit indices of the hypothesized measurement model were examined (Williams, Vandenberg, & Edwards, 2009). In addition to $\chi^2$, Mplus reports four fit indices, including comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR). Results of the CFAs are presented in Table 2. The hypothesized 6-factor model had a $\chi^2 (260, N = 189) = 503.79$, CFI = .93, TLI = .92, RMSEA = .07, and SRMR = .06. All the items were specified to load on their corresponding factors. I-deals was indicated using dimensional scores. Results showed that all of the observed items and dimensions loaded on their respective latent factors, with standardized loadings ranging from .61 to .96 (mean = .82). I further compared the hypothesized measurement model to three alternative models of theoretical interest. The difference between alternative models and the hypothesized model was that in each of the alternative models I fixed the correlation between two theoretically relevant factors to 1.0. The first alternative model was a 5-factor model with
self-efficacy and group potency correlating at 1.0. It had a $\chi^2 (263, N = 189) = 813.81$, CFI = .84, TLI = .82, RMSEA = .11, and SRMR = .22. Thus, the first alternative model provided significantly worse fit to the hypothesized model, with $\Delta\chi^2 (3, N = 189) = 310.02$, $p < .01$. The second alternative model, a 5-factor model with employee in-role performance and team performance correlating at 1.0, had a $\chi^2 (263, N = 189) = 786.30$, CFI = .85, TLI = .83, RMSEA = .10, and SRMR = .14. Again, this model provided worse fit than the hypothesized model, with $\Delta\chi^2 (3, N = 189) = 282.51$, $p < .01$. Lastly, I allowed servant leadership and i-deals to correlate at 1.0. The third alternative model had a $\chi^2 (260, N = 189) = 613.51$, CFI = .90, TLI = .88, RMSEA = .08, and SRMR = .07. Thus, the third alternative model also fit the data worse than the hypothesized model, with $\Delta\chi^2 (3, N = 189) = 109.72$, $p < .01$.

In addition to running the above CFAs with all measures included, I estimated two CFA models on servant leadership and i-deals. The first model was a two-factor model, with servant leadership items and i-deals dimensions specified to load on their corresponding factors. In terms of fit statistics, the two-factor model had a $\chi^2 (34, N = 189) = 113.36$, CFI = .95, TLI = .93, RMSEA = .11, and SRMR = .04. The second model fixed the correlation between servant leadership and i-deals to 1.0. This model had a $\chi^2 (37, N = 189) = 221.65$, CFI = .88, TLI = .86, RMSEA = .16, and SRMR = .37. The likelihood ratio test confirmed that a two-factor model was superior, with $\Delta\chi^2 (3, N = 189) = 108.29$, $p < .01$, demonstrating that servant leadership and i-deals were measured distinctively as expected. In sum, these results indicate that all of the measures used in the present study captured distinct constructs as expected.
Data Aggregation and Levels of Analysis

The measurement of servant leadership followed a direct consensus model (Chan, 1998), which requires a higher-level construct to be in the consensus among lower-level units. Group potency was measured at the individual level based on the referent-shift consensus model (Chan, 1998), which also requires one to show agreement among individual responses of a higher-level construct before aggregating the lower-level data to represent the higher-level construct. To assess whether there was sufficient within-group agreement among employees’ responses regarding these two variables, I examined three statistics, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), intraclass correlations (ICCs), and within-group interrater reliability ($r_{wg}$, James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984). The ANOVA results provided the initial support for aggregation of these two variables, with $F(44, 144) = 1.93, p < .01$ and $F = (44, 143) = 1.94, p < .01$ for servant leadership and group potency, respectively. These significant ANOVA test results indicate that there was significant between-group variance for these two variables, relative to the within-group variance. Additionally, ICC(1)s (i.e., the relative amount of variance that resides between versus within group) and ICC(2)s (i.e., the reliability of between-group measures) were .18 and .48 for servant leadership and .18 and .48 for group potency, providing additional support for aggregation. Lastly, I calculated $r_{wg}$, the within-group interrater reliability, based on several theoretically possible distributions to obtain a range of $r_{wg}$ values (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). Specifically, mean $r_{wg}$ calculated based on a uniform distribution was .98 for both servant leadership and unit helping; Mean $r_{wg}$ calculated based on a small skew distribution was .95 for
servant leadership and .96 for group potency, respectively; Mean $r_{wg}$ calculated based on a moderate skew distribution was .96 for both servant leadership and group potency. These values all exceed the conventional .70 cutoff (James, 1988). In conjunction, these results indicate that it was appropriate to aggregate servant leadership and group potency to the group level in the analysis.

**Analytic Strategy**

The proposed multilevel model was tested using *Mplus* 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). *Mplus* was chosen over other hierarchical linear modeling programs because it allowed estimation of the hypothesized multilevel relationships simultaneously. Also, the use of the MLR estimator (Muthén & Muthén, 2012) provided us with the robust standard errors for coefficient estimates. The multilevel path model approach was used because the sample size did not allow for an estimation with a full structural equation model. Mediational hypotheses were tested using the bootstrap resampling method recommended in MacKinnon, Lockwood, and Williams (2004). Specifically, confidence intervals for indirect effects were created by generating 20,000 Monte Carlo replications.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Model Estimation

Table 4 lists the means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations among the individual-level and group-level variables. In the model estimation, I first estimated the hypothesized model as presented in Figure 1. Next, three alternative models were estimated in comparison to the hypothesized model. Each alternative model included two direct paths that were not specified in the hypothesized model. The first alternative model specified direct paths from servant leadership to group performance and employee in-role performance. In the second alternative model, direct paths from servant leadership to group potency and from servant leadership to self-efficacy were included. The third alternative model specified direct paths from group median i-deals to group performance and from individual i-deals to in-role performance. In all the estimated models, the effect of dyad tenure on in-role performance was controlled for at the individual level, while the effect of average dyad tenure within group on group performance was controlled for at the group level. Except for outcome variables (i.e., in-role performance and group performance), variables were grand-mean centered.

Insert Table 4 about here

Hypothesis Testing

Pseudo $R^2$ ($\sim R^2$) were calculated using Snijders and Bosker’s (1999) formulas to indicate the amount of variations in the individual- and group-level outcome variables that were accounted for by the hypothesized model. In total, the proportion of variance explained by the
model was 21% for employee in-role performance and 20% for group performance, supporting the practical significance of the hypothesized model.

Figure 2 presents the unstandardized estimated coefficients for the paths specified in the model. Given that specific directions were expected in the hypothesized relationships, the significance levels reported were based on one-tailed tests. As shown in Figure 2, servant leadership was positively related to i-deals ($\beta = .89, p < .01$), providing support for Hypothesis 1. At the group level, servant leadership related positively to group median i-deals ($\gamma = .86, p < .01$), supporting Hypothesis 2. Further, supporting Hypothesis 3, i-deals related positively to self-efficacy ($\beta = .10, p < .05$). The significant positive relationship between group median i-deals and group potency ($\gamma = .37, p < .01$) provided evidence supporting Hypothesis 4. The cross-level direct path from group potency to self-efficacy ($\gamma = .29, p < .01$) supported Hypothesis 5.

To estimate the mediational relationships proposed in Hypotheses 6 and 7, I followed the bootstrap resampling strategy recommended by MacKinnon et al. (2004). Specifically, 20,000 Monte Carlo replications were generated for the indirect effects to create corresponding confidence intervals. A confidence interval excluding 0 indicates that the indirect effect is significant. Supporting Hypothesis 6, bootstrapping results showed a significant positive indirect effect from servant leadership to employee in-role performance via i-deals and self-efficacy sequentially, with the indirect effect equal to .02 (95% CI: .01, .03). The indirect effect from servant leadership to group performance through group median i-deals and group potency sequentially was .14 (95% CI: .05, .23), providing support for Hypothesis 7.

Insert Figure 2 about here
Three alternative models were estimated in comparison to the hypothesized model. I did not employ the comparison based on chi-square goodness-of-fit statistic because the classical likelihood ratio test is based on maximum likelihood estimation and the assumption that observations are independently and identically distributed is violated in a multilevel path model (Lee & Song, 2001). Instead, the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) was chosen because the Schwarz criterion on which the BIC is based does not assume a prior distribution and can be used for model comparison purposes, with a tendency to favor parsimony (Kass & Raftery, 1995). The absolute value of BIC for a specific model is of less interest, while researchers are interested in comparing BIC values for various models. Generally, the model associated with a smaller BIC value provides a better fit to the data (Lee & Song, 2001). The hypothesized model had a BIC value of 2559.59. The first alternative model, with additional direct paths specified from servant leadership to group performance and employee in-role performance, had a BIC value of 2560.19. The BIC value for the second alternative model that included direct paths from servant leadership to group potency and self-efficacy was 2561.61. And the third alternative model that specified a direct path from i-deals to employee in-role performance and from second direct path from median i-deals to group performance had a BIC value of 2572.22. The results indicate that alternative models with additional parameters added to represent direct paths did not improve the model fit to the data over the hypothesized model.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

The current multilevel investigation examined the antecedents and influence mechanisms of i-deals from the perspective of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 2001). I proposed that servant leadership is an antecedent to i-deals at both individual and group levels. There are two explanations for this relationship. First, followers are more likely to negotiate i-deals when working with servant leaders, because their proxy agency is enhanced by servant leader behaviors such as putting followers first, helping followers succeed and grow, and empowering followers. Second, servant leaders are more willing to consider followers’ needs and grant i-deals to each follower due to their strong emphasis on serving their followers. Drawing on social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 2001, 2005), I argue that employees engage in self-evaluation and self-reflection which can either enhance or undermine their personal efficacy. Successful negotiations of i-deals contribute to employee positive perceptions of their individual ability to have an impact, enhancing self-efficacy. In contrast, when employees fail to obtain desired customization in work arrangements, they will doubt their capabilities to exert influences at work, disconfirming their self-efficacy and lowering their performance. Further, I proposed that i-deals’ influences on employees’ perceptions about their capabilities are not limited at the individual level. Consistent with the notion in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 2000, 2010) that collective agency plays an important role in group functioning, I reasoned that the overall i-deals within a work group is factored into the members’ shared cognition of how capable people are as a group, which affects group performance.

Results based on a multilevel sample with responses from two sources supported the hypothesized relationships. The identification of i-deals’ positive relationship with self-efficacy
and group potency at two levels contributes to the theoretical development of intermediate processes through which i-deals influence performance. Early i-deals research has focused on explaining the effect of i-deals through the social exchange perspective (Rousseau & Kim, 2006; Liu et al., 2013). The main conclusion of this line of i-deals research is that managers offer employee i-deals to elicit a sense of obligation among employees so that they will reciprocate by enhancing their performance (Rousseau 2005; Rousseau & Kim, 2006). Recently, the job design perspective has provided an additional angle to understand the effect of i-deals. This line of research has demonstrated that the effect of i-deals on employee in-role performance can be explained by changes to specific job characteristics, such as job complexity, job control, and job autonomy (Hornung, Glaser et al., 2010; Hornung, Rousseau, & Glaser, 2010; Hornung et al., in press). While the social exchange theory and job design perspective are both conducive in providing explanatory mechanisms to understanding the effect of i-deals, it is also important to consider the role of personal efficacy, which is the foundation of human functioning (Bandura, 1996). Results from the current study reveal the promise of social cognitive theory in i-deals research from a multilevel perspective. Successful experience of initiating and negotiating customized work arrangements indeed enhanced an individual’s belief that he/she was able to succeed in carrying out his/her work role (Baudura & Locke, 2003). Groups with a high level of i-deals also shared the observation and cognition that they had power in controlling the environment, which promoted their beliefs in their collective capacities to be effective. Not only does the action of negotiating i-deals itself reflect individual proactivity, but the effects of i-deals on employees and groups are consistent with social cognitive theory that people are self-reflected.
The results found in the current study also provide empirical evidence supporting theorizing and operationalizing i-deals as a single construct. Indeed, although i-deals can take different forms, as a single theoretical concept, it captures the extent to which employees have successfully negotiated special work arrangements with their employer. The content of these work arrangements are dimensions of i-deals. Hence, i-deals comprises a single theoretical concept with several distinct but related dimensions (Law, Wong, & Mobley, 1998), consistent with Edwards’ (2001) notion of an aggregate multidimensional construct with specific content dimensions. In line with social cognitive theory, regardless of the content specificity, i-deals as a general construct represent the extent to which employees are able to exercise their agency. The more successful they are in obtaining i-deals, the more confident they become in believing their impacts at work.

Both individual agency (i.e., self-efficacy) and collective agency (i.e., group potency) were studied in the current investigation. In particular, I hypothesized and found support for the positive relationship between group potency and self-efficacy. This finding is in accordance with social cognitive theory’s rejection of contentious dualisms that isolate group functioning from individual functioning (Bandura, 2010). It reveals that individuals indeed benefited from belonging to a group with high collective capabilities at work.

There are also implications for research on servant leadership. Hu and Liden, (2011) found that the effect of servant leadership on team performance is mediated by group potency. At the individual level, Walumbwa et al. (2010) revealed the mediating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between servant leadership and OCB. Extending their findings, the current study showed that servant leaders enhance employee and group competence through human resource practices of customizing employee work arrangements. This result provides us with a closer
examination of processes through which servant leadership influences individual and group performance.

The demonstration of servant leadership as a key antecedent to i-deals contributes to the broader literature integrating leadership and human resource practices. Although i-deals represent a creative human resource strategy that recognizes employees’ proactivity and initiative, the role of managers is still critical. As aforementioned, one of the major distinctions between i-deals and job crafting (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) is that the creation of i-deals requires managers’ approval. That said, managers’ leadership styles are influential on whether they are willing to negotiate i-deals with employees. Surprisingly, no previous study has examined how leadership styles can influence granting of employees’ requests for i-deals. As the first study to investigate the effect of a specific type of leader behavior on i-deals, results of this study show that leaders can grant customized work arrangements to develop employee and group competence and help them become agentic, purposive and proactive regulators of their actions.

**Strengths and Limitations**

Several strengths of the study design allow for greater confidence in the results. First, the multilevel design with data collected from two sources (i.e., employees and managers) reduced common source bias. Second, I collected the data on-site during paid working hours and was available to answer questions during the survey process. This data collection design not only increased response rate but also ensured the accuracy in employees’ responses. Third, the study design has enhanced the generalizability of i-deals research. Specifically, the concept of i-deals was introduced and mainly tested in Western cultures (Rousseau, 2005). In addition, earlier findings regarding i-deals were mainly from the health care industry (Hornung et al., 2011;
Hornung, Glaser, et al., 2010; Hornung, Rousseau, et al., 2010; Rousseau & Kim, 2006). Data for the current study were collected from a Chinese manufacturing company, which contributed to the generalizability of i-deals research to a unique industry in a non-Western culture.

There are also limitations. The fact that data for the current study were collected at two time points does not change the cross-sectional nature of the study design. Therefore, no causal inferences can safely be made. For example, the causal orders proposed in the mediational hypotheses cannot be confirmed. Also, there are alternative explanations for the relationships found in the current study as well as potential reversed causal relationships. For example, the current study theorized that self-efficacy is enhanced by one’s successful experience in negotiating an i-deal. Yet it is probable that individuals with higher self-efficacy are more likely to negotiate i-deals. Alternatively, there might exist a reciprocal relationship between i-deals and self-efficacy, which is consistent with the reciprocal determinism argument in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). It is also possible that group potency is enhanced by high self-efficacy that members have. For example, if a group of highly talented, confident people are assembled into a team, members are likely to think that with these great fellow members, they will be a highly performing team. In addition, prior research has relied on social exchange theory and job design perspective as two main theoretical lens to examine the effect of i-deals. However, given the central role efficacy plays in human functioning, it may be possible that the effect of social exchange and job design runs through efficacy constructs. Specifically, the changes made to job characteristics may increase the fit between the job requirements and individual characteristics, which enhances personal efficacy. Also, self-efficacy may be strengthened when one perceives support from his/her manager or the employer (i.e., social exchange). In order to fully test these
possibilities and draw causal inferences with confidence, longitudinal studies with change scores collected on substantive variables are needed.

In addition, the current study did not include measures to assess managers’ willingness in granting i-deals and employees’ intention to negotiate an i-deal. Thus, it is not able to distinguish whether the positive relationship between servant leadership is because servant leaders are more willing to grant i-deals or because followers are more likely to initiate an i-deal negotiation when they are working with a servant leader. Another question relating to this point is that i-deals can be either requested by employees or offered by managers. Because servant leaders listen to, strive to understand, and seek to help each follower, they may anticipate follower needs and provide special arrangements before the follower asks for an ideal. That said, servant leaders engaging in proactive helping/supportive behaviors can make it unnecessary for the follower to have the need to request i-deals. Yet the measure of i-deals used in the study did not make a distinction between whether the deal was requested by employees or offered by managers. It is likely that respondents who had been offered a special arrangement from the leader without having to negotiate for it, would have faced a dilemma when completing the survey. People who had a special arrangement would decide that they should respond to the questions by saying that they negotiated for the special deal, even though that was not the case. Technically, respondents in such cases should indicate that they did not negotiate for the i-deal, even though they have a special arrangement that the leader suggested.

**Implications for Practices**

Helping employees and groups succeed is always central to managerial roles. Results of the current study not only confirm that leaders who put followers first are more likely to help them build their confidence, but also offer important recommendations on ways to achieve this.
Specifically, to better serve followers, managers are recommended to consider followers’ needs and be willing to make accommodations for them by allowing customized changes to followers’ work arrangements. Employees will gain a sense of confidence at work when they are able to have a work schedule that avoids potential conflicts, to work on tasks that match their strengths and interests, and to further acquire knowledge and skills and advance their capacities to perform their work.

It is expected that different members within a group might have different needs regarding work schedule, task assignments, and opportunities for development. This may result in differences in work engagements for employees working in the same group. As Greenberg and colleagues (2004) cautioned, there might be a fairness issue associated with such differentiation among group members’ work arrangements. However, as long as members’ needs are thoroughly discussed and considered, the entire work group will share the understanding that their voices matter, which will enhance their collective belief about working effectively as a group and their group performance. To facilitate the maintenance of a fair environment, managers are also advised to establish clear conditions for granting i-deals and to avoid creating deals “under the table.”

In addition, managers need to take cautions when they are engaging in servant leader behaviors. Specifically, servant leaders may have an inordinate emotional and logistical burden, because they might be manipulated by followers who are savvy in negotiation of special deals and exploit the servant leader for personal gain (Whetstone, 2002).

Insofar as i-deals are conceptualized to be mutually beneficial to employer and employees, they can be an effective strategy to attract, motivate, and retain productive
employees. Nonetheless, i-deals should be used as a supplement rather than a substitute to well-designed standardized HR practices.

**Future Research**

Results from this study also confirm the promise for studying i-deals from a multilevel perspective. Although i-deals are about the customization of individuals’ work arrangements, they have implications for all members within the group (Rousseau 2005; Rousseau et al., 2006). Indeed, high group median i-deals increase the saliency of the fact that members’ voices are heard. When viewed collectively at the group level, the extent to which i-deals are allowed within groups becomes a meaningful group phenomenon and is powerful in shaping group processes. Specifically revealed in the current study, when group members share the observation that they are allowed to have control over their own work, they tend to share the cognition of their collective capacity to be effective, which contributes directly to their group performance. One fruitful direction for future research on i-deals would be to continue the examination of i-deals’ implications at different levels. The current study focused on overall tendency of i-deals at the group level. In addition to overall level of i-deals within a group, future research can also examine how i-deals are differentially distributed within a work group. Indeed, one of the defining features of i-deals is that differentiation of i-deals may exist (Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau et al., 2006). Some group members may have negotiated more i-deals than others. Alternatively, some members may have i-deals but others do not. Such within-group heterogeneity is inherently a group-level variable that describes characteristics of a group (Klein, Dansereau, & Hall, 1994). The degree of within-group heterogeneity regarding i-deals can vary across groups. In some groups, there might be no differentiation in terms of how many i-deals group members get, while within-group heterogeneity regarding i-deals might be large in other groups. More
critical than the number of i-deals is the significance/importance of the i-deal. An employee might have an important i-deal, while other employees only have a trivial i-deal. Future research may focus on identifying theories that can be applied to understanding how such differentiations on i-deals (i.e., number of i-deals and significance of i-deals) impact group processes and outcomes. Also, the issue of how the distribution of i-deals may affect members’ perceptions of group fairness can be investigated. In addition, as a group-level phenomenon, how i-deals are distributed may impact how employees view their own i-deals, which is likely to alter the effect of i-deals on employee outcomes.

Another group-level phenomenon that is relevant to i-deals is “we-deals” (Hornung et al., 2009). Future research is encouraged to consider “we-deals,” which refer to special work arrangements negotiated collectively by and for an entire work group. Indeed, many of the challenges at work are pertinent to common problems that require group members to work collectively in voicing their opinions (Bandura, 1997). Such voice may include changes to what specific tasks the group works on, schedules related to group projects, and/or special opportunities for team building in a group. It is probable that we-deals promotes greater performance of group tasks than group median i-deals. First, we-deals may provide a more direct experience to the entire group regarding their capabilities to exert influence within the group. Second, the specific content negotiated via we-deals may directly contribute to the nature of group tasks and/or work schedule, which can elevate the entire group’s motivation in accomplishing their work and enhance group potency more directly. It would also be interesting to compare the relative importance of the effects of group median i-deals and we-deals on group outcomes.
Future research may also compare the operationalization of i-deals as a single versus multiple variables. Prior research has primarily theorized and hypothesized i-deals at the dimensional level. Drawing on social cognitive theory, the current study revealed the utility to theorize and operationalize i-deals as a single concept. Indeed, although i-deals can take different forms, i-deals as a single construct captures the extent to which employees have successfully negotiated special work arrangements with their employer. Consistent with Edwards (2001), i-deals can be viewed as an aggregate multidimensional construct with specific content dimensions. This is akin to formative measures, various contents of i-deals form or induce the general i-deals construct (Edwards & Bagozzi, 2000). It is noteworthy that dimensions of an aggregate construct are not necessarily highly correlated with each other. That said, employees who obtain one type of i-deal may or may not get another type. The negotiation of one type of i-deal can occur independently of bargaining for another type. There is good reason to treat different i-deal contents as distinct variables, just as there is support for examining i-deals as a single general concept. The appropriateness of each approach depends on the nature of the research question. Thus, it would be valuable to explore under what conditions types of i-deals should be examined separately and when can they be considered as a holistic construct.

Future studies are recommended to develop models of i-deals with cultural variables included. Although data for the current study was collected in a non-Western culture, no cross-cultural hypotheses were theorized and tested. Cross-cultural research has long demonstrated the promise of studying cultural impact at the individual level, measuring people’s personal values (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Cultural values may affect how i-deals impact individual attitudes and behaviors (Liu et al., 2013). For example, as suggested by Lee and Hui (2011), compared with Western cultures, high power distance introduces greater status differences between the
parties when negotiating i-deals. Status differences can alter the nature of negotiation processes including the leverage the employee exercises as well as the legitimacy of requests for special arrangements. At the same time, such arrangements can involve intangible resources tied to one’s social standing and social connections (i.e., guanxi; Xin & Pearce, 1996) that are highly valued in Eastern cultures. In contrast, the tangible value of i-deals for solving personal problems or providing career opportunities may be more important in Western cultures (Ng & Feldman, in press). Related to the cross cultural research on i-deals, future research should establish measurement equivalence to ensure that the concept is understood in the same way across settings as in the case of Ng and Feldman (in press).

It is also recommended that the measurement of i-deals be enhanced in future research. The empirical development of any field, including i-deals, largely depends on the soundness of the measurement tools (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). The i-deals measure used in the current study reflects the latest development in the operationalization of i-deals. However, from the perspective of the construct validity of i-deals, researchers have yet to explicitly develop a measure that is able to test whether the special work arrangements meet an important criterion for i-deals, such that i-deals are intended to be mutually beneficial for both employee and employer (Rousseau et al., 2006). Because parties differ in their relative power and interests, deals that are intended to benefit can have different effects than do those that may favor the interest of one party relative to the other. It would not be totally unreasonable to suspect whether the measured deals are different from malfunctioned person-specific arrangements.

Consistent with the majority of prior studies, the current study used employees’ source of reports on i-deals. It is worthy to note that two studies (Anand et al., 2010; Hornung et al., 2009) asked supervisors to report on their subordinates’ i-deals. Supervisor reports have the advantage
of eliminating the threat of common method bias in i-deals research on employee attitudes. However, employees’ self-reports have the advantage of providing information about the i-deals an individual has bargained for regardless of the employer representative involved. Future studies may examine the level of agreement or explanatory power of different sources.

In the current article, I contend that servant leadership, because of its emphasis on satisfying followers’ needs, is well suited to the understanding of the i-deal creation. The sample from the current study supported a positive relationship between servant leadership and i-deals at both the individual and group levels. However, prior research found LMX relates positively to ideals (Hornug, Rousseau, et al., 2010; Hornung et al., in press; Rosen et al., 2013) and that there is a high correlation between servant leadership and LMX (Liden et al., 2008). Indeed, although leader behaviors and leader-member relationships are conceptually distinct, LMX is highly correlated with positive leadership styles (e.g., .72 with transformational leadership, and .73 with contingent reward behavior, Dulebohn et al., 2012). The strong positive relationships between positive leadership styles and LMX call for attention to examining additional predictive validity a particular leadership style has on the creation of i-deals, over and beyond the effect of LMX. In addition, positive leadership styles may be beneficial in fostering high quality LMX relationships. Thus, it is likely that LMX serves as a mediator in explaining the effect of positive leadership styles (e.g., servant leadership, transformational leadership) on the creation of i-deals.

**Conclusion**

While past research has demonstrated the importance of i-deals to organizations, its theoretical development is still at an early stage. With data collected from two sources and variables from two levels, the current study has extended i-deals research by initiating multilevel theory development of i-deals. The results have demonstrated servant leadership as an
antecedent to i-deals at individual and group levels and showed promise for social cognitive theory as a key explanatory mechanism for why servant leadership and i-deals were related to performance at two levels. Future research is encouraged to continue the exploration of additional theories that can contribute to the multilevel theory development of i-deals.
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### TABLE 1

**Related Constructs of I-Deals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Relationship to I-Deals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dysfunctional person-specific arrangements</td>
<td>Work arrangements centered on individuals but lack their legitimacy either because they are pure self-serving or not permitted (e.g., favoritism or unauthorized arrangements).</td>
<td>Dysfunctional person-specific work arrangements are not legitimate and do not benefit the employer. I-deals are distinct from dysfunctional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job crafting</td>
<td>“physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work”</td>
<td>Both job crafting and i-deals reflect employees’ personal initiative in making changes to their jobs. However, job crafting does not always involve objective modifications that are approved by the organization as is the case in i-deals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee psychological contracts</td>
<td>“Individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an exchange agreement between individuals and their organization.”</td>
<td>Psychological contracts reflect an employee’s belief of what the employer has promised in the employment relationship, while i-deals are not inherently perceptual and are actual work arrangements an individual has negotiated. I-deals can influence the way employees perceive psychological contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>Exchange relationships developed between leader and member within a workgroup.</td>
<td>LMX can result in either legitimate i-deals or dysfunctional person-specific employment practices, depending on whether LMX has a legitimate basis. I-deals can also have an impact on LMX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Employees’ “beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being.”</td>
<td>POS can encourage employees’ negotiation of i-deals. Meanwhile, i-deals granted by the employer can strengthen employees’ POS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Relationship to I-Deals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace flexibility (Goodstein, 1994)</td>
<td>A flexible work environment consists of an array of organization-sponsored programs (e.g., flextime, voluntary shifts to part-time work, job sharing, and flexible leaves).</td>
<td>Organization-sponsored programs are standard to all employees, while i-deals are tailored for each individual. Flexibility offered by organizational standard programs is likely to impact i-deals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Hypothesized model. H = Hypothesis. I-deals = Idiosyncratic deals. H6 represents the indirect effect from servant leadership to in-role performance via i-deals and self-efficacy. H7 represents the indirect effect from servant leadership to group performance via group median i-deals and group potency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$df_{\Delta \chi^2}$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized model</td>
<td>503.79</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative model 1</td>
<td>813.81</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>310.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative model 2</td>
<td>786.30</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>282.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative model 3</td>
<td>613.51</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>109.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 189$. $df =$ Degrees of freedom. $\Delta \chi^2 = \chi^2$ differences between the hypothesized model and alternative models. CFI = Comparative fit index. TLI = Tucker-Lewis index. RMSEA = Root-mean-square error of approximation. SRMR = Standardized root-mean-square residual. For the multidimensional scale (i.e., i-deals), dimensional scores were used to indicate the construct, while other unidimensional scales were indicated by their items. Alternative model 1 = A 5-factor model with self-efficacy and group potency correlating at 1.0. Alternative model 2 = A 5-factor model with employee in-role performance and team performance correlating at 1.0. Alternative model 3 = A 5-factor model with servant leadership and i-deals correlating at 1.0.
### TABLE 3

**CFA Results on Servant Leadership and I-Deals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$df_{(\Delta \chi^2)}$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-factor model</td>
<td>113.36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model</td>
<td>221.65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>108.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $N = 189$. df = Degrees of freedom. $\Delta \chi^2 = \chi^2$ differences between the hypothesized model and alternative models. CFI = Comparative fit index. TLI = Tucker-Lewis index. RMSEA = Root-mean-square error of approximation. SRMR = Standardized root-mean-square residual. I-deals were indicated by dimensional scores, while servant leadership was indicated by items. Two-factor model = Dimensions of i-deals and items of servant leadership loaded on their respective factors. One-factor model = I-deals and servant leadership correlated at 1.0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group Level</th>
<th>Individual Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Servant leadership</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group median i-deals</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group potency</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group performance</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Average dyad tenure (years)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I-deals</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In-role performance</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dyad tenure (years)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 169-189 at the individual level. N = 45 at the group level. **p<.01; *p<.05. †p<.10. Two-tailed. Internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach’s alphas) are reported in bold on the diagonal. I-Deals = Idiosyncratic deals.
**FIGURE 2**

*Estimated Unstandardized Path Coefficients*

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 2.* Unstandardized path coefficients for the hypothesized model. I-deals = Idiosyncratic deals. **p<.01; *p<.05. One-tailed.*
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