

Brain Drain: Possible Consequence of Employees' Unsuccessful Developmental I-deals

Yetunde Awe

Postgraduate Research Student
College of Business, Law and Social Sciences
University of Derby, UK
Kedleston Road
DE22 1GB

Email: y.awe@derby.ac.uk

Brain Drain: Possible Consequence of Employees' Unsuccessful Developmental I-deals.

Summary

Idiosyncratic deals (I-deals) are arrangements between employees and their organisations that provide greater flexibility and autonomy in the workplace. Although I-deals have been shown to positively affect employee attitudes and behaviours, the effects of denied I-deals have received less attention. Moreover, denied I-deals can lead to negative emotions such as anger and frustration, harming work performance and relationships. This paper, therefore, examines the potential repercussions of rejecting developmental I-deals that, if approved, might have benefitted employees, the organisation, and, subsequently, the country. Hence, investigating unsuccessful I-deals will aid a better understanding of the mechanisms underlying these effects and how to counter them.

Keywords: Idiosyncratic deals, I-deals, Developmental, Human Resource Management (HRM)

Track: Organisational Psychology

Word Count: 1931 (Excluding title and references)

Introduction

"Given the versatility of i-deals for solving employment-related problems, we speculate that they also play a role in small business settings in both the developed and less developed world if for no other reasons than the lower incidence of formal policies or standard practices."

(Simosi et al., 2023, p. 20)

An emerging shift in research focus is directing attention towards other cultural contexts and countries, highlighting the need for a more comprehensive understanding of Idiosyncratic deals (I-deals) beyond traditional boundaries. The change in research focus towards I-deals is evident through studies exploring different cultural contexts and countries. For instance, Katou et al. (2021) investigated career I-deals in the Greek crisis economy, where employers face challenges in providing desirable benefits to workers with limited employment opportunities. Liao et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analysis synthesising findings on I-deals from Eastern and Western cultures. Rofcanin et al. (2016) examined I-deals in Istanbul, Turkey, a fast-growing economy. Ayeni et al. (2023) researched I-deals in Nigeria, where highly skilled workers are in internal and external labour market talent wars. Additionally, Gelfand et al. (2007) highlighted the significance of understanding different cultures beyond the USA and other Anglo-Saxon countries, emphasising the implications for employee behaviours. These studies contribute to a broader understanding of I-deals in diverse cultural settings.

However, despite the growing research focus on I-deals in various cultural contexts and countries, there remains a significant disparity in the understanding of non-Western cultures (Simosi et al., 2023), particularly Nigeria, which faces the challenge of brain drain (Ayeni et al., 2023, Ebuka et al., 2022). Nigeria, the most populous nation in Africa, substantially impacts the socioeconomic processes of countries within its region (Edoho, 2015). Lagos, the largest city in Nigeria, is a hub for highly skilled, well-educated, and adaptable employees with substantial market power (Ayeni et al., 2023, da Costa, 2019). Nevertheless, it experiences significant international migration of talented individuals (Imafidon, 2018). Likewise, the country's history of problematic and non-participatory employment interactions, coupled with a lack of employee representation, creates a distinct workplace relations landscape that differs from Western nations like the United Kingdom (Fajana et al., 2011, Miller, 2009, Oyelere, 2014).

Although organisations claim that there is a widely accepted approach to HRM in Nigeria, it is considered to have significant flaws (Anakwe, 2002, Otober, 2016). Some scholars argue that Nigeria's consensus approach to HRM is simply empty talk and hollow promises (Mushfiqu et al., 2018). Consequently, employees in Nigeria often face voicelessness, limited say in employment relations, and a high turnover rate (Oyelere, 2014, Emelifeonwu and Valk, 2019, Siyanbola and Gilman, 2017). This circumstance, characterised by limited employee input and a high turnover rate, has led to the brain drain phenomenon in Nigeria (Ebuka et al., 2022, Mushfiqu et al., 2018, Adisa et al., 2016), which remains a severe issue for the country (Anetoh and Onwudinjo, 2020). Consequently, a comprehensive evaluation and understanding of HR practices in Nigeria are essential to promote effective managerial procedures, recruit, retain a dynamic workforce, and drive socioeconomic performance in the country (Budhwar and Boyne, 2004, Pingel et al., 2019).

Therefore, the paper investigates whether brain drain in Nigeria results from unsuccessful developmental I-deal. Furthermore, it explores the interaction between employees' job performance and LMX. It also investigates how the interaction might lead to the denial of

developmental I-deal negotiations and employees' responses in terms of turnover intentions. The findings can help to further our understanding of developmental I-deal and how supervisors contribute to their identification. In addition, it can uncover new applications and functions of I-deals in Nigeria and the broader employment landscape.

Literature Review

I-deals are personalised agreements between employees and employers, providing flexible solutions to employment-related issues (Bal and Dorenbosch, 2015, Rosen et al., 2013, Liao et al., 2016, Rousseau et al., 2006). These deals can be categorised into various types, including developmental, task, flexibility, workload, and financial (Rosen et al., 2013, Hornung et al., 2008). Developmental I-deals are significant as they enhance skill and career growth (Rosen et al., 2013, Hornung et al., 2008, Hornung et al., 2009, Ng, 2017). Moreover, research has shown that employees who receive developmental I-deals experience increased job satisfaction (Singh and Vidyarthi, 2018), organisational commitment (Katou et al., 2021), work engagement (Hornung et al., 2010), perceived organisational support (Liu et al., 2013), motivation to continue working after retirement (Bal et al., 2012) and intention to stay (Ho and Tekleab, 2016).

However, despite its acknowledged importance, limited empirical research has explored I-deals' role in reducing employee turnover and its intentions (Liao et al., 2016, Ho and Tekleab, 2013, Lee and Chung, 2019). Furthermore, meta-analyses on employee turnover have also overlooked the inclusion of I-deals as antecedents (Rubenstein et al., 2018). This knowledge gap is significant because I-deals can contribute to mutually beneficial outcomes for employees and employers, including talent attraction and retention (Lee and Chung, 2019). Nevertheless, the consequences of denied I-deals and their relationship with employee outcomes have received limited attention (Pestotnik and Süß, 2023). Understanding the implications of unsuccessful I-deal negotiations on employee attitudes and behaviours can shed light on the factors contributing to high turnover rates in countries like Nigeria, where turnover and brain drain are prevalent (Ebuka et al., 2022). Seeing that successful developmental I-deals positively relate to employees' intentions to continue working beyond retirement (Bal et al., 2012) and a sense of commitment by employees towards their organisation (Gouldner, 1960), this paper explores the impact of unsuccessful developmental I-deals on turnover intentions among employees.

Theoretical Background

This research paper builds upon Social Exchange Theory (SET), which explains the dynamics of human social relationships (Blau, 1968). According to this theory, employees' behaviour towards their employers is influenced by the expected outcomes of their interactions. When the perceived rewards outweigh the costs, employees tend to have positive feelings towards the relationship and are likelier to stay. Conversely, if the costs outweigh the benefits, their satisfaction declines, increasing the likelihood of ending the relationship (Blau, 1968).

From the SET perspective, I-deals' nature can vary significantly (Simosi et al., 2023). For example, regarding developmental I-deals, this I-deal often involves a trade-off, where the employee agrees to contribute in specific ways to receive additional training or developmental opportunities (Rosen et al., 2013). On the other hand, an employee may threaten to quit unless they receive a raise or promotion without offering anything in return. Alternatively, they may use a win-win approach, offering to contribute future value to the organisation in exchange for a customised resource, such as developmental opportunities (Simosi et al., 2023).

When explaining I-deals, the interconnection between SET and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) becomes apparent (Sparrowe and Liden, 1997). I-deals are often negotiated within social exchanges between employees and supervisors (Hornung et al., 2010, Rousseau et al., 2006). Hence, employees with high-quality LMX relationships, characterised by trust and support, are likelier to engage in positive social exchanges with their supervisors (Hornung et al., 2010). These employees perceive that their contributions are valued and rewarded, which increases their willingness to negotiate I-deals. In high-quality LMX relationships, supervisors may be more inclined to offer I-deals to their trusted and high-performing employees to reward and retain them (Dansereau et al., 1975, Morf et al., 2019). Nonetheless, the probability of employees' requests being rejected is reduced when they maintain a solid and effective bond with their supervisors (Hornung et al., 2010). Thus, I-deals can be seen as a social exchange that strengthens the positive relationship between the supervisor and the employee. However, it is essential to note that a high-quality relationship does not guarantee that all employees involved are high performers (Çaliskan and Torun, 2019). Instead, it reflects the level of trust, resource exchange, and support between the leader and the member (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Based on SET, when employees, especially high performers, do not receive requested I-deals, it could lead to feelings of unfairness (Kwon et al., 2010, Siegrist, 1996, Lee et al., 2022) and consequently may lead to their intention to leave their organisations. Given that I-deals serve as indicators for positive evaluation (Ho and Kong, 2015) and high performers also believe they deserve such arrangements (Bal, 2017, Anand et al., 2010), it is likely that those who receive developmental I-deals will feel a sense of commitment to their organisation and thus are less likely to quit, seeing it as a way to repay the organisation's investment (Gouldner, 1960). Conversely, providing I-deals to deserving employees who perform well can improve their positive work outcomes (Ho and Tekleab, 2016). However, the opposite is expected when employees' requests for developmental I-deals are unsuccessful, as high performers may be more inclined to explore external opportunities (Guerrero et al., 2014), regardless of the reason behind its denial.

Thus, it is logical to assume that when high performers perceive that their contributions and achievements are undervalued or unrecognised, they may feel a sense of inequity, leading to turnover intentions and are likely to seek alternative employment options. Therefore, examining whether the interaction between performance and LMX can predict the outcomes of I-deal negotiations and employees' reactions to unsuccessful I-deal negotiations is essential. Given that high performers are more inclined to perceive the denial of an I-deal as unjust treatment by the organisation, employees who demonstrate high-performance levels but have a low-quality LMX relationship might exhibit greater turnover intentions when an I-deal is denied.

Research Aim/Question

The paper aims to answer the following questions:

1. Does the correlation between employees' job performance and LMX predict the success of developmental I-deal negotiation?
2. Will this interaction lead to unsuccessful developmental I-deal negotiation?
3. Do employees with high job performance and low-quality LMX exhibit signs of intending to leave?

Methodology

This study will employ a quantitative research method to investigate various variables such as employees' performance, LMX, developmental I-deals, and turnover intentions among workers in Nigeria. The primary data collection method will involve distributing questionnaires via email to gather quantitative data. In addition, both supervisor and employee assessments of LMX will be utilised to mitigate social desirability bias.

The study will focus on examining the I-deal experiences of employees in Nigeria, a developing country, aiming to enrich our understanding of the dynamics and implications of I-deals within this specific context. To ensure comprehensive insights across organisational levels and minimise common method bias, supervisors will evaluate employee performance, and the supervisor's and employees' perceptions of LMX will be assessed. In addition, quantitative data will be collected from various employees in Nigeria, enabling a broader workforce representation and enhancing the findings' generalisability.

Conclusion

The present paper provides significant theoretical and practical knowledge that aims to address an aspect of the brain drain in Nigeria through deductive reasoning. It addresses the combined effort of LMX and performance on denied I-deals and, subsequently, employee turnover intentions. It also highlights the difference between I-deals receipt and unsuccessful I-deals and sheds light on the possible negative consequence of denied developmental I-deals in Nigeria.

References

- ADISA, T. A., OSABUTEY, E. L. C. & GBADAMOSI, G. 2016. Understanding the causes and consequences of work-family conflict. *Employee Relations*, 38, 770-788.
- ANAKWE, U. P. 2002. Human resource management practices in Nigeria: challenges and insights. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13, 1042-1059.
- ANAND, S., VIDYARTHI, P. R., LIDEN, R. C. & ROUSSEAU, D. M. 2010. Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality. *Academy of management journal*, 53, 970-988.
- ANETOH, B. C. & ONWUDINJO, V. G. 2020. Emigration and the problem of brain drain in Nigeria: a philosophical evaluation. *Journal of African Studies and Sustainable Development*, 3.
- AYENI, D., CHAUDHRY, S. & ALDOSSARI, M. 2023. Temporal contexts and actors vis-a-vis I-deals' timing and creation: Evidence from Nigeria. *Group & Organization Management*, 48, 262-316.
- BAL, P. M. 2017. Why do employees negotiate idiosyncratic deals?: An exploration of the process of i-deal negotiation. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 42, 2-18.
- BAL, P. M., DE JONG, S. B., JANSEN, P. G. & BAKKER, A. B. 2012. Motivating employees to work beyond retirement: A multi-level study of the role of I-deals and unit climate. *Journal of management studies*, 49, 306-331.
- BAL, P. M. & DORENBOSCH, L. 2015. Age-related differences in the relations between individualised HRM and organisational performance: A large-scale employer survey. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25, 41-61.
- BLAU, P. M. 1968. Social exchange. *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, 7, 452-457.
- BUDHWAR, P. S. & BOYNE, G. 2004. Human resource management in the Indian public and private sectors: an empirical comparison. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15, 346-370.
- ÇALISKAN, E. & TORUN, A. 2019. Individualized HR practices and idiosyncratic deals (i-deals) and the expected positive individual and organizational outcomes. *Istanbul Business Research*, 48, 36-63.
- DA COSTA, P. N. 2019. TECH TALENT SCRAMBLE TECH TALENT SCRAMBLE. *Finance & Development*, 56.
- DANSEREAU, F., GRAEN, G. & HAGA, W. J. 1975. A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- EBUKA, A. A., NGOZI, N. H., OBIANUJU, C. & PEACE, N. N. 2022. Job Crafting, a brain drain antidote in Public Universities in Nigeria. *Annals of Human Resource Management Research*, 2, 1-13.
- EDOHO, F. M. 2015. Entrepreneurship and socioeconomic development. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 6, 127-147.
- EMELIFEONWU, J. C. & VALK, R. 2019. Employee voice and silence in multinational corporations in the mobile telecommunications industry in Nigeria. *Employee Relations*, 41, 228-252.
- FAJANA, S., OWOYEMI, O., ELEGBEDE, T. & GBAJUMO-SHERIFF, M. 2011. Human resource management practices in Nigeria. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 2, 57.
- GELFAND, M. J., EREZ, M. & AYCAN, Z. 2007. Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 58, 479-514.
- GOULDNER, A. W. 1960. The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- GRAEN, G. B. & UHL-BIEN, M. 1995. Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.
- GUERRERO, S., BENTEIN, K. & LAPALME, M.-È. 2014. Idiosyncratic Deals and High Performers' Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29, 323-334.
- HO, V. & TEKLEAB, A. G. Ask and ye shall receive: a model of ex-ante and ex-post idiosyncratic deal-making and outcomes. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2013. Academy of Management Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510, 11481.

- HO, V. T. & KONG, D. T. 2015. Exploring the signaling function of idiosyncratic deals and their interaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 131, 149-161.
- HO, V. T. & TEKLEAB, A. G. 2016. A model of idiosyncratic deal-making and attitudinal outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31, 642-656.
- HORNUNG, S., ROUSSEAU, D. M. & GLASER, J. 2008. Creating flexible work arrangements through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93, 655.
- HORNUNG, S., ROUSSEAU, D. M. & GLASER, J. 2009. Why supervisors make idiosyncratic deals: Antecedents and outcomes of i-deals from a managerial perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24, 738-764.
- HORNUNG, S., ROUSSEAU, D. M., GLASER, J., ANGERER, P. & WEIGL, M. 2010. Beyond top-down and bottom-up work redesign: Customizing job content through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 187-215.
- IMAFIDON, J. 2018. *One Way Traffic: Nigeria's Medical Brain Drain. A Challenge for Maternal Health and Public Health System in Nigeria?*, University of California, Los Angeles.
- KATOU, A. A., BUDHWAR, P. S. & PATEL, C. 2021. Idiosyncratic deals in less competitive labor markets: testing career i-deals in the Greek context of high uncertainties. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32, 3748-3775.
- KWON, K., BAE, J. & LAWLER, J. J. 2010. High Commitment HR Practices and Top Performers. *Management International Review*, 50, 57-80.
- LEE, E. K., HONG, W. & RUPP, D. E. 2022. Employee idiosyncratic deals (i-deals) and organizational justice: the role of individual job performance and coworkers' i-deals. *Personnel Review*.
- LEE, J.-Y. & CHUNG, H. 2019. Peer perspectives on employee idiosyncratic deals. *Seoul Journal of Business*, 25, 1-26.
- LIAO, C., WAYNE, S. J. & ROUSSEAU, D. M. 2016. Idiosyncratic deals in contemporary organizations: A qualitative and meta-analytical review. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 37, S9-S29.
- LIU, J., LEE, C., HUI, C., KWAN, H. K. & WU, L.-Z. 2013. Idiosyncratic deals and employee outcomes: The mediating roles of social exchange and self-enhancement and the moderating role of individualism. *Journal of applied psychology*, 98, 832.
- MILLER, K. 2009. Gendered nature of managerialism? Case of the National Health Service. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 22, 104-113.
- MORF, M., BAKKER, A. B. & FEIERABEND, A. 2019. Bankers closing idiosyncratic deals: Implications for organisational cynicism. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 29, 585-599.
- MUSHFIQUR, R., MORDI, C., ORUH, E. S., NWAGBARA, U., MORDI, T. & TURNER, I. M. 2018. The impacts of work-life-balance (WLB) challenges on social sustainability. *Employee Relations*, 40, 868-888.
- NG, T. W. H. 2017. Can idiosyncratic deals promote perceptions of competitive climate, felt ostracism, and turnover? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 99, 118-131.
- OTOBO, D. 2016. *Reforms and Nigerian labour and employment relations: Perspectives, issues and challenges*, Malthouse Press.
- OYELERE, M. 2014. Political developments, trade union and social movement unionism: A case of Nigeria labour congress. *Regent's Working Papers in Business & Management Working Paper*, 1404.
- PESTOTNIK, A. & SÜß, S. 2023. How do idiosyncratic deals influence employees' effort-reward imbalance? An empirical investigation of the role of social comparisons and denied i-deals. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34, 1015-1043.
- PINGEL, R., FAY, D. & URBACH, T. 2019. A resources perspective on when and how proactive work behaviour leads to employee withdrawal. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92, 410-435.
- ROFCANIN, Y., BERBER, A., KOCH, S. & SEVINC, L. 2016. Job crafting and I-deals: A study testing the nomological network of proactive behaviors. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27, 2695-2726.

- ROSEN, C. C., SLATER, D. J., CHANG, C.-H. & JOHNSON, R. E. 2013. Let's make a deal: Development and validation of the ex post i-deals scale. *Journal of Management*, 39, 709-742.
- ROUSSEAU, D. M., HO, V. T. & GREENBERG, J. 2006. I-deals: Idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships. *Academy of management review*, 31, 977-994.
- RUBENSTEIN, A. L., EBERLY, M. B., LEE, T. W. & MITCHELL, T. R. 2018. Surveying the forest: A meta-analysis, moderator investigation, and future-oriented discussion of the antecedents of voluntary employee turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 71, 23-65.
- SIEGRIST, J. 1996. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 27-41.
- SIMOSI, M., ALDOSSARI, M., CHAUDHRY, S. & ROUSSEAU, D. M. 2023. Uncovering missing voices: Invisible aspects of idiosyncratic deals (i-deals). SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- SINGH, S. & VIDYARTHI, P. R. 2018. Idiosyncratic Deals to Employee Outcomes: Mediating Role of Social Exchange Relationships. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 25, 443-455.
- SIYANBOLA, T. O. & GILMAN, M. W. 2017. Extent of employee turnover in Nigerian SMEs. *Employee Relations*, 39, 967-985.
- SPARROWE, R. T. & LIDEN, R. C. 1997. Process and structure in leader-member exchange. *Academy of management Review*, 22, 522-552.