

# Exploring Flexible Work Arrangements: Implications for Employee Satisfaction and Productivity Across Various Sectors in General Santos City

Grace B. Apiag<sup>1\*</sup>, Monsour A. Pelmin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mindanao State University, General Santos City, Philippines

**Abstract**— This study investigated the impact of Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs) on employee satisfaction and productivity across various sectors in General Santos City, Philippines. Using a descriptive quantitative research design, data were collected from 352 full-time employees in six sectors: education, healthcare, government, manufacturing, business process outsourcing (BPO), and retail/hospitality. Grounded in Self-Determination Theory, Capability Theory, and Facilitation Theory, the study assessed the implementation of Flexible Work Arrangements such as telecommuting, flextime, compressed workweeks, and shift work and their relationship to job satisfaction, work-life balance, and performance outcomes. Results showed that Flexible Work Arrangements, particularly flextime, were positively associated with increased satisfaction and productivity. Knowledge-based sectors benefited more from scheduled autonomy, while operational sectors responded better to structured flexibility. Respondents noted improved task completion, morale, and overall work-life integration. The study concluded that Flexible Work Arrangements were effective in enhancing both employee well-being and organizational efficiency when implemented appropriately. Recommendations included adopting context-specific FWA models, investing in technological infrastructure, training managers in remote supervision, and conducting trial periods with ongoing employee feedback. These strategies may help organizations create resilient, inclusive, and performance-driven work environments in the post-pandemic era.

**Index Terms**—Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs), job satisfaction, work-life balance, employee productivity, organizational commitment, performance outcomes, descriptive quantitative research, General Santos City, Philippines.

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, the global workforce has experienced significant transformation driven by technological advancements, evolving workforce expectations, and disruptive events such as the COVID-19 pandemic. These developments have compelled organizations to reassess traditional work structures and adopt more adaptive and resilient employment models. Among these, Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs) including telecommuting, flextime, compressed workweeks, and hybrid systems have emerged as essential strategies for

enhancing organizational efficiency and employee well-being.

Extensive global literature demonstrates that FWAs contribute positively to both individual and organizational outcomes. Flexible work practices enable employees to achieve better work-life balance, resulting in increased job satisfaction, improved motivation, and enhanced productivity. Moreover, FWAs support employee autonomy and psychological well-being, which are critical drivers of engagement and long-term retention. As organizations increasingly prioritize sustainable workforce practices, FWAs are no longer viewed as optional benefits but as strategic mechanisms for maintaining competitiveness in dynamic labor markets.

In the Philippine context, the adoption of FWAs has accelerated across various sectors, particularly in education, healthcare, government institutions, and business process outsourcing. Cultural factors, such as strong family orientation and caregiving responsibilities, further emphasize the importance of workplace flexibility among Filipino employees. However, the implementation of FWAs also presents challenges, including blurred boundaries between work and personal life, reduced interpersonal interaction, and potential communication gaps, which necessitate effective organizational policies and management strategies.

Despite the growing body of international research on FWAs, there remains a notable gap in studies focusing on mid-sized and developing urban centers. Much of the existing literature is concentrated in highly industrialized or metropolitan regions, limiting its applicability to local contexts with different socio-economic and cultural dynamics. General Santos City, as a rapidly developing urban center with a diverse economic landscape, provides a relevant setting for examining how FWAs function across various sectors.

This study aims to explore the implications of Flexible Work Arrangements on employee satisfaction and productivity in General Santos City. Specifically, it seeks to analyze how flexible work practices influence job satisfaction, work-life balance, and performance outcomes among employees in selected sectors. By providing empirical evidence from a

\*Corresponding author: grace.apiag@msugensan.edu.ph

localized context, the study contributes to the broader discourse on flexible work systems and offers insights for organizations, human resource practitioners, and policymakers in designing inclusive and adaptive workplace strategies in the post-pandemic era.

## 2. Literature Review

Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs) have become an essential component of contemporary organizational strategies, shaped by technological innovation, shifting employee expectations, and global disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic. These arrangements—including telecommuting, flexible scheduling, compressed workweeks, hybrid models, and job sharing—provide employees with greater discretion over when and where work is performed. Consequently, organizations increasingly adopt FWAs to balance operational efficiency with employee well-being.

A substantial body of research indicates that FWAs contribute positively to employee performance. Evidence suggests that flexible work structures enable individuals to optimize their productivity by aligning work schedules with personal peak performance periods while minimizing time lost to commuting and workplace interruptions (Bloom *et al.*, 2015; Gajendran & Harrison, 2016). These conditions support more efficient task completion and improved output quality, while also reducing absenteeism and enhancing overall organizational effectiveness.

In addition to performance benefits, FWAs are strongly associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. Employees granted flexibility tend to experience greater autonomy, which reduces work-related strain and fosters a more positive work experience (Allen *et al.*, 2019; Kossek *et al.*, 2021). Increased satisfaction often translates into stronger organizational attachment, lower turnover intentions, and improved morale within the workforce.

The literature also highlights the role of FWAs in strengthening work–life balance. By allowing employees to accommodate personal responsibilities—such as family care, education, and health needs—flexible arrangements reduce conflicts between professional and personal domains (Shockley *et al.*, 2021). This balance contributes to improved psychological well-being, including lower levels of stress, fatigue, and burnout.

Advancements in digital technology have been instrumental in enabling FWAs, particularly in remote and hybrid settings. Communication platforms, cloud-based systems, and project management tools facilitate coordination and collaboration across geographically dispersed teams. Despite these advantages, challenges remain, including potential communication gaps, reduced interpersonal interaction, and difficulties in maintaining boundaries between work and personal life (Plooij *et al.*, 2022). These concerns underscore the need for structured policies and effective leadership practices.

Empirical evidence from various international contexts consistently supports the positive outcomes associated with FWAs. Studies conducted across different regions report

improvements in employee engagement, satisfaction, and productivity. Within the Philippine setting, particularly in General Santos City, FWAs have gained traction as organizations adapted to pandemic-related disruptions. Local findings indicate that flexible work practices enhance employee well-being, reduce stress, and strengthen organizational commitment (Bacalso, 2020; Villanueva, 2021). Furthermore, these arrangements have been linked to improved retention rates and increased workforce stability.

However, the applicability of FWAs varies depending on the nature of work and organizational requirements. Certain roles necessitate physical presence or close coordination, limiting the feasibility of highly flexible arrangements. As such, organizations must carefully tailor FWAs to align with job demands and employee preferences.

Effective implementation of FWAs requires deliberate planning and continuous evaluation. The literature emphasizes the importance of establishing clear guidelines, monitoring performance outcomes, and incorporating employee feedback into policy design. Trial implementation phases, supported by adequate technological infrastructure and targeted training, can help organizations assess feasibility and address potential challenges before full adoption.

Overall, existing literature provides compelling evidence that FWAs enhance employee satisfaction, productivity, and work–life balance. While challenges persist, these can be addressed through strategic management, supportive leadership, and appropriate technological investments. As work environments continue to evolve, FWAs offer a sustainable approach to fostering a more engaged and productive workforce.

## 3. Research Design and Methodology

### A. Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive survey research design employing a quantitative approach to systematically examine the implications of Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs) on employee satisfaction and productivity. A descriptive design was deemed appropriate as it enables the objective measurement and analysis of existing conditions without manipulating variables (Williams, 2021).

Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire designed to assess employees' perceptions of FWAs, including dimensions such as autonomy, work–life balance, time management, collaboration, efficiency, and overall productivity.

Despite its strengths, the study acknowledges several limitations. First, the focus on employees within General Santos City limits the generalizability of findings to other geographic contexts. Second, reliance on self-reported data introduces potential biases, including social desirability and recall bias. Lastly, the inclusion of only six sectors may not fully capture the diversity of experiences across all industries.

### B. Research Locale

The study was conducted in General Santos City, a major economic center in the SOCCSKSARGEN region. The city

recorded a 9.0% economic growth rate in 2022 and contributed 25.6% to the region’s total economic output of ₱503.64 billion (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2023). Its dynamic economic landscape, diverse workforce, and expanding business environment make it a suitable setting for examining the effects of FWAs across multiple sectors.

*C. Research Respondents and Sampling Design*

Due to the absence of an official database of employees engaged in FWAs, the study employed the Cochran formula to estimate the required sample size, resulting in 385 respondents. A non-probability sampling technique, specifically convenience sampling, was used due to practical constraints such as time and accessibility.

To ensure sectoral representation, respondents were proportionally distributed based on estimated workforce sizes derived from secondary data sources.

The selected sectors represent diverse operational environments, allowing comparative analysis of FWAs across both service-oriented and production-based industries.

Out of 385 targeted respondents, 352 valid responses were collected, yielding a 91.4% response rate, which is considered statistically acceptable for survey research.

*D. Sampling Method and Procedure*

Convenience sampling was utilized to recruit participants who were readily accessible and willing to participate (Etikan et al., 2016). Additionally, purposive sampling was applied to ensure representation from six key sectors known to implement FWAs.

Participants were recruited through coordination with organizational representatives, human resource personnel, and professional networks. Invitations were disseminated via email and online platforms such as Facebook and LinkedIn. Data were collected through a self-administered online questionnaire using Google Forms.

*E. Inclusion Criteria*

Participants were required to:

1. Be at least 18 years old
2. Be currently employed under a flexible work arrangement
3. Have at least three months of experience under such arrangements

*F. Data Collection Instrument*

The primary instrument was a structured questionnaire adapted from Mugove et al. (2021). Modifications were made to ensure relevance to the Philippine context and alignment with the study’s objectives.

Key constructs retained included:

- Employee satisfaction (e.g., job satisfaction, work–life balance)
- Productivity (e.g., task completion, performance quality)

Enhancements included:

- Localization of demographic variables
- Expansion of job categories across sectors
- Inclusion of FWAs commonly practiced in the Philippines

Job classifications were aligned with the Philippine Standard Occupational Classification (PSOC).

The instrument underwent expert validation and pilot testing. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha, confirming internal consistency.

*G. Data Analysis and Interpretation*

Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics included:

- Frequency distributions
- Means and standard deviations

Inferential analysis utilized Spearman’s Rank Correlation Coefficient to examine relationships between FWAs, satisfaction, and productivity. This method was appropriate due

Table 1  
Proportionate distribution based on estimated workforce

Sector	Estimated Employees	Percentage of Total Population	Estimated Respondents
Higher Education	3,000	14.3%	55
Retail Hospitality	1,500	7.1%	27
Manufacturing	9,000	43%	167
BPO	1,500	7.1%	27
Healthcare Services	2,000	9.5%	36
Local Government Unit	4,000	19.0%	73
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>385</b>

Table 2  
Mapping of survey job types to PSOC major groups

Job Type	PSOC Code	PSOC Major Group
Administrative	4	Clerical Support Workers
Technical/Engineering	3	Technicians and Associate Professionals
Sales/Marketing	5	Service and Sales Workers
Customer Service	5	Service and Sales Workers
Management	1	Managers
Educator	2	Professionals
House Parent	9	Elementary Occupations
Utility	9	Elementary Occupations
Production Worker	8	Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers
Practicing Professional	2	Professionals
Others	NA	Not Classified / Varies by context

Table 3  
Likert scale interpretation

Scale	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very high	Strongly favorable response; excellent perception or impact
4	3.41 – 4.20	High	Generally positive response; satisfactory perception
3	2.61 – 3.40	Moderate	Neutral to slightly positive; room for improvement
2	1.81 – 2.60	Low	Generally negative; dissatisfaction or poor outcome
1	1.00 – 1.80	Very low	Strongly negative; critical perception or low effectiveness

to the non-normal distribution of perception-based data.

Spearman’s Rank was selected because it evaluates relationships based on ranked data rather than strict numerical distribution, making it suitable for analyzing subjective responses.

H. Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to established ethical standards, ensuring participant confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntary participation. Respondents were fully informed about the study’s purpose and their right to withdraw at any time.

No personally identifiable information was collected. Data were securely stored in password-protected systems accessible only to the researcher.

Ethical clearance was obtained prior to data collection (Approval No. 191-2025-MSUGSC-IERC), confirming compliance with institutional research ethics guidelines.

4. Results and Discussions

A. The Profile of the Respondents – Employees

This section presents the responses on the problem “What are the demographic characteristics of the respondent employees in terms of age, educational background, sex, job type and functions, marital and family life status, and job tenure?”.

Table 4  
The profile of the Respondent -Employees in terms of age bracket

Age Bracket	No. of Frequency	Percentage
Over 50 years old	90	25.57
41-50	77	21.88
31-40	142	40.34
21-30	39	11.08
Under 20	4	1.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 4 findings indicate that the largest proportion of respondents falls within the 31–40 age group, suggesting a workforce largely composed of mid-career professionals. Individuals in this stage are typically characterized by high productivity but also increased work–life demands (Ng & Feldman, 2018). The notable representation of employees over 50 further emphasizes the importance of accommodating age-related needs in workplace policies (Wheatley, 2021). These results highlight the necessity of designing FWAs that address varying career and life stages.

Table 5 illustrates that the majority of respondents possess at least a bachelor’s degree, indicating a workforce with substantial educational attainment. Higher levels of education are often associated with greater adaptability and openness to flexible work practices (Allen et al., 2021). This supports the view that FWAs are particularly effective in environments requiring analytical and cognitive skills (Brynjolfsson &

McAfee, 2019). Aligning flexible policies with employee competencies may therefore enhance organizational outcomes.

Table 5  
The profile of the Respondent -Employees in terms of educational background

Educational Background	No. of Frequency	Percentage
High School Graduate	12	3.41
Bachelor’s Degree	259	73.58
Master’s Degree	76	21.59
Doctorate Degree	1	0.28
Other (Tech-Voc)	4	1.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 6  
The profile of the Respondent -Employees in terms of sex

Sex	No. of Frequency	Percentage
Male	202	57.39
Female	150	42.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 6 data reveal a slight predominance of male respondents, reflecting ongoing gender imbalances within certain sectors (Cotter et al., 2001). Flexible work arrangements have been identified as mechanisms that can help address gender-related disparities, particularly by supporting employees with caregiving roles (Chung & van der Horst, 2018). These findings underscore the importance of ensuring that FWAs are accessible and beneficial to all employees, regardless of gender.

Table 7  
The profile of the Respondent -Employees in terms of job types and functions

Job Types and Functions	No. of Frequency	Percentage
Administrative	95	26.99
Technical/Engineering	23	6.53
Sales/Marketing	1	0.28
Customer Service	35	9.94
Management	7	1.99
Educator	10	2.84
House Parent	1	0.28
Utility	1	0.28
Production Worker	150	42.61
Practicing Professional	26	7.39
Others	3	0.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 7 presents the distribution of respondent-employees based on their job types and functions. The largest group of respondents were production workers, accounting for 42.61% of the total sample. This was followed by administrative personnel (26.99%), technical and engineering workers (6.53%), and those involved in customer service (9.94%). Smaller proportions were found in the categories of practicing professionals (7.39%), educators (2.84%), and other roles such as management, utility, house parents, and sales personnel. The predominance of production and administrative roles suggests that a large portion of the workforce is engaged in structured,

task-oriented activities. Such roles often require physical presence and are less amenable to remote work (International Labour Organization, 2020). Consequently, flexibility in these contexts may take alternative forms, such as shift scheduling or compressed workweeks. This highlights the importance of tailoring FWAs to job-specific requirements.

Table 8

The profile of the Respondent -Employees in terms of marital and family life status

Marital and Family Life Status	No. of Frequency	Percentage
Single	125	35.51
Married	170	48.30
Widowed	26	7.39
In a domestic partnership	31	8.81
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 8 presents the marital and family life status of the respondent-employees. Nearly half of the respondents identified as married (48.30%), while 35.51% were single. A smaller proportion reported being in domestic partnerships (8.81%) or widowed (7.39%), with no respondents indicating divorced or annulled status. The high proportion of married respondents suggests that many employees manage both work and family responsibilities. Such dual roles often lead to work-family conflict, which can affect well-being and performance (Shockley et al., 2021). Flexible work arrangements can mitigate these challenges by allowing employees to better integrate their personal and professional roles (Kossek & Michel, 2011). These findings reinforce the value of family-supportive workplace policies.

Table 9

The profile of the Respondent -Employees in terms of job tenure

Job Tenure	No. of Frequency	Percentage
Less than 1 year	2	0.57
1-5 years	67	19.03
6-10 years	200	56.82
More than 10 years	83	23.58
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 9 outlines the length of service among respondent-employees. The data indicate that most employees have moderate to long tenure, reflecting workforce stability. Employees with longer tenure often exhibit higher levels of organizational commitment and familiarity with workplace systems (Allen & Shockley, 2020). It is also likely that many respondents transitioned into FWAs rather than starting under such arrangements (Bailey & Kurland, 2020). This trend highlights the evolving nature of work practices.

*B. Flexible Work Arrangement Among the Respondents Across Various Sectors*

This section shows the responses of the employee-

respondents to the problem “What was the flexible work arrangements implemented among the respondents across various sectors?”

Table 10 presents the differentiated adoption of flexible work arrangements across sector which can be more deeply understood by anchoring the "how," "when," and "where" of FWA implementation within established theoretical frameworks—namely Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Capability Theory, and Facilitation Theory. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) developed by Deci and Ryan (1985) - Addressing the “How”, suggests that motivation and well-being at work are fostered when three fundamental psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—are satisfied. The success of FWAs, particularly flexi-time and telecommuting, can be largely attributed to their support for autonomy, allowing employees greater control over how and when they complete their tasks. The findings show that flexitime and shift work are the most prevalent arrangements, reflecting both autonomy-driven and operationally constrained work environments. Shift work remains dominant in sectors requiring continuous operations, such as manufacturing (International Labour Organization, 2020), whereas flexitime is more common in roles that allow greater discretion over work schedules (Gagné & Deci, 2005). These results demonstrate that the adoption of FWAs is strongly influenced by the nature of work and sectoral demands.

*1) Overall Perceived Satisfaction and Productivity Among Employees Regarding the Available Flexible Work Arrangements*

This section presents the results answering the problem “What was the overall perceived satisfaction and productivity among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements in terms of job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, task completion, performance quality, and output per hour worked?”

Table 11 presents the perceived job satisfaction levels among employees engaged in Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs), assessed through five targeted indicators. The overall mean score of 3.67 with a standard deviation of 0.87 denotes a generally high level of job satisfaction. The highest-rated item was "I receive adequate support from my supervisors to perform my job effectively" (M = 3.79, SD = 0.88), highlighting the critical role of supervisory support. Conversely, the lowest-rated item, "I would recommend my job to a friend as a good place to work" (M = 3.47, SD = 1.04), fell within the moderate range. Job satisfaction levels were generally high, with supervisory support emerging as a key influencing factor. Effective leadership plays a crucial role in facilitating positive employee experiences in flexible work environments (Wang et

Table 10  
Flexible work arrangement among the respondents across various sectors

Flexible Work Arrangement	Academic		Service		Canning		BPO		Practitioner		Government		Total	Overall Average
	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%		
Telecommuting	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	30	0	0	0	0	12	3.40%
Flexi-time	18	67	0	0	0	0	22	55	0	0	108	100	148	41.93%
Compressed Work week	7	26	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2.27%
Shift Work	2	7	12	92	138	100	6	15	0	0	0	0	158	45.04%
Annualized Hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	100	0	0	26	7.36%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 11

Perceived satisfaction among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements in terms of job satisfaction

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
1. I am satisfied with my current job role and responsibilities.	3.75	0.85	High
2. My Flexible Work Arrangement has positively contributed to my overall job satisfaction.	3.61	1.05	High
3. I feel valued by my organization for the work I do.	3.72	0.84	High
4. I receive adequate support from my supervisors to perform my job effectively.	3.79	0.88	High
5. I would recommend my job to a friend as a good place to work.	3.47	1.04	Moderate
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 12

Level of satisfaction among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements in terms of work-life balance

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
1. I am able to balance my work responsibilities with my personal life effectively.	3.45	1.14	Moderate
2. My current work arrangement allows me time for personal interests and family.	3.48	1.35	Moderate
3. I find it easy to take breaks when needed during my workday.	3.43	1.46	Moderate
4. Working from home/using a Flexible Work Arrangement has helped me manage stress better.	3.73	1.13	High
5. I am able to disconnect from work during my personal time effectively.	3.55	1.34	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 13

Level of satisfaction among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements in terms of organizational commitment

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
1. I feel a strong sense of loyalty toward my organization.	3.51	0.98	High
2. I identify with the goals and values of my organization.	3.47	1.03	Moderate
3. I am proud to be a part of my organization.	3.45	1.03	Moderate
4. I am willing to put in extra effort to help my organization succeed.	3.67	0.81	High
5. I see myself working for this organization for the foreseeable future.	3.45	0.97	Moderate
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>High</b>

al., 2021). However, the moderate rating for workplace advocacy suggests that some organizational issues remain unresolved. This indicates that job satisfaction is influenced by a broader set of factors beyond flexibility alone (Allen et al., 2023).

Table 12 analyzes employees' satisfaction regarding work-life balance under Flexible Work Arrangements. The overall mean of 3.53 (SD = 1.14) indicates a high level of satisfaction. The highest-rated statement, "Working from home/using a Flexible Work Arrangement has helped me manage stress better" (M = 3.73, SD = 1.13), affirms the psychological benefits of flexibility. Conversely, moderately rated items such as "I find it easy to take breaks when needed" (M = 3.43, SD = 1.46) and "I am able to balance my work responsibilities with my personal life effectively" (M = 3.45, SD = 1.14) suggest structural or cultural limitations. Respondents reported improvements in stress management, although some challenges in maintaining clear work-life boundaries persisted. This reflects the concept of boundary permeability, where flexible work can blur distinctions between professional and personal roles (Derks et al., 2021). Organizational norms and expectations significantly influence how effectively employees can manage these boundaries (Kossek et al., 2022). Therefore, both structural and cultural interventions are necessary.

Table 13 outlines employees' organizational commitment levels under Flexible Work Arrangements. The overall mean of 3.51 (SD = 0.91) suggests a high level of commitment. The highest-rated item, "I am willing to put in extra effort to help my organization succeed" (M = 3.67, SD = 0.81), reflects strong normative commitment. However, items measuring affective and continuance commitment, such as pride in the organization or future tenure intentions, received only moderate ratings (M = 3.45–3.47).

Employees demonstrated high levels of commitment,

particularly in terms of effort and dedication. However, emotional attachment to the organization remained moderate. This suggests that while FWAs foster a sense of obligation, they may not fully strengthen affective commitment (Giauque et al., 2021). Additional engagement initiatives are needed to reinforce organizational identity.

Table 14

Summary of the level of satisfaction among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
Job Satisfaction	3.67	0.87	High
Work-Life Balance	3.53	1.14	High
Organizational Commitment	3.51	0.91	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 14 provides a consolidated view of employee satisfaction across three critical dimensions: Job Satisfaction (M = 3.67, SD = 0.87), Work-Life Balance (M = 3.53, SD = 1.14), and Organizational Commitment (M = 3.51, SD = 0.91). The overall composite mean of 3.57 (SD = 0.97) reflects a generally high level of satisfaction with Flexible Work Arrangements. Overall satisfaction levels were high, confirming the positive impact of FWAs on employee experience. Nevertheless, variations in responses indicate that the effectiveness of flexibility differs across contexts (Chong et al., 2020). Integrating FWAs with broader organizational practices is essential for achieving consistent outcomes.

Table 15 presents a comprehensive view into the employees' perceptions of how flexible work arrangements influenced their task completion efficiency. The high composite mean of 4.14, accompanied by relatively low standard deviation (0.53), indicated a generally positive evaluation among employees concerning their productivity under flexible schedules. Flexible work arrangements were associated with improved efficiency

Table 15  
Level of productivity among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements in terms of task completion

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
1. I can efficiently complete my tasks due to my Flexible Work Arrangement.	4.12	0.45	High
2. I often meet my deadlines with my current work arrangement.	4.31	0.56	High
3. I feel that my work hours are sufficient to complete my tasks.	3.97	0.76	High
4. I prioritize my tasks effectively while working under a Flexible Work Arrangement.	4.08	0.63	High
5. I can concentrate better on my tasks due to the flexibility of my work arrangement.	4.19	0.65	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 16  
Level of productivity among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements in terms of performance quality

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
1. I can efficiently complete my tasks due to my Flexible Work Arrangement.	4.07	0.72	High
2. I often meet my deadlines with my current work arrangement.	4.47	0.50	High
3. I feel that my work hours are sufficient to complete my tasks.	4.05	0.68	High
4. I prioritize my tasks effectively while working under a Flexible Work Arrangement.	4.10	0.66	High
5. I can concentrate better on my tasks due to the flexibility of my work arrangement.	4.38	0.50	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 17  
Level of productivity among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements in terms of output per hour worked

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
1. I am able to achieve a higher output per hour worked with my current Flexible Work Arrangement	4.20	0.66	High
2. My productivity levels have increased since implementing a Flexible Work Arrangement.	4.09	0.61	High
3. I believe I accomplish more in less time working from home/on a Flexible Work Arrangement.	4.08	0.75	High
4. I feel that my output is consistent with the effort I put into my work.	4.22	0.51	High
5. I have noticed improvements in my efficiency since adopting a Flexible Work Arrangement	4.00	0.53	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 19  
Relationship between flexible work arrangements and employee satisfaction

Variables	Flexible Work Arrangements		Degree of Relationship	Remarks
	r <sub>s</sub> - value	p-value		
Job Satisfaction	0.4278	0.0000	Moderate Positive	Significant
Work-Life Balance	0.352	0.0000	Weak Positive	Significant
Organizational Commitment	0.5192	0.0000	Moderate Positive	Significant

in task completion and deadline adherence. Increased autonomy allows employees to manage their time more effectively (Choudhury et al., 2019). Enhanced concentration and prioritization further contribute to productivity gains. These findings support the role of FWAs in improving task-related outcomes.

Table 16 provides information regarding employees' views on how flexible work arrangements affect the quality of their work performance. The high composite mean of 4.21, paired with a low standard deviation of 0.43, suggested a strong agreement among employees that flexibility has a positive effect on their output quality. Although employees perceived improvements in performance quality, the impact of FWAs appears to be influenced by additional factors. Greater autonomy can enhance focus and output (Yun et al., 2020), but consistent quality often depends on structured systems and standards. This suggests that flexibility alone does not guarantee improved performance quality.

Table 17 offers insights into how employees perceived the impact of flexible work arrangements on their efficiency, particularly in terms of output per hour worked. The high mean of 4.12, along with a low standard deviation of 0.49, indicated a strong agreement that Flexible Work Arrangements positively affect productivity efficiency.

Employees reported increased efficiency, indicating that FWAs enable better utilization of time and resources. This aligns with findings that flexible work enhances productivity by allowing employees to work during optimal periods (Gajendran

& Harrison, 2018). The perceived alignment between effort and output reinforces motivation.

Table 18 provides a summarized view of employee productivity across three key dimensions—Task Completion, Performance Quality, and Output per Hour Worked in relation to available flexible work arrangements. The overall mean of 4.16 with a standard deviation of 0.48 indicates a consistently high level of perceived productivity among employees under flexible work settings. Overall productivity was rated highly across all indicators. The consistency of responses suggests that employees widely perceive FWAs as beneficial. These findings position flexibility as an important organizational resource. However, sustainability requires appropriate support systems.

Table 18  
Summary of the level of productivity among employees regarding the available flexible work arrangements

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
Task Completion	4.14	0.53	High
Performance Quality	4.21	0.43	High
Output per Hour Worked	4.12	0.49	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>High</b>

C. The Relationship Between Flexible Work Arrangements and Employee Satisfaction in Different Industries

This section presents the results answering the problem “Was there a relationship between flexible work arrangements and employee satisfaction in different industries?”

Table 19 presents the statistical correlation between Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs) and three dimensions of

Table 20  
Relationship between flexible work arrangements and employee productivity

Variables	Flexible Work Arrangements		Degree of Relationship	Remarks
	$r_s$ - value	p-value		
Task Completion	0.1978	0.0002	Very Weak Positive	Significant
Performance Quality	0.0582	0.2761	Very Weak Positive	Not Significant
Output per Hour Worked	0.1871	0.0004	Very Weak Positive	Significant

employee satisfaction: Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, and Organizational Commitment. The results reveal that FWAs exhibit a statistically significant positive relationship with all three dimensions ( $p$ -value = 0.0000 for each), underscoring the relevance of flexibility as a key driver of employee well-being. The results show significant positive relationships between FWAs and all satisfaction dimensions, particularly organizational commitment. This supports theoretical perspectives emphasizing the role of autonomy in enhancing motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). FWAs contribute meaningfully to employee well-being. Their strategic value is evident.

#### D. The Relationship Between Flexible Work Arrangements and Employee Productivity in Different Industries

This section presents the results answering the problem “Was there a significant relationship between flexible work arrangements and employee productivity in different industries?”

Table 20 presents the statistical relationship between Flexible Work Arrangements and three key indicators of employee productivity: task completion, performance quality, and output per hour worked. Spearman’s rank-order correlation was employed to evaluate the strength and significance of these relationships. The results indicated a *very weak but statistically significant positive correlation* between FWAs and both task completion ( $r_s = 0.1978$ ,  $p = 0.0002$ ) and output per hour ( $r_s = 0.1871$ ,  $p = 0.0004$ ). However, the correlation between Flexible Work Arrangements and performance quality was *non-significant* ( $r_s = 0.0582$ ,  $p = 0.2761$ ). The relationships between FWAs and productivity indicators were weak, with no significant effect on performance quality. This suggests that productivity outcomes are influenced by multiple factors beyond flexibility. Job design and organizational controls play a critical role (Gajendran & Harrison, 2018). A multi-dimensional approach is required.

## 5. Conclusions

This study investigated the impact of Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs) on employee satisfaction and productivity across various sectors in General Santos City, Philippines. Using a descriptive quantitative research design, the findings validated five of the six hypotheses, confirming that Flexible Work Arrangements are positively associated with job satisfaction, work-life balance, and organizational commitment. These results reinforce the view that FWAs enhance employee well-being and strengthen organizational attachment when implemented appropriately.

Consistent with the reported performance outcomes, Flexible Work Arrangements were also positively associated with improved task completion and output per hour worked,

indicating gains in employee productivity and organizational efficiency. Respondents’ experiences of improved morale and work-life integration further support these findings. However, no significant relationship was found between FWAs and performance quality, suggesting that quality outcomes may depend more on internal controls, professional standards, and sector-specific job demands.

Overall, the study concludes that Flexible Work Arrangements are effective in enhancing employee well-being and productivity, but require context-specific implementation and robust performance management systems to ensure consistent quality outcomes across sectors.

## References

- [1] T. D. Allen and K. M. Shockley, “Flexible work arrangements: Help or hype?,” *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, vol. 7, pp. 367–389, 2020.
- [2] T. D. Allen, T. D. Golden, and K. M. Shockley, “How effective is telecommuting?,” *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 40–68, 2021.
- [3] T. D. Allen, R. C. Johnson, K. M. Kiburz, and K. M. Shockley, “Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements,” *Journal of Management*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 1–30, 2023.
- [4] D. E. Bailey and N. B. Kurland, “A review of telework research,” *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 383–400, 2020.
- [5] E. Brynjolfsson and A. McAfee, *The Second Machine Age*. New York, NY, USA: W. W. Norton, 2019.
- [6] P. Choudhury, C. Froughi, and B. Larson, “Work-from-anywhere,” *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 655–683, 2019.
- [7] H. Chung and M. van der Horst, “Flexible working and gender equality,” *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 151, pp. 365–381, 2018.
- [8] D. Cotter, J. Hermsen, S. Ovadia, and R. Vanneman, “The glass ceiling effect,” *Social Forces*, vol. 80, no. 2, pp. 655–681, 2001.
- [9] E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan, “Self-determination theory,” *Psychological Inquiry*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 227–268, 2000.
- [10] D. Derks, H. van Mierlo, and E. Schmitz, “Boundary management in flexible work,” *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 1–14, 2021.
- [11] R. S. Gajendran and D. A. Harrison, “The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 92, no. 6, pp. 1524–1541, 2018.
- [12] M. Gagné and E. L. Deci, “Self-determination theory and work motivation,” *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 331–362, 2005.
- [13] D. Giauque, S. Anderfuhren-Biget, and F. Varone, “HR practices and commitment,” *Public Administration Review*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2021.
- [14] J. M. Haar, M. Russo, A. Suñe, and A. Ollier-Malaterre, “Work-life balance outcomes,” *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 29, no. 21, pp. 1–28, 2018.
- [15] International Labour Organization, *Working From Home: Estimating the Worldwide Potential*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization, 2020.
- [16] E. E. Kossek and J. S. Michel, “Flexible work schedules,” in *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Association, 2011.
- [17] E. E. Kossek, R. J. Thompson, and B. A. Lautsch, “Balanced workplace flexibility,” *Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–45, 2022.
- [18] T. W. H. Ng and D. C. Feldman, “Age and job performance,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 93, no. 2, pp. 392–423, 2018.
- [19] I. Robeyns, “Capability approach,” *Journal of Human Development*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 93–117, 2005.

- [20] T. N. Sahu, A. Pathardikar, and A. Kumar, "Flexible work and engagement," *Employee Relations*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 1–15, 2023.
- [21] K. M. Shockley, M. Clark, H. Dodd, and E. B. King, "Work–family strategies," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 106, no. 6, pp. 1–19, 2021.
- [22] B. Wang, Y. Liu, J. Qian, and S. Parker, "Remote working effectiveness," *Applied Psychology*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 16–59, 2021.
- [23] D. Wheatley, "Flexible working and satisfaction," *Work, Employment and Society*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 567–585, 2021.
- [24] H. Yun, W. J. Kettinger, and C. C. Lee, "Work flexibility and performance," *Information Systems Research*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 949–968, 2020.