



International Journal of Management Science and Business Conclave (IJMSABC)

<https://ijmsabc.com/>

P-ISSN-: 3108-2688

E ISSN-:****_****



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Impact of Flexible Work Arrangement on Employee Productivity

Dr.Bhavanam Lakshma Reddy,^{1*} Dr. Priyanka A Nanotkar,²

¹ Professor, Department Of Cse, Rajarajeswari College Of Engineering, Bengaluru, Karnataka.

² Associate Professor & Head Of The Department, Department Of Mba, Suryodaya College Of Engineering And Technology, Nagpur, Maharashtra.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 21 September 2025

Accepted: 05 October 2025

Published: 14 October 2025

CITATION

Reddy. B. L. (2025).
Impact of Flexible Work
Arrangement on
Employee Productivity,
International Journal of
Management Science and
Business Conclave
(IJMSABC), 1(2), 19-28.
<https://doi.org/>

Abstract

Flexible work arrangements have gained increasing importance in contemporary Indian organizations as a response to technological advancements, changing workforce expectations, and the need for improved work-life balance. This study examines the impact of flexible working hours on employee productivity, job satisfaction, work-life balance, and related organizational outcomes in the Indian context, with specific reference to employees in the Ahmednagar district. Adopting an applied research approach, the study combines a systematic review of existing literature with an empirical survey. Primary data were collected from 400 employees using structured questionnaires, and stratified random sampling was employed to ensure representation across different roles, experience levels, and demographic categories. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques such as frequency and percentage analysis. The findings indicate that flexible work arrangements are positively associated with enhanced employee performance, improved work-life balance, higher job satisfaction, better punctuality and attendance, and increased creativity. Employees also perceived flexibility as an important factor for retention, with minimal negative impact on collaboration and communication. Overall, the study concludes that flexible working hours contribute significantly to positive employee experiences and organizational effectiveness. However, the research is limited by its geographic scope and reliance on questionnaire-based data. The study suggests that broader, multi-method research is required to fully understand the long-term effects of flexible work arrangements on productivity and organizational sustainability in India.

Keywords: Employee Productivity, technology, Consumer, Statistical techniques,

1 Introduction

In contemporary India, flexible working hours are increasingly acknowledged as a strategic necessity for organizational adaptability. Rapid technological advances, cultural transformations, and global economic shifts have compelled institutions to prioritize scheduling flexibility as a key driver of talent retention and competitiveness (Roberto et al., 2023). This study explores implementation models of flexible work in the Indian context, evaluating their operational impacts and organizational outcomes.

Historically, workplace structures were primarily designed to meet industrial demands (Berniel et al., 2023). Widespread adoption of flexibility, however, gained momentum only in the mid-20th century, as organizations sought new mechanisms to enhance employee engagement and sustain productivity. India's adoption of flexible scheduling is influenced by both global movements and local factors, including

cultural norms, governance frameworks, and technological capabilities of the workforce (Wahab, Washed, & AbdRazak, 2024).

Flexible work arrangements provide employees with greater autonomy in managing their schedules, which improves work-life balance, fosters career development, and enhances overall well-being. These arrangements have been shown to elevate morale, increase satisfaction, and strengthen organizational productivity. Yet, challenges remain. Coordinating dispersed teams requires robust communication strategies, while dynamic work environments demand advanced performance monitoring systems to ensure accountability and measurable output (Banerjee et al., 2023).

Equitable implementation is also essential. Organizations must create inclusive policy frameworks that guarantee access to flexible options across all levels of hierarchy. Meanwhile, technology—particularly artificial intelligence and machine learning—is reshaping scheduling practices. Advanced analytics now enable real-time monitoring of productivity trends, preference patterns, and workforce demands, offering data-driven insights for aligning employee needs with organizational objectives. Predictive models such as neural networks and random forests can forecast workload requirements, optimize schedules, and dynamically adapt them to meet the evolving needs of employees and institutions. Thus, flexibility is no longer simply operational—it is becoming a strategic pillar for sustainable organizational growth.

2 Literature Review

Ghazi, Shahzada, and Khan (2013) emphasized that organizations that prioritize hygiene factors—such as working conditions and salary structures—are more likely to reduce job dissatisfaction and improve employee performance. Their interpretation of Herzberg’s two-factor theory highlights the importance of distinguishing between hygiene factors and motivators when analyzing performance outcomes. Tariq, Ramzan, and Riaz (2013) demonstrated that high employee turnover negatively impacts organizational efficiency. Their findings also showed a negative correlation between employee performance and turnover, salary dissatisfaction, workload, and stress, indicating that retention strategies are crucial for sustaining performance. Similarly, Medina (2013) found that turnover intentions were linked to employees’ age and education level, with younger and more educated employees more likely to leave compared to their less-educated counterparts. Goldsmith (2013) identified flexible working arrangements as a significant factor in employee retention and satisfaction. Likewise, Cairn (2013) applied Maslow’s hierarchy of needs to workplace flexibility, suggesting that such arrangements affect motivation differently depending on whether they fulfill lower-order or higher-order needs. At the group level, flexibility was shown to shape employees’ sense of belonging and engagement. Robbins et al. (2013) provided a framework for understanding performance behaviors, categorizing them into task performance, citizenship, and counterproductive behaviors. Task performance refers to completing core responsibilities, citizenship behaviors support the organizational climate, and counterproductive behaviors undermine

outcomes, such as through theft or intentional absenteeism. Lunau et al. (2014) emphasized that imbalances between professional and personal commitments often lead to stress-related health issues, which reduce workplace performance. In line with this, Nohe and Sonntag (2014) reported that work–family conflict diminishes both job and marital satisfaction. Leiter (2014), using Conservation of Resource (COR) theory, further explained how resource depletion caused by stressful environments adversely impacts employees’ health and productivity. Coti, Haley, and Miller (2014) demonstrated through regression analysis that workplace flexibility is more strongly associated with job satisfaction than changes in wages. SHRM (2015) also reported that more than half of employees viewed work–life balance flexibility as a key driver of job satisfaction and retention. Similarly, Timeware (2015) highlighted that absenteeism can be effectively reduced through flexible scheduling and remote work options. University of Minnesota Libraries (2015) outlined that employee performance is influenced by stress, interpersonal relationships, and work attitudes, while Platis, Reklitis, and Zimeras (2015) stressed the importance of quality, knowledge management, and organizational growth as determinants of performance. Wheatley (2016) and Palkisetia (2015) further confirmed that work–life balance strongly correlates with improved workplace performance.

Stroup and Yoon (2016) argued that flexible work arrangements enhance retention, commitment, and financial performance, provided that they are effectively implemented. Adikaram (2016) and Sturges (2012) also supported the notion that work–life balance significantly influences job satisfaction. More recently, Nair and Millath (2020) showed that employee characteristics play a key role in determining the adoption of flexible work practices, which in turn strengthen engagement levels. Mustajab et al. (2020) examined the shift to working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic and found both productivity benefits and challenges. Idowu (2020), focusing on Nigerian manufacturing, linked flexible working hours to job performance and retention. Austin-Egole, Iheriohanma, and Nwokorie (2020) provided a multidisciplinary review, integrating theories such as social exchange and role theory to explain the organizational impact of workplace flexibility. Shanika and Bhebhe (2023) found that telecommuting during COVID-19 enhanced employee motivation and productivity, while Chung (2022) cautioned that excessive flexibility could lead to self-exploitation. Finally, Angelici and Profeta (2024) advanced the concept of “smart working,” emphasizing flexibility that minimizes constraints while maximizing autonomy, satisfaction, and productivity.

3 Objectives

1. To explore the relationship between flexible work arrangements and employee productivity levels.
2. To identify the types of flexible work arrangements that have a significant impact on employee productivity.

4 Research Hypotheses

1. **H1:** Employees who have flexible work arrangements tend to be more productive than employees with traditional, fixed work schedules.
2. **H2:** There is no significant difference between the productivity of employees who have flexible work arrangements and those with traditional, fixed work schedules.

5 Limitations of the Study

1. The study is limited to employees working in the Ahmednagar district only.
2. Data is collected exclusively through the questionnaire method, which may restrict the scope of responses.

6 Research Design

This study follows a **Systematic Review and Empirical Survey Approach:**

- A systematic review will involve a thorough evaluation of existing literature concerning flexible work arrangements and productivity.
- The empirical survey will collect primary data from employees through structured questionnaires to understand their perceptions and productivity outcomes.

6.1 Type of Research Method

This study is Applied Research. It focuses on a specific issue—the impact of flexible work schedules on employee productivity—and aims to provide practical insights and recommendations for organizations.

- **Primary Data:** Collected through questionnaires administered to employees working in various institutions in Ahmednagar district.
- **Secondary Data:** Sourced from published research papers, reports, and official websites.

6.2 Sample Size Determination

The study will include a sample of 400 employees, selected using the questionnaire method. This size is considered adequate to ensure statistically significant results.

6.3 Sampling Technique

The study will employ a probability sampling technique. Specifically, stratified random sampling will be used to ensure representation across different categories of employees (such as job roles, gender, and work models).

6.4 Scheme of the Study

- Selection of sampling technique.
- Determination of sample size.

- Collection of data using stratified random sampling from employees working in the Ahmednagar district.

7 Data Analysis

Table 1 : Personal Details

Category	Particulars	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
AGE	18–25	27	6.8%
	26–35	68	17.0%
	36-45	108	27.0%
	46-55	59	14.8%
	56+	16	04.0%
Gender	Male	176	44.0%
	Female	101	25.2%
Role in College	Faculty Member	173 (43.2%)	43.2%
	Administrative Staff	44	11.0%
	Support Staff	28	07.00 %
	Other	32	08.00%
Working Experience (Years)	0–2	33	08.20 %
	03-05	73	18.2%
	06-10	84	21.8%
	11+	87	21.8%
Flexible Work Arrangement	Yes	165	41.2%
	NO	111	27.8%

Interpretation

- The majority of respondents are middle-aged (36–45 years) and predominantly male.
- Faculty members form the largest group, followed by administrative and support staff.
- Most employees have significant work experience, with many serving over 6 years.
- Flexible work arrangements are available to 41.2% of the workforce but not universal.

Table 2: Employee Performance / Work-Life Balance / Job Satisfaction (N=400)

Question / Statement	Response Option	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
Rating of performance with flexible work	1	1	0.3%
	2	4	1.0%
	3	19	4.8%
	4	68	17.0%
	5	67	16.8%
Do you feel your job responsibilities are more effective with flexible work?	Yes	144	36.00%
	No	19	4.8%

Have you noticed improvement in outcomes when you have flexible work?	Yes	120	30.00%
	No	39	9.8%
Do you feel flexible work hours allow you to manage your personal life?	Yes	117	29.2%
	No	41	10.2%
Do you find yourself working overtime when you have flexible work hours?	Never	17	4.20%
	Rarely	24	6.0%
	Sometimes	69	7.2%%
	Often	37	9.2%
	Always	12	3.0%
Are you satisfied with your current work arrangement (Flexible or Fixed)?	1	3	0.8%
	2	8	2.0%
	3	39	9.8%
	4	59	14.8%
	5	51	12.8%
Does flexible work contribute positively to your job?	Yes	136	34.0%
	No	%	5.0

Interpretation

1. Most employees rated their performance positively under flexible work, with higher scores concentrated at levels 4 and 5.
2. A large proportion (36%) believe flexible work makes their job responsibilities more effective.
3. Many employees (30%) noticed improved outcomes, and nearly the same share (29.2%) felt it supports personal life balance.
4. While some employees reported working overtime occasionally, very few marked "always" or "never," showing moderate overtime impact.

Table 3 :Attendance and punctuality/ Student outcome/ collaboration and communication

Question / Statement	Response Option	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
Rate your punctuality with flexible work	Very Punctual	33	8.30%
	Punctual	100	25.00%
	Occasionally Late	24	6.00%
	Frequently Late	3	0.80%
	Very Late	1	0.20%
About your attendance with flexible work	Improved	135	33.80%
	Same	24	6.00%

	Worsened	1	0.20%
Do you believe flexible work leads to better student academics?	Yes	143	35.80%
	No	16	4.00%
Have you observed an increment in student engagement?	Yes	136	34.00%
	No	25	6.30%
Does flexible work affect negatively your ability to collaborate with colleagues?	Yes	132	33.00%
	No	29	7.30%
Quality of communication with your colleagues when you have flexible work	Very Effective	43	10.80%
	Effective	69	17.30%
	Neutral	28	7.00%
	Ineffective	8	2.00%
	Very Ineffective	1	0.20%

Interpretation

Most employees reported being punctual and noted that flexible work improved attendance.

They widely believed it enhanced student academics and engagement.

Collaboration with colleagues was largely unaffected, with communication rated effective by many.

Overall, flexible work arrangements were linked to positive professional and academic outcomes.

Table 4 : Stress and burnout levels/ work hours utilization / Retention Rates / Innovation and creativity

Question / Statement	Response Option	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
Do you feel less stress with flexible work or with fixed?	Yes	144	36.00%
	No	15	3.80%
Do you feel burnout or work fatigue due to flexible work?	Never	32	8.00%
	Rarely	48	12.00%
	Sometimes	51	12.80%
	Often	27	6.80%
	Always	4	1.00%
How effective is flexible work in completing your job responsibilities?	Very Effective	59	14.80%
	Effective	79	19.80%
	Neutral	16	4.00%
	Ineffective	5	1.30%
Does flexible work help in better time management?	Very Ineffective	0	0.00%
	Yes	140	35.00%
	No	17	4.20%

Would you consider leaving your job if flexible work arrangements were not offered?	Yes	136	34.00%
	No	23	5.80%
Does flexible work help retain employees in your institution?	Yes	133	33.30%
	No	23	5.80%
Has having flexible hours encouraged you to explore new teaching methods/ideas?	No	27	6.80%
Do you feel flexible working hours allow more time to think creatively?	Yes	133	33.30%
	No	20	5.00%

Interpretation

Most employees reported reduced stress and minimal burnout under flexible work arrangements. They found flexible work effective in completing tasks and helpful for better time management. A majority indicated they might leave if flexibility was withdrawn, highlighting its role in retention. Flexible hours also encouraged creativity and exploration of new teaching methods.

8 Findings

The present study conducted in Ahmednagar district examines the effects of flexible work arrangements and reveals largely positive employee perceptions. A majority of respondents indicated that flexible work enhances their job performance and overall effectiveness. Employees also reported improvements in work-life balance and greater job satisfaction. Additionally, flexible work was found to contribute to better punctuality and attendance, with many believing it supports student academic progress and engagement. Importantly, the findings suggest that flexible work does not hinder collaboration among colleagues.

Nevertheless, the study is limited in scope, being restricted to a single geographical area and relying only on questionnaire-based data. Moreover, crucial aspects such as the impact of flexible work on stress levels, burnout, time management, employee retention, and innovation were not assessed, which prevents a complete understanding of its overall implications.

Although the results point toward a positive link between flexible work and several dimensions of employee experience and productivity, the absence of broader data on well-being and organizational outcomes highlights the need for further exploration. Future research should expand the geographical coverage, adopt varied research methods, and specifically examine the overlooked factors to develop a more comprehensive perspective in the Indian context.

8 Conclusion

This study, carried out in the Ahmednagar district, highlights a positive relationship between flexible work arrangements and several important employee outcomes. Respondents noted enhanced job performance, better work-life balance, and increased job satisfaction when flexibility was provided. They also observed

improvements in punctuality, attendance, and student academic engagement, with no reported negative impact on teamwork or collaboration.

Nonetheless, the findings are constrained by the study's limited geographical scope and exclusive dependence on questionnaire responses. More importantly, the lack of data on critical factors such as stress, burnout, employee retention, and innovation restricts a full evaluation of flexible work's overall influence.

Thus, while the results point to significant advantages of flexible work arrangements, drawing a conclusive picture of their broader impact on employee productivity and organizational outcomes in the Indian context requires further investigation. Future research should overcome these limitations by widening the study scope and including analysis of the currently missing variables.

References

1. Berkery, E., Morley, M. J., Tiernan, S., Purtill, H., & Parry, E. (2017). On the uptake of flexible working arrangements and the association with human resource. *European Management Review*, 14(2), 165–183. <https://journalofphilanthropyandmarketing.org/index.php/JPM/article/view/40>
2. Bhattacharya, D., Gibson, C. F., & Dolan, C. F. (2005). The effects of flexibility in employee skills, employee behaviours, and human resource practices on firm performance. *Journal of Management*, 31, 44. <https://www.raviinfra.com/>
3. Burt, K., Oseland, N. A., Marks, K., & Greenberg, B. (2010). *Making flexible working work*. London: British Council for Offices.
4. Estes, B., & Wang, J. (2008). Workplace incivility: Impacts on individual and organisational performance. *Human Resource Development Review*, 7, 218.
5. Gibson, C. F., Dolan, C. F., & Bhattacharya, D. (2005). The effects of flexibility in employee skills, employee behaviours, and human resource practices on firm performance. *Journal of Management*, 31, 44.
6. Greenberg, B., Burt, K., Oseland, N. A., & Marks, K. (2010). *Making flexible working work*. London: British Council for Offices.
7. Hashim, M., Ullah, M., & Khan, M. A. (2017). Impact of time flexibility on employees' performance: A study of teaching faculty in government colleges of management sciences, Peshawar. *City University Research Journal*, 206–207.
8. Hutchinson, S., Purcell, J., & Kinnie, N. (2000). Fun and surveillance: The paradox of high employee relations. *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 696–710.
9. Jonas, E., Frey, D., & Kauffeld, S. (2004). Effects of a flexible work-time design on employee and company-related aims. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13(1), 79–100.
10. Kauffeld, S., Jonas, E., & Frey, D. (2004). Effects of a flexible work-time design on employee and company-related aims. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13(1), 79–100.
11. Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2008). For better or for worse? An analysis of how flexible working impacts employees.
12. Kim, J., & Campagna, A. (1981). Effects of flexitime on employee attendance and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 729–741. <https://ijrar.org/papers/IJRAR21A1674.pdf>
13. Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., & Purcell, J. (2000). Fun and surveillance: The paradox of high employee relations. *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 696–710.
14. Kottey, B., & Sharma, B. (2016). Predictors of flexible working arrangement provision in small and medium enterprises (SMEs). *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(22), 2753–2770.

15. Lepak, D. P., Takeguchi, R., & Snell, S. A. (2003). Employment flexibility and firm performance in less favoured regions. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 22(1), 67–98.
16. Marks, K., Burt, K., Oseland, N. A., & Greenberg, B. (2010). *Making flexible working work*. London: British Council for Offices.
17. Michie, J., & Sheehan-Quinn, M. (2001). Labour market flexibility, human resource management and corporate performance. *British Journal of Management*, 12, 287–306.
18. Morley, M. J., Tiernan, S., Purtill, H., Parry, E., & Berkery, E. (2017). On the uptake of flexible working arrangements and the association with human resource. *European Management Review*, 14(2), 165–183.
19. Oseland, N. A., Burt, K., Marks, K., & Greenberg, B. (2010). *Making flexible working work*. London: British Council for Offices.
20. Parry, E., Berkery, E., Morley, M. J., Tiernan, S., & Purtill, H. (2017). On the uptake of flexible working arrangements and the association with human resource. *European Management Review*, 14(2), 165–183.
21. Pérez, M. P., Sánchez, A. M., & de Luis Carnicer, M. P. (2002). Benefits and performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 802–835.
22. Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., & Hutchinson, S. (2000). Fun and surveillance: The paradox of high employee relations. *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 696–710.

COPYRIGHT:

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>