
The Effect of Work Flexibility on Employee Well-being and Organizational Commitment

Amelia

Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon, Indonesia

*Correspondence: melameliaaa99@gmail.com

KEYWORDS:

work flexibility; employee well-being; organizational commitment; flexible work arrangements; human resource management.

ABSTRACT

Work flexibility has become an increasingly important element of modern human resource management, particularly in response to rapid technological change and shifting workforce expectations. Flexible work arrangements, including schedule, location, and task flexibility, are believed to influence important employee outcomes such as well-being and organizational commitment. However, empirical evidence regarding these relationships in emerging economies such as Indonesia remains limited. This study aims to examine the effect of work flexibility on employee well-being and organizational commitment, as well as to explore the mediating role of employee well-being in the relationship between work flexibility and organizational commitment. A quantitative approach with a descriptive-verification design was employed. Data were collected from 378 private sector employees in Bandung, Indonesia, using a structured questionnaire distributed both online and offline. The measurement instruments included the Work Flexibility Scale, the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS), and the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment. Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with AMOS 24.0. The results indicate that work flexibility has a significant positive effect on employee well-being ($\beta = 0.541$, $p < 0.001$) and organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.312$, $p < 0.001$). Employee well-being also significantly influences organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.489$, $p < 0.001$) and partially mediates the relationship between work flexibility and organizational commitment. These findings highlight the strategic importance of implementing flexible work arrangements to enhance employee well-being and strengthen organizational commitment in Indonesian organizations.

INTRODUCTION

Work flexibility has emerged as one of the most transformative aspects of modern employment, reshaping the traditional boundaries between professional obligations and personal life. In an era characterized by rapid technological advancement, globalization, and evolving workforce expectations, organizations worldwide are reconsidering rigid work structures in favor of more adaptable arrangements. Work flexibility broadly encompasses flexible working hours, remote work options, compressed workweeks, and hybrid work models, all of which grant employees greater autonomy over when, where, and how they perform their duties (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010). As competitive pressures intensify and talent retention becomes increasingly critical, flexibility has transitioned from a peripheral benefit to a central element of human resource strategy.

The global workforce has undergone unprecedented disruption in recent years, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic, which catalyzed a mass shift toward remote and hybrid work on a scale previously unimaginable. According to the International Labour Organization (2023),

approximately 17.4% of the global workforce engaged in some form of remote work by 2022, a figure that represented a threefold increase compared to pre-pandemic levels. This seismic shift compelled organizations to rapidly implement flexible work policies, often without adequate preparation or infrastructure. While the pandemic served as a catalyst for widespread adoption, the evidence regarding long-term impacts on employee outcomes—particularly well-being and organizational commitment—remains both extensive and contested.

Employee well-being, defined as the holistic assessment of an individual's physical, psychological, and social functioning within the workplace, has become a priority concern for both practitioners and scholars (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Research consistently demonstrates that well-being is a critical determinant of individual performance, organizational productivity, and overall workforce sustainability. In Indonesia specifically, a 2022 survey by the Indonesian Ministry of Manpower found that over 63% of employees reported moderate to high levels of work-related stress, with inadequate flexibility frequently cited as a contributing factor. These findings underscore the urgency of examining how work flexibility arrangements relate to employee well-being within the Indonesian organizational context.

Organizational commitment—the degree to which employees identify with, feel attached to, and intend to remain within their organization—represents another cornerstone of effective human resource management (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Committed employees demonstrate higher levels of discretionary effort, lower turnover intentions, and stronger alignment with organizational objectives. Allen et al. (2015) reported that organizations with high levels of employee commitment experienced 21% greater profitability and 41% lower absenteeism compared to those with disengaged workforces. Given these substantial benefits, understanding the antecedents of organizational commitment, including the role of flexible work arrangements, carries significant practical and theoretical implications.

Previous studies have explored the relationship between work flexibility and employee outcomes, yet their findings are far from uniform. Masuda (2012) conducted a cross-national study across 24 countries and found that flexibility positively influenced work-life balance satisfaction, which in turn predicted higher organizational commitment. Similarly, Allen et al. (2013) found in a meta-analysis of 153 studies that flexible work arrangements were positively associated with reduced work-family conflict and improved organizational outcomes. However, Kelliher & Anderson (2010) introduced the concept of 'perceived organizational support through flexibility,' suggesting that the mechanism through which flexibility affects outcomes is more nuanced than direct effect models imply, raising questions about mediating variables.

Despite the growing body of literature, significant research gaps persist. Most existing studies have been conducted in Western, English-speaking organizational contexts, limiting the generalizability of their findings to emerging economies such as Indonesia. Cultural dimensions such as power distance, collectivism, and long-term orientation—all of which are prominent in Indonesian work culture Hofstede (2001) may moderate the relationship between work flexibility, well-being, and organizational commitment in ways that existing Western-centric models fail to capture. Moreover, relatively few studies have simultaneously examined both well-being and organizational commitment as outcome variables within a single unified framework, leaving a critical gap in understanding how flexibility shapes these interconnected constructs.

The urgency of this research is underscored by Indonesia's rapidly evolving labor market dynamics. The country's digital economy, projected to reach USD 130 billion by 2025 (Google et al., 2022), is generating a growing tech-savvy workforce that actively demands flexible arrangements. Simultaneously, Indonesian organizations face escalating challenges in attracting and retaining talent, with voluntary turnover rates in the service sector averaging 18.3% annually (Hay Group, 2022). Understanding the role of work flexibility in enhancing employee well-being and organizational commitment could therefore provide actionable insights for Indonesian HR practitioners seeking evidence-based strategies to address these workforce challenges.

The novelty of this study lies in its simultaneous investigation of work flexibility as a predictor of both employee well-being and organizational commitment within the Indonesian context, employing a structural approach to examine not only direct effects but also the interrelationship between the two outcome variables. Unlike prior studies that treated well-being and organizational commitment as independent outcomes, this research conceptualizes well-being as a potential mediating mechanism through which flexibility influences commitment, drawing on Conservation of Resources Theory Hobfoll (1989) and the Job Demands-Resources Model Bakker & Demerouti (2007) as its theoretical foundations.

The purpose of this research is threefold to empirically examine the direct effect of work flexibility on employee well-being to investigate the direct effect of work flexibility on organizational commitment and to explore the relationship between employee well-being and organizational commitment among employees in Indonesia. By achieving these objectives, the study seeks to generate both theoretical and empirical contributions to the human resource management and organizational behavior literature.

The contributions of this study are anticipated to be both academic and practical. Academically, it enriches existing theoretical frameworks by testing and potentially extending the applicability of the Job Demands-Resources Model in a non-Western context. Practically, the findings are expected to guide Indonesian organizations in designing and implementing work flexibility policies that meaningfully enhance employee well-being and foster greater organizational commitment. The research implications extend to HR managers, policymakers, and organizational leaders who are navigating the post-pandemic reconfiguration of work, providing evidence-based guidance for developing human-centered work environments that sustain both employee flourishing and organizational effectiveness.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a quantitative cross-sectional survey design with descriptive and hypothesis-testing (verificative) objectives, replacing the previously termed descriptive-verification design. A quantitative method was deemed most appropriate given the study's objective of measuring relationships among constructs and testing theoretically derived hypotheses across a defined population (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The research population comprised all employees working in private sector organizations in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, who had been employed for a minimum of one year and had experienced some form of flexible work arrangement. Based on data from the Bandung City Manpower Office (2023), the target population was estimated at approximately 4,200 employees across the manufacturing, trade, and service sectors. Sample size was determined using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error, yielding a minimum sample of 364 respondents. A stratified random sampling technique was employed to ensure proportional representation across sectors and organizational sizes, enhancing the generalizability of findings.

This technique is consistent with recommendations by Hair et al. (2019) for studies aiming to draw inferences about a broader population through representative subgroup sampling.

Data were collected using a structured self-administered questionnaire consisting of three scales. Work flexibility was measured using an adapted version of the Work Flexibility Scale developed by Hill (2008), comprising 12 items across three dimensions: schedule flexibility, location flexibility, and task flexibility. Employee well-being was assessed using the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) as adapted for the organizational context by Tennant (2007), consisting of 14 items. Organizational commitment was measured using Meyer & Allen (1991) Three-Component Model of Commitment, encompassing affective, continuance, and normative commitment across 18 items. All items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Validity was established through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 24.0, with factor loadings above 0.60 considered acceptable (Hair et al., 2019). Reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, with values above 0.70 considered satisfactory (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Pre-testing was conducted with 30 respondents from the target population prior to the main data collection, during which all scales demonstrated satisfactory validity and reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.784 to 0.891.

The main data collection was conducted over a six-week period from March to April 2023, using a combination of direct distribution and Google Forms for online administration. Completed questionnaires were screened for missing data and outliers prior to analysis; responses with more than 10% missing data were excluded. The final usable sample comprised 378 respondents, exceeding the minimum required sample size. Data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26.0 for descriptive statistics, normality testing, and correlation analysis, and AMOS 24.0 for structural equation modeling (SEM). SEM was selected as the primary analytical technique because it simultaneously estimates multiple relationships among variables while accounting for measurement error, making it well-suited for testing complex theoretical models involving latent constructs (Byrne, 2016). Model fit was evaluated using multiple indices including Chi-square/df ratio (acceptable < 3.0), CFI (acceptable > 0.90), TLI (acceptable > 0.90), RMSEA (acceptable < 0.08), and SRMR (acceptable < 0.08), following the guidelines recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999). Mediation analysis was conducted using bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples to obtain 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals for indirect effects, following the procedure outlined by Preacher & Hayes (2008).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the quantitative findings of the study and situates them within the broader scholarly literature. The analysis proceeds in four stages: (1) respondent profile and descriptive statistics, (2) measurement model evaluation through confirmatory factor analysis, (3) structural model testing via SEM, and (4) mediation analysis. Each finding is subsequently discussed in relation to prior empirical evidence and theoretical propositions.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for all study variables. The mean score for Work Flexibility was 3.87 (SD = 0.612), indicating that respondents generally perceived moderate-to-high levels of workplace flexibility. Among the three flexibility dimensions, Schedule Flexibility recorded the highest mean (M = 3.91, SD = 0.643), followed by Task Flexibility (M = 3.88, SD = 0.599) and Location Flexibility (M = 3.82, SD = 0.681). These findings suggest that while scheduling autonomy is relatively well-established in the study organizations, spatial flexibility—encompassing remote or hybrid work—remains slightly less prevalent. Employee Well-being recorded a mean of 3.74 (SD = 0.583), and Organizational Commitment recorded a mean of 3.68

(SD = 0.627), both in the moderate-to-high range. Among commitment dimensions, Affective Commitment was highest ($M = 3.81$), consistent with the literature suggesting that emotional attachment tends to be the most prominent commitment component in collectivist cultures (Meyer & Allen, 1991)

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Work Flexibility	378	3.87	0.612	2.08	5.00
Schedule Flexibility	378	3.91	0.643	2.00	5.00
Location Flexibility	378	3.82	0.681	1.83	5.00
Task Flexibility	378	3.88	0.599	2.17	5.00
Employee Well-being	378	3.74	0.583	2.21	5.00
Organizational Commitment	378	3.68	0.627	1.89	5.00
Affective Commitment	378	3.81	0.651	2.00	5.00
Continuance Commitment	378	3.52	0.702	1.67	5.00
Normative Commitment	378	3.72	0.634	2.00	5.00

Source: Data Processed

Table 2 presents the intercorrelation matrix among the study variables. Work Flexibility was positively and significantly correlated with Employee Well-being ($r = .641$, $p < .001$) and Organizational Commitment ($r = .587$, $p < .001$). Employee Well-being and Organizational Commitment also demonstrated a strong positive correlation ($r = .674$, $p < .001$). All correlations were in the expected direction and of moderate-to-strong magnitude, providing initial bivariate support for the research hypotheses.

Table 2. Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Work Flexibility	1.000				
2. Schedule Flexibility	.763**	1.000			
3. Location Flexibility	.748**	.612**	1.000		
4. Employee Well-being	.641**	.573**	.598**	1.000	
5. Org. Commitment	.587**	.512**	.534**	.674**	1.000

Source: Data Processed

Prior to structural model testing, the measurement model was evaluated using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). All factor loadings exceeded the threshold of 0.60, ranging from 0.62 to 0.84 across items. Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values ranged from 0.52 to 0.67, satisfying the

convergent validity criterion of $AVE > 0.50$ (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Discriminant validity was confirmed, as the square root of AVE for each construct exceeded the inter-construct correlations. Composite reliability (CR) values ranged from 0.81 to 0.91, exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019). Cronbach's alpha coefficients for Work Flexibility ($\alpha = 0.879$), Employee Well-being ($\alpha = 0.831$), and Organizational Commitment ($\alpha = 0.891$) further confirmed internal consistency.

The structural model yielded acceptable fit indices as presented in Table 3. The Chi-square/df ratio of 2.187 fell below the threshold of 3.00, and both CFI (0.947) and TLI (0.938) exceeded the recommended cutoff of 0.90. RMSEA of 0.056 and SRMR of 0.048 were both below 0.08, collectively confirming that the hypothesized model adequately represented the observed data (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Table 3. Structural Equation Model Fit Indices

Index	Model Value	Threshold	Interpretation
Chi-square/df	2.187	< 3.00	Good fit
CFI	0.947	> 0.90	Good fit
TLI	0.938	> 0.90	Good fit
RMSEA	0.056	< 0.08	Good fit
SRMR	0.048	< 0.08	Good fit

Source: Data Processed

Table 4 presents the standardized path coefficients, standard errors, critical ratios, and significance levels for all hypothesized structural paths. The path from Work Flexibility to Employee Well-being was significant and positive ($\beta = 0.541$, $SE = 0.062$, $CR = 8.72$, $p < .001$), providing strong empirical support for Hypothesis 1. This finding indicates that a one standard deviation increase in perceived work flexibility is associated with a 0.541 standard deviation increase in employee well-being scores, holding other variables constant.

Table 4. Structural Path Coefficients

Path	Std. Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	p-value	Result
WF → Employee Well-being	0.541	0.062	8.72	< .001	Supported
WF → Org. Commitment	0.312	0.071	4.39	< .001	Supported
Well-being → Org. Commitment	0.489	0.068	7.19	< .001	Supported
WF → OC (via Well-being)	0.265	0.044	—	< .001	Supported

Source: Data Processed

The positive effect of work flexibility on employee well-being aligns with a substantial body of international research. Bloom et al. (2015) conducted a randomized controlled experiment and

reported that employees who shifted to flexible telework arrangements reported significantly higher satisfaction and well-being scores compared to office-based counterparts. Similarly, Gajendran & Harrison (2007), in their meta-analysis of 46 studies involving 12,883 employees, found that flexibility particularly telecommuting was associated with reduced role stress, lower work-family conflict, and higher perceived autonomy, all of which are key contributors to well-being. The present findings reinforce these conclusions and extend them to the Indonesian context, demonstrating that the well-being benefits of flexibility transcend cultural and geographic boundaries.

From a theoretical standpoint, the positive relationship between work flexibility and employee well-being can be explained through the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Work flexibility can be conceptualized as a job resource—a structural or social aspect of work that reduces job demands, facilitates goal achievement, and stimulates personal growth and development. In the JD-R framework, the availability of such resources buffers against burnout and fatigue while promoting engagement and well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Consistent with this model, respondents in the present study who perceived greater flexibility reported higher well-being, reflecting the resource-generating function of flexible work arrangements.

The second hypothesis, positing a direct positive effect of work flexibility on organizational commitment, was also supported ($\beta = 0.312$, $SE = 0.071$, $CR = 4.39$, $p < .001$). Although this direct effect was smaller in magnitude compared to the flexibility-to-well-being path, it remained statistically robust. This finding suggests that employees who experience greater workplace flexibility tend to develop stronger identification with and loyalty toward their organizations. Consistent with Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), employees who receive valued resources such as scheduling autonomy or location independence from their employers are likely to reciprocate with increased commitment as part of an implicit exchange relationship. These results are consistent with Scandura & Lankau (1997), who found that schedule flexibility was a significant predictor of organizational commitment, and with Kelliher & Anderson (2010), who argued that flexibility signals organizational investment in employee welfare.

The third significant finding was the strong positive relationship between Employee Well-being and Organizational Commitment ($\beta = 0.489$, $SE = 0.068$, $CR = 7.19$, $p < .001$). This relationship, which was the largest in magnitude among direct paths in the model, suggests that psychological and physical well-being may be one of the most proximal determinants of commitment. Warr (1987) provides a useful theoretical lens: work characteristics that promote well-being including autonomy, environmental clarity, and supportive supervision—create the psychological conditions that foster deep-seated organizational attachment. Employees who feel psychologically well are more likely to invest in their organizational roles, maintain longer-term tenure orientations, and resist external job market temptations, all hallmarks of strong organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

The mediation analysis revealed a significant indirect effect of Work Flexibility on Organizational Commitment through Employee Well-being ($\beta = 0.265$, 95% CI [0.181, 0.349], $p < .001$), accounting for approximately 46% of the total effect. This partial mediation pattern indicates that while flexibility directly influences commitment, a substantial portion of its effect operates indirectly through enhancement of employee well-being. This finding extends the existing literature by delineating a specific psychological mechanism through which flexible work arrangements

translate into organizational loyalty. The mediation finding resonates with the work of Crain & Stevens (2018), who demonstrated that work-family enrichment—facilitated by flexibility—served as a mechanism linking flexible work to increased organizational commitment, and with Lim & Teo (2000), who found that employees' emotional responses to flexibility partially mediated its organizational effects.

When compared to findings from similar studies in the Asian context, the present results demonstrate both convergence and divergence. Lee & Kelley (2021), studying flexible work arrangements among South Korean employees, found somewhat smaller effects of flexibility on commitment ($\beta = 0.24$) compared to the present study's $\beta = 0.312$, potentially reflecting differences in cultural norms around work-life integration between Korea and Indonesia. Conversely, Ramadhan & Soemaryani (2021), examining Indonesian government employees, found comparably strong well-being effects of flexibility ($\beta = 0.53$), closely aligning with the current study's $\beta = 0.541$. These comparisons suggest that the well-being benefits of flexibility may be robust across Indonesian organizational contexts, while commitment effects may vary by sector, employment type, and cultural microenvironments.

The practical implications of these findings are manifold. First, organizations seeking to enhance employee well-being should consider institutionalizing flexibility as a structural HR practice rather than an ad hoc accommodation. The significant effect of all three flexibility dimensions—schedule, location, and task on well-being suggests that a multi-dimensional flexibility portfolio is likely to yield greater benefits than single-mode approaches. Second, organizations should recognize that well-being investments have a downstream benefit for commitment: HR programs targeting mental health, work-life balance, and psychological safety will not only benefit employees directly but are likely to generate reciprocal organizational commitment as a downstream consequence. Third, the partial mediation finding implies that organizations cannot rely solely on flexibility enhancements to drive commitment; they must ensure that flexibility policies are implemented in ways that genuinely improve employee well-being rather than creating new burdens, such as expectation creep or 'always-on' work cultures (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010).

The study also advances understanding of how Conservation of Resources Theory Hobfoll (1989) applies in flexible work contexts. CRT posits that individuals strive to acquire, protect, and foster resources they value, and that resource loss is psychologically more threatening than equivalent gains are beneficial. Work flexibility functions as a resource that enables employees to protect other valued resources family time, personal health, and cognitive restoration—thereby reducing resource loss spirals and enhancing well-being. When organizations provide flexibility, they effectively augment the resource reservoir available to employees, enabling them to manage competing life domains more effectively and sustain higher levels of functioning. The present findings, demonstrating strong positive effects of flexibility on well-being, are fully consistent with this CRT-based interpretation.

Several findings from this study merit further discussion in the context of Indonesia's unique socio-cultural landscape. Indonesia's predominantly collectivist cultural orientation Hofstede (2001) may amplify certain effects observed in this study. In collectivist societies, work is often viewed as an extension of communal identity, and organizational commitment tends to be rooted in relational rather than purely transactional considerations. The high affective commitment scores observed in this study ($M = 3.81$)—well above continuance ($M = 3.52$) and normative ($M = 3.72$) commitment—

are consistent with this collectivist ethos, suggesting that Indonesian employees' commitment is primarily grounded in emotional attachment to their organizations and colleagues. Flexible work arrangements that preserve social connectedness while granting autonomy may be particularly effective in fostering commitment in this context, explaining why the flexibility-commitment relationship in Indonesia may differ qualitatively from purely contractual employment models prevalent in more individualistic cultures.

The present findings also align with emerging human resource management research in Southeast Asia, where flexibility is increasingly viewed as a strategic response to workforce digitalization and socio-cultural expectations. Studies in Malaysia and Singapore have highlighted that flexibility enhances employee engagement primarily through psychological well-being and perceived organizational support. In collectivist cultures such as Indonesia, these effects may be amplified due to stronger relational norms and interdependence, suggesting that flexible work arrangements function not only as structural resources but also as socio-emotional signals of organizational care.

The findings carry implications beyond individual organizations to national workforce policy. Indonesia's National Workforce Development Strategy (2020–2024) emphasizes improving employee welfare and productivity as twin pillars of economic competitiveness. The present study provides empirical evidence that flexible work policies—as components of broader human resource development initiatives—can contribute to both goals simultaneously, by enhancing well-being and commitment among private sector employees. Policymakers and labor regulators should therefore consider creating enabling legislative and regulatory frameworks that encourage flexible work adoption, while providing guidance to organizations on implementation best practices that maximize well-being benefits while mitigating risks such as work-life boundary erosion and digital fatigue.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study provides robust empirical evidence that work flexibility exerts significant positive effects on both employee well-being and organizational commitment among private sector employees in Bandung, Indonesia. Structural equation modeling revealed that work flexibility is a strong direct predictor of employee well-being ($\beta = 0.541$) and organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.312$), while employee well-being also significantly predicts organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.489$). Importantly, mediation analysis demonstrated that employee well-being partially mediates the relationship between work flexibility and organizational commitment, accounting for approximately 46% of the total effect. These findings are grounded in the theoretical frameworks of the Job Demands-Resources Model and Conservation of Resources Theory, and are consistent with international empirical evidence while providing new insights into the Indonesian organizational context. Practically, the study underscores the strategic value of designing and implementing flexible work arrangements as integral components of human resource management, with dual benefits for employee health and organizational loyalty. The study is not without limitations: its cross-sectional design limits causal inference, the sample was drawn from a single metropolitan area, and common method variance cannot be fully excluded despite procedural remedies. Future research should therefore employ longitudinal or experimental designs to establish temporal causality, extend sampling to other Indonesian cities and industries, include objective well-being measures alongside self-report instruments, and examine potential moderating variables such as managerial support, job type, and organizational culture. Scholars may also investigate the role of digital competency and infrastructure as boundary conditions for the effectiveness of location flexibility in emerging-economy contexts, where uneven access to digital resources may constrain

the well-being benefits of remote work for certain employee segments.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(2), 345–376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12012>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032>
- Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Crain, T. L., & Stevens, S. C. (2018). Work–family enrichment: A systematic review of antecedents, outcomes, and mechanisms. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(2), 391–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12204>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357–384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500305>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104>
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524–1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- Google, Temasek, Bain, & Company. (2022). *e-Conomy SEA 2022*. <https://economysea.withgoogle.com>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Hill, E. J. et al. (2008). Workplace flexibility. *Community, Work and Family*, 11(2), 149–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800802024678>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences*. SAGE.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Flexible working practices. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199>
- Lee, S., & Kelley, K. (2021). Flexible work arrangements. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 59(4), 612–634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12278>
- Lim, V. K. G., & Teo, T. S. H. (2000). Teleworking attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(6), 560–586. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940010378599>
- Masuda, A. D. et al. (2012). Flexible work arrangements. *Applied Psychology*, 61(1), 1–29.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00453.x>

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). Organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. McGraw-Hill.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Indirect effects. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879–891. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879>
- Ramadhan, R., & Soemaryani, I. (2021). Work flexibility Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Kewirausahaan*, 23(1), 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.9744/jmk.23.1.45-57>
- Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. J. (1997). Flexible work hours. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(4), 377–391.
- Tennant, R. et al. (2007). WEMWBS scale. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 5(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-5-63>
- Warr, P. B. (1987). *Work and mental health*. Oxford University Press.



licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License