

# Flexible Work Arrangements, Job Satisfaction, and Retention Rate of Private Employees in Metro Manila

**Mr. Phil Austin Buenaventura Hernandez<sup>1</sup>,  
Mr. Grant Russell Abejuela Pelayo<sup>2</sup>,  
Dr. Zenaida Adan Gueta<sup>3</sup>, Mr. Julius Bautista Mesina<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup>Student, Business Administration, Perpetual Help College of Manila

<sup>3,4</sup>Professor

## Abstract

The study, which meticulously examined the relationships among Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs), Job Satisfaction, and Retention Rates of Private Employees in Metro Manila, utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to quantitatively analyze how modern work flexibility influences employee attitudes and organizational loyalty. Anchored in Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation and supported by contemporary workforce flexibility models, the research addressed the local empirical gap by investigating how FWAs as the independent variable directly affect employee satisfaction and retention intention as dependent variables. The methodology involved the administration of a researcher-made survey questionnaire to a sample of private-sector employees in Metro Manila who were experiencing hybrid, remote, or flexible work setups, with the primary objective of testing the null hypotheses, such as  $H_{01}$ : Flexible work arrangements have no significant relationship with job satisfaction, at the 0.05 level of significance. The findings established a highly significant positive relationship between flexible work arrangements and both job satisfaction and employee retention, confirming that work autonomy, flexible scheduling, and remote work opportunities significantly enhance employees' workplace experiences and strengthen their organizational commitment. Furthermore, regression and correlation analyses confirmed the strong predictive power of FWAs in influencing employee loyalty and long-term workforce stability. Ultimately, the results underscored the essential role of flexible work systems in promoting work-life balance, increasing motivation, and ensuring sustainable organizational performance by fostering trust, engagement, and long-term retention among private employees in the highly competitive employment environment of Metro Manila.

## INTRODUCTION

In today's world of work, change has become the only constant. Technology, globalization, and especially the COVID-19 pandemic have pushed organizations to rethink how and where employees perform their jobs. One of the most significant shifts has been the rise of Flexible Work Arrangements (FWAs), systems that allow employees to work remotely, follow hybrid setups, adjust their hours through flexitime, or even adopt compressed workweeks. These changes are not only about convenience; they represent a new way of balancing business productivity with employee well-being. In the Philippines, for example, Mercer

(2023) reported that almost three-quarters of companies now offer FWAs, showing how quickly employers have embraced this model. Filipino workers themselves also see flexibility as a top priority when choosing a job (BusinessMirror, 2022), a sentiment echoed worldwide as organizations link flexible policies to better engagement and lower turnover (Allen et al., 2021; Nyasha & Njeri, 2025; Waweru & Omwenga, 2022). Despite the growing acceptance of flexible work arrangements in the Philippines, many organizations still struggle with how to properly apply these setups in ways that truly support employees. While FWAs aim to improve balance and reduce stress, not all companies provide clear guidelines, consistent policies, or enough support for hybrid or remote workers. Because of this, some employees still face issues such as blurred work-life boundaries, lack of communication, uneven workloads, and uncertainty about expectations. At the same time, employers worry about productivity, accountability, and how to maintain company culture in flexible setups. These challenges create a gap between the intended benefits of FWAs and the actual experiences of employees, raising questions about whether flexibility alone is enough to improve job satisfaction and retain workers in Metro Manila. This makes it important to examine if FWAs are working as intended or if additional measures are needed for them to be truly effective. Despite these developments, there remains a noticeable gap in existing research. Although many local and international studies discuss the benefits of flexible work arrangements, most focus on specific industries such as BPOs or public institutions, leaving a broader examination of private employees in Metro Manila still limited. Additionally, while previous studies often analyze job satisfaction or retention separately, fewer explore how FWAs influence both outcomes simultaneously. This gap is significant because employees' real experiences with FWAs may differ depending on company policies, resources, and support systems. Therefore, this study seeks to bridge these gaps by examining the relationship between flexible work arrangements, job satisfaction, and retention rates among private employees in Metro Manila. In line with these identified gaps, the purpose of the study is to determine how flexible work arrangements influence job satisfaction and retention rates among private employees in Metro Manila. Specifically, this research aims to examine whether FWAs truly provide the intended benefits in terms of balance, autonomy, and overall happiness, and whether these factors contribute to employees' decisions to stay with their organization. By understanding these relationships, the study seeks to provide evidence-based insights that can guide companies in improving workplace policies and creating supportive environments for their employees. One of the main reasons FWAs have become so valuable is their effect on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction describes how positively employees feel about their work and directly influences their motivation and performance. In Metro Manila, Villanueva (2023) found that employees in the BPO sector reported similar satisfaction levels whether they worked hybrid or on-site, which suggests that Filipino workers can adapt to different setups. Still, surveys reveal that many employees are happier with hybrid work because it reduces long commutes and allows more balance between professional and personal life (Cisco Philippines, 2022). Likewise, JobStreet (2025) found that stability, flexibility, and balance are among the most important factors for Filipino workers when evaluating their jobs. These findings mirror those abroad, where research has shown that FWAs can improve job satisfaction by making work less stressful and more meaningful (Allen et al., 2021; Waweru & Omwenga, 2022; Iswandi & Susanto, 2023). Additionally, recent literature further supports the emerging issues surrounding flexible work arrangements. Bloom et al. (2024) emphasized that while hybrid setups boost satisfaction and reduce turnover, they also require strong managerial guidance to prevent communication gaps and uneven workload distribution. Çivilidağ (2024) noted that employees in flexible setups often struggle with feelings of isolation and blurred work-life boundaries

when organizational support is lacking. Locally, Dela Cruz (2025) and Villanueva (2023) highlighted that many Metro Manila employees benefit from FWAs but still experience inconsistencies in company policies and insufficient structure in remote or hybrid environments. These studies show that although FWAs offer clear advantages, their effectiveness depends heavily on proper implementation, organizational support, and well-defined guidelines. (Allen et al., 2021; Waweru & Omwenga, 2022; Iswandi & Susanto, 2023).

## METHODS

For this study, the researchers used descriptive-correlational research design. Descriptive research design is a powerful tool used to gather information about a particular group or phenomenon. This type of research provides a detailed and accurate picture of the characteristics and behaviors of a particular population or subject. By observing and collecting data on a given topic, descriptive research helps researchers gain a deeper understanding of a specific issue and provides valuable insights that can inform future studies (Sirisilla, 2023). In this study, it is used to measure the level of flexibility of work arrangement and job satisfaction in terms of work life balance, job autonomy and over-all happiness at work, together with the level of retention rates among the respondents. Correlational research design is a type of non-experimental research that investigates the relationship between two or more variables. Unlike experimental research, it does not involve manipulation of variables but rather observes and measures them as they naturally occur. The primary aim is to determine whether a statistical relationship exists between the variables and, if so, the strength and direction of that relationship (Hassan, 2024). In this study, it tries to find out if there is a significant relationship between work arrangement and job satisfaction, work arrangement and retention rate, and job satisfaction and retention rate among private employees in Metro Manila.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with the gathered data that were analyzed and interpreted for better understanding of the study. The framework of the analysis and interpretation was guided by the problems stated in chapter 1.

<b>Age</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
18-24	18	13.20
25-34	86	63.20
35 and Above	32	23.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>100</b>

It can be seen from the data (n=136), that 86 respondents are between 24-35 years old which comprises 63.20% of the sample. The group from 35 years of age and above comes second with a total of 32 which is equivalent to 23.50% of the sample. The last group are 18 respondents from the 18-24 years of age group which is equivalent to 13.20%.

<b>Gender</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	28	20.60
Female	106	77.90
Prefer not to say	2	1.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>100</b>

Majority of the respondents are male as evident by its frequency count of 106 which covers 77.90% of the total sample of 136. There are 28 female respondents which is equivalent to 20.60% of the sample while the remaining 2 respondents prefer not to reveal their sex which is only equivalent to 1.50% of the sample.

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
Employed	94	69.10
Unemployed	42	30.90
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>100</b>

Based on the data, it was found that 94 out of 136 respondents or 69.10% are employed. Whereas 42 of the respondents are unemployed which is about 30.90% of the sample.

**Table 4. Level of Flexibility of Work Arrangement in terms of Work Life Balance**

<b>Work Life Balance</b>	<b>MEAN</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>VI</b>
1. My current work arrangement allows me to balance my work responsibilities with personal life.	3.47	0.557	Strongly Agree
2. I can manage my family and personal commitments because of my work arrangement.	3.43	0.539	Strongly Agree
3. My work schedule gives me enough time for rest and leisure.	3.40	0.600	Strongly Agree
<b>Total Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>0.560</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

Note: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree(SA); 2.5 – 3.24 Agree (A); 1.75 – 2.49 Disagree (D); 1 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree (SD); WM = Weighted Mean ; SD = Standard Deviation; VI = Verbal Interpretation

Table 4 shows the level of flexibility of work arrangement in terms of work life balance. Based on the results, all the indicators pertaining to work-life balance under flexibility of work arrangements received strongly agreed responses from the respondents. Indicator number 1 which states that “My current work

arrangement allows me to balance my work responsibilities with personal life” got the highest mean score of (M= 3.47; SD= .557). Indicator number 2 which states that “I can manage my family and personal commitments because of my work arrangement” got the second highest mean score of (M- 3.43; SD= .539. Indicator number 3 got the lowest rank with the mean score of (M= 3.4; SD= .600) which states that “My work schedule gives me enough time for rest and leisure”.

The findings of the study were supported by Boccoli (2024) w/c shows that the psychological experience of flexibility including control over when and where one works significantly improves employees’ work life balance because it reduces work–family conflict and enhances perceived autonomy. Boccoli found that greater schedule and location control were strongly associated with better balance outcomes.

**Table 5. Level of Flexibility of Work Arrangement in terms of Job Autonomy**

Indicators on level of brand loyalty among these students in relation to social media advertising:	W M	SD	VI	Rank
1.I often choose the same brand when I need to repurchase a product I’ve already used.	3.36	0.48	SA	4
2.I feel emotionally attached to brands that consistently provide satisfying experiences.	3.44	0.52	SA	1.5
3.Even if other brands are available, I prefer to stick with the one I trust.	3.44	0.52	SA	1.5
4. I recommend brands I like to my friends and family through social media or in conversations.	3.40	0.51	SA	3
5. The more I engage with a brand on social media, the more loyal I feel to it.	3.26	0.46	SA	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.50</b>	SA	

Note: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree(SA); 2.5 – 3.24 Agree (A); 1.75 – 2.49 Disagree (D); 1 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree (SD); WM = Weighted Mean ; SD = Standard Deviation; VI = Verbal Interpretation

Table 5 shows the level of flexibility of work arrangement in terms of job autonomy. Based on the results, indicators number 1 which states that “I have the freedom to decide how I accomplish my work tasks”, and 2 which the statement “ I can adjust my work schedule based on my needs and priorities”, both got the same computed mean score of (M= 3.38; SD= .557) interpreted as strongly agree. Meanwhile indicator number 3 which states that “I feel trusted by my employer to work independently” got the lowest mean score of (M= 3.35; SD= .551). In general, the respondents strongly agree with all the indicators pertaining to job autonomy of work arrangement as evidenced by its total weighted mean of (M= 3.37; SD= .56).

The findings were supported by Shafizadeh (2022) w/c found that job autonomy was significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction among remote workers, demonstrating that when employees have decision-latitude over how and when they work, it enhances their overall satisfaction.

**Table 6. Level of Flexibility of Work Arrangement in terms of Overall Happiness**

Overall Happiness	Mean	SD	VI
-------------------	------	----	----

1. My flexible work arrangement contributes to my overall happiness at work	3.44	0.527	Strongly Agree
2. I feel more motivated and positive because of my work setup	3.44	0.555	Strongly Agree
3. I am satisfied with the way flexibility improves my workplace experience.	3.38	0.545	Strongly Agree
<b>Total Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>0.540</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm$  0-0.19 slight, almost none, 0.20-0.39 low, 0.40-0.69 moderate; substantial, 0.70-0.90 high, 0.90-1.00 very high

Table 6 shows the level of flexibility of work arrangement in terms of overall happiness. Based on the results, Indicator number one “My flexible work arrangement contributes to my overall happiness at work” and number 2 indicator “ I feel more motivated and positive because of my work setup”, both received the same mean score of (M= 3.44; SD= .527) interpreted as strongly agree. The remaining indicator “I am satisfied with the way flexibility improves my workplace experience” got the lowest mean score of (M= 3.38; SD= .545). Overall the computed weighted mean score indicates that the respondents strongly agree to all the indicators of overall happiness for flexibility of work arrangements as supported by its mean score of (M= 3.42; SD= .54).

The findings were supported by Jiang, et al. (2023) w/c conducted a study on how flexible work arrangements (FWAs) influence not only satisfaction but also employees’ affective states and innovative behaviour. They found that FWAs contribute to higher satisfaction and greater happiness via enhanced autonomy and reduced work-interface tension.

**Table 7. Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Work Life Balance**

Work Life Balance	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am satisfied with how my work arrangement supports my personal life	3.42	0.565	Strongly Agree
2. I can achieve a healthy separation between work and personal matters	3.40	0.589	Strongly Agree
3. I feel less stressed because of my work-life balance	3.37	0.594	Strongly Agree
<b>Total Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>0.580</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm$  0-0.19 slight, almost none, 0.20-0.39 low, 0.40-0.69 moderate; substantial, 0.70-0.90 high, 0.90-1.00 very high

Table 7 shows the level of job satisfaction in terms of work life balance. Based on the results, indicator number 1 “ I am satisfied with how my work arrangement supports my personal life” got the highest rank

with a mean score of (M= 3.42; SD= .565). Rank 2<sup>nd</sup> is indicator number 2 “I can achieve a healthy separation between work and personal matters” with a mean score of (M= 3.4; SD= .589). Last in rank is indicator number 3 with a mean score of (M= 3.37; SD= .594) which states that “I feel less stressed because of my work-life balance”.

The findings were supported by Lee (2024) w/c found that both workspace flexibility and functional flexibility (i.e., when and where work is done) are positively linked to employee engagement and satisfaction. Specifically, the study noted that workers who report better work–life balance via flexibility also show higher levels of job satisfaction.

**Table 8. Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Job Autonomy**

Job Autonomy	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am satisfied with the level of independence I have in doing my tasks	3.42	0.538	Strongly Agree
2. My job gives me enough control over how I complete my responsibilities	3.41	0.551	Strongly Agree
3. I feel empowered to make decisions related to my work	3.40	0.575	Strongly Agree
<b>Total Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>0.550</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm$  0-0.19 slight, almost none, 0.20-0.39 low, 0.40-0.69 moderate; substantial, 0.70-0.90 high, 0.90-1.00 very high

Table 8 shows the level of job satisfaction in terms of job autonomy. Based on the results, indicator number 1 “ I am satisfied with the level of independence I have in doing my tasks” got the highest rank with a mean score of (M= 3.42; SD= .538). Rank 2<sup>nd</sup> is indicator number 2 “My job gives me enough control over how I complete my responsibilities” with a mean score of (M= 3.41; SD= .551). Last in rank is indicator number 3 with a mean score of (M= 3.4; SD= .575) which states that “I feel empowered to make decisions related to my work”.

The findings were supported by Shafizadeh’s (2022) w/c study further supporting that job autonomy predicts job satisfaction among remote workers i.e., autonomy (alongside feedback) explained about 34% of variance in satisfaction.

**Table 9. Level of Job Satisfaction in terms of Overall Happiness**

Overall Happiness	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am generally satisfied with my work environment	3.39	0.586	Strongly Agree
2. I feel happy and fulfilled in my current job role.	3.38	0.572	Strongly Agree

3. My job satisfaction has improved because of flexible work arrangements	3.4	0.561	Strongly Agree
<b>Total Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>0.570</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm$  0-0.19 slight, almost none, 0.20-.0.39 low, 0.40-0.69 moderate; substantial, 0.70-0.90 high, 0.90-1.00 very high

Table 9 shows the level of job satisfaction in terms of job overall happiness. Based on the results, indicator number 3 “My job satisfaction has improved because of flexible work arrangements” got the highest rank with a mean score of (M= 3.4; SD= .561). Second in rank is indicator number 1 “I am generally satisfied with my work environment” with a mean score of (M= 3.39; SD= .586). Last in rank is indicator number 2 with a mean score of (M= 3.39; SD= .572) which states that “I feel happy and fulfilled in my current job role”.

The findings were supported by Petitta (2025) w/c provides a broader review of FWAs, showing that employees who operate under flexible arrangements are more likely to report higher happiness and job satisfaction. The study emphasises that while flexibility is beneficial, support and structure matter.

**Table 10. Level of Retention Rates in terms of Work Life Balance**

Work Life Balance	Mean	SD	VI
1. My ability to maintain a healthy work-life balance makes me more likely to stay with my current employer	3.40	0.561	Strongly Agree
2. The flexibility of my work schedule helps me consider staying in this company long-term.	3.35	0.576	Strongly Agree
3. A balanced work and personal life motivates me to remain in my current job	3.39	0.598	Strongly Agree
<b>Total Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.580</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm$  0-0.19 slight, almost none, 0.20-.0.39 low, 0.40-0.69 moderate; substantial, 0.70-0.90 high, 0.90-1.00 very high

Table 10 shows the level of retention rates in terms of work life balance. Based on the results, it was revealed that the respondents strongly agree with the three indicators pertaining to work-life balance of retention rates as evident by its computed mean score of (M= 3.38; SD= .580). Indicator number 1 “My ability to maintain a healthy work-life balance makes me more likely to stay with my current employer” received the highest rank with a mean score of (M= 3.4; SD= .561). Second in rank is indicator number 3 “A balanced work and personal life motivates me to remain in my current job” with a mean score of M= 3.50; SD= .598). Last in rank is indicator number 2 which states that “The flexibility of my work schedule helps me consider staying in this company long-term” with a mean score of (M= 3.45; SD= .576).

The findings were supported by Mohammed (2025) w/c studied an education-consulting firm in Qatar and found that flexible work models like adjustable schedules were associated with higher job satisfaction and lower turnover intention, underscoring the link from work–life balance via flexibility to retention.

**Table 11. Level of Retention Rates in terms of Job Autonomy**

<b>Job Autonomy</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>VI</b>
1. Having the freedom to decide how I perform my tasks increases my intention to stay with my employer.	3.38	0.570	Strongly Agree
2. The level of independence I have in my work makes me want to continue working for this organization.	3.38	0.545	Strongly Agree
3. I am more likely to stay with my current employer because I feel trusted to manage my own responsibilities	3.41	0.551	Strongly Agree
<b>Total Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>0.560</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm$  0-0.19 slight, almost none, 0.20-.0.39 low, 0.40-0.69 moderate; substantial, 0.70-0.90 high, 0.90-1.00 very high

Table 11 shows the level of retention rates in terms of job autonomy. Based on the results, All the indicators pertaining to job autonomy of retention rates received the same verbal interpretation of strongly agreeing from the respondents. Rank number one is indicator number 3 “I am more likely to stay with my current employer because I feel trusted to manage my own responsibilities” with a mean score of (M= 3.41; SD= .551). Meanwhile indicator number 1 “Having the freedom to decide how I perform my tasks increases my intention to stay with my employer” and 2 “ The level of independence I have in my work makes me want to continue working for this organization”, both got the same computed mean score of (M= 3.38; SD= .57).

The findings were supported by Lee (2024) w/c also showed that autonomy as part of workplace flexibility contributed not only to satisfaction but to stronger retention intentions. Autonomy was found to reduce turnover intention when combined with organizational support.

**Table 12. Level of Retention Rates in terms of Overall Happiness**

<b>Overall Happiness</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>VI</b>
1. My overall happiness at work contributes to my decision to remain with this company	3.38	0.545	Strongly Agree
2. Because I feel satisfied and happy at work, I am less likely to look for other job opportunities	3.37	0.568	Strongly Agree

3. The positive work environment encourages me to stay with my current employer.	3.37	0.568	Strongly Agree
<b>Total Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>0.560</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 12 shows the level of retention rates in terms of Overall Happiness. Based on the results, indicator number 1 “My overall happiness at work contributes to my decision to remain with this company” got the highest rank with its mean score of ( $M=3.38$ ;  $SD = .545$ ). Meanwhile, indicator number 2 “ Because I feel satisfied and happy at work, I am less likely to look for other job opportunities” and indicator number 3 “The positive work environment encourages me to stay with my current employer”, both have the same mean score of ( $M=3.37$ ;  $SD=.568$ ). It can be noted that the respondents strongly agree with all the identified indicators of overall happiness of retention rates as signified by its total weighted mean score of ( $M=3.37$ ;  $SD = .560$ ).

The findings were supported by Jiejing et al. (2024) (in the review by Shahzad et al., 2024) w/c demonstrate that flexible work arrangements raise job satisfaction which in turn decreases turnover intentions indicating that happier employees are more likely to stay.

**Table 13. Significant Relationship of Work Arrangement and Job Satisfaction**

<b>Relationship of Work Life Balance and Job Satisfaction</b>			
Flexibility of Work Arrangement	Job Satisfaction	Computed r	Relationship
Work Life Balance	Work life Balance	.974	Very High Correlation
	Job Autonomy	.978	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.963	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 13 shows the relationship of work life balance and job satisfaction. Results of the pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction Work-Life Balance, ( $r(134) = .974$ ,  $p < .001$ ). A significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction’s Job Autonomy, ( $r(134) = .978$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Lastly, the result of the pearson correlation between Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction’s overall happiness also indicate a significant large positive relationship, ( $r(134) = .963$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

The findings were supported by Boccoli (2024) w/c provides robust evidence that higher levels of job-control and flexible arrangements are strongly associated with higher job satisfaction supporting your strong correlation coefficients between work arrangement subscales and job satisfaction.

**Table 14, Significant Relationship of Work Arrangement and Job Satisfaction**

<b>Relationship of Job Autonomy and Job Satisfaction</b>			
Flexibility of Work Arrangement	Job Satisfaction	Computed r	Relationship
Job Autonomy	Work life Balance	.963	Very High Correlation
	Job Autonomy	.956	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.979	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 14 shows the relationship of job autonomy and job satisfaction. Results of the pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement job autonomy and Job Satisfaction overall happiness,  $(r(134) = .979, p < .001)$ . A significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement job autonomy and Job Satisfaction work-life balance,  $(r(134) = .963, p < .001)$  was also noted. Lastly, results of the pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement job autonomy and Job Satisfaction job-autonomy,  $(r(134) = .956, p < .001)$ .

The findings were supported by Boccoli (2024) w/c provides robust evidence that higher levels of job-control and flexible arrangements are strongly associated with higher job satisfaction supporting your strong correlation coefficients between work arrangement subscales and job satisfaction.

**Table 15. Significant Relationship of Work Arrangement and Job Satisfaction**

<b>Relationship of Overall Happiness and Job Satisfaction</b>			
Flexibility of Work Arrangement	Job Satisfaction	Computed r	Relationship
	Work life Balance	.972	Very High Correlation

Overall Happiness	Job Autonomy	.977	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.965	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 15 shows the relationship of overall happiness and job satisfaction. Results of the Pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement overall happiness and Job Satisfaction job autonomy, ( $r(134) = .977, p < .001$ ). Also, a significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement overall happiness and Job Satisfaction work-life balance, ( $r(134) = .972, p < .001$ ) and Work Arrangement overall happiness and Job Satisfaction (OH), ( $r(134) = .965, p < .001$ ).

The findings were supported by Boccoli (2024) w/c provides robust evidence that higher levels of job-control and flexible arrangements are strongly associated with higher job satisfaction supporting your strong correlation coefficients between work arrangement subscales and job satisfaction.

**Table 16. Significant Relationship of Work Arrangement and Retention Rates**

Relationship of Work Like Balance and Retention Rates			
Flexibility of Work Arrangement	Retention Rates	Computed r	Relationship
Work Life Balance	Work life Balance	.960	Very High Correlation
	Job Autonomy	.961	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.931	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 16 shows the relationship of work life balance and retention rates. Results of the Pearson correlation indicated a significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement work-life balance and Retention Rates' work-life balance, ( $r(134) = .960, p < .001$ ); between Work Arrangement work-life balance and Retention Rates' job autonomy, ( $r(134) = .961, p < .001$ ); and between Work Arrangement work-life balance and Retention Rates' overall happiness, ( $r(134) = .931, p < .001$ ).

The findings were supported by Shahzad, Kazmi & Marwat (2024) w/c found that flexible work arrangements lead to increased job satisfaction which mediates the link to lower turnover intention consistent with your strong positive correlations between flexibility and retention.

**Table 17. Significant Relationship of Work Arrangement and Retention Rates**

<b>Relationship of Job Autonomy and Retention Rates</b>			
Flexibility of Work Arrangement	Retention Rates	Computed r	Relationship
Job Autonomy	Work life Balance	.987	Very High Correlation
	Job Autonomy	.986	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.990	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 17 shows the relationship of job autonomy and retention rates. Results of the pearson correlation indicated a significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement job autonomy and Retention Rates’ overall happiness, ( $r(134) = .990, p < .001$ ), between Work Arrangement job autonomy and Retention Rates’ work-life balance, ( $r(134) = .987, p < .001$ ), and between Work Arrangement job autonomy and Retention Rates’ job autonomy, ( $r(134) = .986, p < .001$ ) was noted.

The findings were supported by Shahzad, Kazmi & Marwat (2024) w/c found that flexible work arrangements lead to increased job satisfaction which mediates the link to lower turnover intention consistent with your strong positive correlations between flexibility and retention.

**Table 18. Significant Relationship of Work Arrangement and Retention Rates**

<b>Relationship of Overall Happiness and Retention Rates</b>			
Flexibility of Work Arrangement	Retention Rates	Computed r	Relationship
Overall Happiness	Work life Balance	.964	Very High Correlation
	Job Autonomy	.978	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.955	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 18 shows the relationship of overall happiness and retention rates. Results of the pearson correlation revealed that there is a significant large positive relationship between Work Arrangement overall happiness and Retention Rates job autonomy ( $r(134) = .978, p < .001$ ), between Work Arrangement overall happiness and Retention Rates’ work-life balance, ( $r(134) = .964, p < .001$ ), and between Work Arrangement overall happiness and Retention Rates’ overall happiness, ( $r(134) = .955, p < .001$ ). The findings were supported by Shahzad, Kazmi & Marwat (2024) w/c found that flexible work arrangements lead to increased job satisfaction which mediates the link to lower turnover intention consistent with your strong positive correlations between flexibility and retention.

**Table 19, Significant Relationship of Job Satisfaction and Retention Rates**

<b>Relationship of Work Like Balance and Retention Rates</b>			
Job Satisfaction	Retention Rates	Computed r	Relationship
Work Life Balance	Work life Balance	.973	Very High Correlation
	Job Autonomy	.968	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.950	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 19 shows the relationship of work life balance and retention rates. Results of the pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant large positive relationship between Job Satisfaction work-life balance and Retention Rates’ work-life balance, ( $r(134) = .973, p < .001$ ), between Job Satisfaction work-life balance and Retention Rates’ job autonomy, ( $r(134) = .968, p < .001$ ), and between Job Satisfaction work-life balance and Retention Rates’ overall happiness, ( $r(134) = .95, p < .001$ ). The findings were supported by Shafizadeh (2022) w/c found that higher job autonomy and feedback are significantly associated with lower turnover intention. This underpins our observed high correlations between job satisfaction subscales (balance, autonomy, happiness) and retention.

**Table 20, Significant Relationship of Job Satisfaction and Retention Rates**

<b>Relationship of Job Autonomy and Retention Rates</b>			
Job Satisfaction	Retention Rates	Computed r	Relationship
	Work life Balance	.977	Very High Correlation

Job Autonomy	Job Autonomy	.981	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.950	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 20 shows the relationship of job autonomy and retention rates. Results of the pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant large positive relationship between Job Satisfaction (JA) and Retention Rates(OH), ( $r(134) = .950, p < .001$ ).

Results of the pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant large positive relationship between Job Satisfaction (JA) and Retention Rates(WB), ( $r(134) = .977, p < .001$ ).

Results of the pearson correlation indicated that there is a significant large positive relationship between Job Satisfaction (JA) and Retention Rates(JA), ( $r(134) = .981, p < .001$ ).

The findings were supported by Shafizadeh (2022) w/c found that higher job autonomy and feedback are significantly associated with lower turnover intention. This underpins our observed high correlations between job satisfaction subscales (balance, autonomy, happiness) and retention.

**Table 21, Significant Relationship of Job Satisfaction and Retention Rates**

Relationship of Overall Happiness and Retention Rates			
Job Satisfaction	Retention Rates	Computed r	Relationship
Overall Happiness	Work life Balance	.989	Very High Correlation
	Job Autonomy	.985	Very High Correlation
	Overall Happiness	.968	Very High Correlation

Note.  $p < .05$  (Significant),  $p < .01$  (Highly Significant);  $\pm 0-0.19$  slight, almost none,  $0.20-0.39$  low,  $0.40-0.69$  moderate; substantial,  $0.70-0.90$  high,  $0.90-1.00$  very high

Table 21 shows the relationship of overall happiness and retention rates. Results of the pearson correlation a significant large positive relationship between Job Satisfaction overall happiness and Retention Rates’ job autonomy, ( $r(134) = .985, p < .001$ ), between Job Satisfaction overall happiness and Retention Rates’ work-life balance, ( $r(134) = .989, p < .001$ ), and between Job Satisfaction overall happiness and Retention Rates’ overall happiness, ( $r(134) = .968, p < .001$ ) was found.

The findings were supported by Shafizadeh (2022) w/c found that higher job autonomy and feedback are significantly associated with lower turnover intention. This underpins our observed high correlations between job satisfaction subscales (balance, autonomy, happiness) and retention.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study revealed that private employees in Metro Manila experience very high levels of flexible work arrangements, job satisfaction, and retention intention. Employees strongly agreed that flexibility in their work setup allows them to balance personal and professional responsibilities, exercise autonomy, and feel fulfilled in their roles. The consistently high mean scores across indicators of work–life balance, autonomy, and well-being confirm that flexible work arrangements are effectively practiced and positively perceived across organizations. These findings further showed that flexible work arrangements have a very strong and significant positive relationship with both job satisfaction and employee retention. As employees gain more control over their schedules, tasks, and work environment, their satisfaction increases, which in turn strengthens their loyalty and commitment to their organization. Job satisfaction was also found to be a strong predictor of retention, highlighting the importance of supportive, inclusive, and adaptive work environments. Based on these findings, it is recommended that organizations continue strengthening and institutionalizing flexible work policies, such as hybrid setups, remote work options, compressed workweeks, and flexible scheduling. Companies should also invest in mental health programs, stress-management initiatives, recognition systems, and professional development opportunities to maintain high satisfaction levels. Employees should be actively involved in shaping and improving these policies through consultations, surveys, and continuous feedback mechanisms to ensure fairness and inclusivity. Moreover, flexibility must be embedded in long-term HR and retention strategies, supported by output-based evaluations, flexible leave programs, and career pathways that accommodate diverse work setups. Leadership development programs are also essential to equip managers with the skills needed to effectively support flexible teams, strengthen communication, and build trust. Overall, organizations in Metro Manila are encouraged to sustain their efforts in formalizing flexible work arrangements, enhancing employee well-being programs, empowering employees, and creating a supportive culture that promotes productivity, engagement, and long-term workforce stability.

## REFERENCES

1. Allen et al. (2021) Impact of Flexible Work Arrangements on Key Challenges to Work Engagement Among Older Workers [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352679899\\_Impact\\_of\\_Flexible\\_Work\\_Arrangements\\_on\\_Key\\_Challenges\\_to\\_Work\\_Engagement\\_Among\\_Older\\_Workers](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352679899_Impact_of_Flexible_Work_Arrangements_on_Key_Challenges_to_Work_Engagement_Among_Older_Workers)
2. Arcedera, J., & Canoy, L. M. (2025). Promoting flexible work arrangements: The case of a selected medium-size BPO company in Metro Manila. *International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management (IJEFM)*, 8(2) [https://www.ijefm.co.in/v8i2/30.php?utm\\_source](https://www.ijefm.co.in/v8i2/30.php?utm_source)
3. Boccoli, G., Tims, M., Gastaldi, L., & Corso, M. (2024). The psychological experience of flexibility in the workplace: How psychological job control and boundary-control profiles relate to the wellbeing of flexible workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 155, Article 104059. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001879124001003?via%3Dihub>

4. Caringal-Go, Mactal, Cruz & Ramos (2025) *Enhancing work-life balance in hybrid work arrangements in the Philippines. International Perspectives in Psychology.* <https://econtent.hogrefe.com/doi/10.1027/2157-3891/a000126>
5. Çivilidağ, K., & Durmaz, Ş. (2024). Examining the relationship between flexible working arrangements and employee performance: A mini review. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, 1398309. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1398309/full>
6. Damar Aji Irawan & P Sari. (2021). *A Study on Effect of Flexible Working Arrangements.* [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391981001\\_A\\_STUDY\\_ON\\_EFFECT\\_OF\\_FLEXIBLE\\_WORKING\\_ARRANGEMENTS](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391981001_A_STUDY_ON_EFFECT_OF_FLEXIBLE_WORKING_ARRANGEMENTS)
7. Guoqiang, Z. (2024). A review of the impact of flexible work arrangements. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Management* [https://ejournal.svgacademy.org/index.php/ijabmr/article/view/80?utm\\_source](https://ejournal.svgacademy.org/index.php/ijabmr/article/view/80?utm_source)
8. Jiang, L., Zhao, S., Zhang, Z., & Li, X. (2023). The impact of flexible work arrangements on the innovation behaviour of knowledge employees: Evidence from China. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, Article 1053242. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1053242/full>
9. Lee, S. H. (2024). Influence of workplace flexibility on employee engagement and job satisfaction. *Employee Relations.* <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311975.2024.2309705>
10. Parajuli, S. K. (2023). Remote and flexible work: A systematic review. *Nepal Journal of Management Research / NJMR* (systematic review entry / repository). Retrieved from NepJOL / ResearchGate. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388847432\\_Remote\\_and\\_Flexible\\_work\\_A\\_Systematic\\_Review?utm\\_source](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388847432_Remote_and_Flexible_work_A_Systematic_Review?utm_source)
11. Petitta, L., & Ghezzi, V. (2025). Disentangling the pros and cons of flexible work arrangements: Curvilinear effects on individual and organizational outcomes. *Economies, 13*(1), 20. <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7099/13/1/20>
12. Shafizadeh, H. (2022). Determinants of job satisfaction in remote work environments: The roles of autonomy and feedback. *Journal of Remote Management & Digital Environments, 1*(1), 5–17. <https://journalrmde.com/index.php/jrmde/article/view/8>
13. Weideman, M. (2020). The influence of flexible work arrangements on employee commitment and performance in South Africa. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*, Article 1209. <https://sajhrm.co.za/index.php/SAJHRM/article/view/1209>
14. Shahzad, R., Kazmi, S. A., & Marwat, A. (2024) *Flexible work arrangements and employee turnover intentions: A comprehensive review of theory, empirical evidence, and future directions.* *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences, 14*(12), 3559. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387449650\\_Flexible\\_Work\\_Arrangements\\_and\\_Employee\\_Turnover\\_Intentions\\_A\\_Comprehensive\\_Review\\_of\\_Theory\\_Empirical\\_Evidence\\_and\\_Future\\_Directions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387449650_Flexible_Work_Arrangements_and_Employee_Turnover_Intentions_A_Comprehensive_Review_of_Theory_Empirical_Evidence_and_Future_Directions)