

WORK SCHEDULE FLEXIBILITY AND JOB SATISFACTION IN A GLOBAL CORPORATE ENVIRONMENT

Mila Hariani, Rahayu Mardikaningsih

Univeristas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: milamasroni@gmail.com

Abstract - This literature review investigates the relationship between work schedule flexibility and job satisfaction in multinational corporate environments. Drawing from peer-reviewed studies across organizational psychology and management, the review synthesizes theoretical and empirical findings to understand how flexible arrangements impact employee morale, autonomy, and engagement. Results indicate that flexible scheduling positively correlates with job satisfaction, particularly when supported by transparent policies, strong leadership, and digital infrastructure. However, disparities in access, inconsistent application, and cultural misalignment can undermine these benefits. The review highlights key mediating factors such as perceived fairness, managerial trust, and role clarity. It also explores how demographic and professional variables such as gender, job type, and organizational tenure influence employee perceptions of flexibility. The findings emphasize the importance of contextual adaptation in global firms, arguing that flexibility must be thoughtfully implemented to avoid inequity and dissatisfaction. Concluding remarks underscore the need for integrative frameworks that position flexible scheduling as part of a larger employee well-being agenda.

Keywords: flexible work scheduling, job satisfaction, multinational corporations, employee autonomy, organizational behavior, managerial trust, cultural adaptation.

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of work arrangements in the global economy has reshaped traditional understandings of employment structure, particularly within multinational corporations. The advent of digital communication technologies, combined with a growing emphasis on employee well-being, has led organizations to reconsider rigid scheduling systems. Flexible work schedules have gained attention as one possible solution for aligning corporate productivity with individual satisfaction. In competitive global markets, the ability to accommodate diverse working styles has become increasingly relevant for attracting and retaining talent (Pavlova, 2019).

Within these organizations, human resource policies are now scrutinized not solely for their administrative efficiency but also for their impact on employee engagement and psychological well-being. Work schedule flexibility, encompassing options such as telecommuting, compressed workweeks, and flextime, is often positioned as a benefit that supports autonomy and work-life balance. As such, it is hypothesized to contribute to enhanced job satisfaction, especially in multicultural and multidisciplinary corporate settings. This shift suggests that satisfaction is derived not only from compensation or job design but also from the structure in which time is managed (Andrade et al., 2019).

The complexity of managing global teams introduces further considerations. Employees operating across time zones, cultural frameworks, and regulatory systems experience varying degrees of autonomy and institutional constraint. In such cases, standardized scheduling becomes impractical. Flexibility emerges as a necessary adjustment, not merely a perk. However, literature remains divided on whether this arrangement consistently yields higher satisfaction or simply introduces new forms of workload diffusion, ambiguity, or perceived inequity.

Research in this field continues to explore the conditions under which schedule flexibility influences job attitudes positively. The relevance of organizational culture, managerial support, task interdependence, and industry-specific expectations are frequently cited as mediating variables. Understanding these dynamics becomes vital for multinational corporations seeking to design equitable, adaptive, and sustainable work environments. The literature review that follows aims to clarify these variables and assess the consistency of findings across different corporate models and employee demographics.

While flexibility is often cited as a contributor to job satisfaction, empirical studies have identified inconsistencies in its outcomes. According to Scandura and Lankau (1997), flexible arrangements may lead to perceptions of favoritism when applied unevenly, undermining their potential benefits. They note that without transparency and clear performance metrics, employees may interpret schedule leniency as biased or as masking deeper inequities in workload distribution. Favoritism in the workplace can affect employee well-being and organizational sustainability. The uneven implementation of flexible work arrangements can create a perception of favoritism, which can undermine the benefits of such arrangements (Lasisi et al., 2022).

A study by Pierce and Dunham (1992) suggested that the mere availability of flexible options was insufficient in predicting job satisfaction. Rather, the extent to which employees exercised control over their schedules proved to be the determining factor. In cases where flexibility existed on paper but was discouraged by supervisors, perceived autonomy diminished,

leading to reduced job contentment. Flexible working may enhance job satisfaction through many mechanisms. First, it improves the fit between paid work and other activities. Second, it allows employees to work during times more suited to their personal needs and more productive for themselves, potentially decreasing work and commuting-related stress. Third, flexible working may signal employees that their employers trust them and care about their well-being (Agnolotto, 2024).

Baltes et al. (1999), through a meta-analytical review, found that flexible scheduling was positively associated with employee satisfaction, particularly when paired with supportive leadership and minimal role ambiguity. Their findings indicate that organizational context, including communication style and leadership orientation, moderates the effectiveness of flexible policies. As such, policy design must be complemented by a workplace culture that affirms and sustains flexibility as a norm rather than an exception. Social support and role clarity within the organization can enhance the positive impact of flexible work policies on employee well-being (Zettna et al., 2025).

Corporate structures across different sectors exhibit varied responses to flexible scheduling. In technology firms, such arrangements are often embedded into the organizational DNA, while in manufacturing or financial services, implementation is met with more resistance. This sectoral variation creates inconsistency in policy outcomes, highlighting the need for contextual sensitivity in interpreting the relationship between schedule flexibility and satisfaction metrics.

Employee expectations in global corporations are increasingly shaped by values of autonomy, recognition, and adaptability. Without alignment between policy and perception, flexibility can become a symbolic gesture rather than a transformative mechanism. Studies continue to underscore the importance of consistency, fairness, and managerial reinforcement in ensuring that flexible scheduling enhances rather than complicates the employee experience.

This literature review aims to examine the relationship between work schedule flexibility and job satisfaction in multinational corporate settings. The objective is to identify how flexible arrangements affect employee morale, perceived autonomy, and overall workplace engagement, while also exploring organizational variables that strengthen or weaken this association. Findings are expected to clarify best practices and provide insights for decision-makers seeking to implement flexible systems that are both functional and equitable.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study applies a qualitative literature review methodology, emphasizing thematic interpretation to investigate the relationship between work schedule flexibility and job satisfaction within multinational corporate environments. The primary objective is to synthesize scholarly insights, drawn from peer-reviewed empirical studies, conceptual models, and meta-analytical reviews, that address the influence of flexible scheduling on employee attitudes and organizational outcomes. A literature-based approach is particularly suitable for exploring this subject, as it allows for the integration of interdisciplinary perspectives encompassing organizational behavior, human resource management, and industrial psychology. According to Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart (2003), structured literature reviews are valuable tools for consolidating fragmented evidence into coherent frameworks, offering both academic depth and managerial relevance.

The data collection process involved a systematic review of publications accessible through major academic databases, including ProQuest, JSTOR, and ScienceDirect. Inclusion criteria focused on works that presented theoretical models or empirical findings specifically related to flexible work scheduling in global business settings. Thematic analysis, as articulated by Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006), guided the coding and categorization of relevant texts, allowing for the identification of recurring constructs such as autonomy, perceived fairness, managerial trust, work-life integration, and motivational impact. Each selected study was evaluated for methodological transparency and relevance to multinational corporate settings, ensuring that the synthesis captures both breadth and specificity. The review process was designed to maintain a balance between conceptual clarity and practical application, offering a comprehensive understanding of how schedule flexibility affects job satisfaction across diverse organizational structures.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The evolving landscape of global employment has introduced complex considerations for organizations striving to maintain competitiveness while fostering positive employee experiences. Among the emerging priorities in multinational enterprises is the structuring of work time in ways that support both productivity and individual agency. Flexible scheduling has gained traction as a mechanism for achieving such balance, offering employees autonomy in managing work commitments without compromising performance standards (Omondi & K'Obonyo, 2018).

As workforce expectations continue to shift toward greater personalization and adaptability, corporate policies have begun to reflect a growing awareness of psychological and logistical needs. Rather than adhering to conventional models of time regulation, forward-looking firms now explore alternative frameworks that accommodate variability in lifestyle, family responsibilities, and workflow preferences. This development has prompted researchers to investigate whether such flexibility genuinely enhances satisfaction or merely represents a superficial accommodation with limited substantive effect (Galinsky et al., 2011).

Empirical findings suggest that the success of flexible scheduling depends less on its availability and more on how it is structured and communicated. The organizational environment, particularly leadership behavior and procedural transparency, significantly shapes employee perceptions of fairness and legitimacy. Without these elements, flexibility may be viewed with skepticism or interpreted as privilege rather than policy. Thus, understanding how implementation practices influence outcomes is essential to evaluating its contribution to job satisfaction across global workforces.

Flexible work scheduling has increasingly become a subject of empirical scrutiny in multinational corporations seeking to align operational efficiency with employee well-being. Baltes et al. (1999) identified that employees working under flexible scheduling frameworks reported higher satisfaction levels, particularly when combined with supportive managerial structures. This finding illustrates that flexibility alone does not guarantee satisfaction, but its perceived legitimacy and implementation process play critical roles in determining its effectiveness. The mediating role of work-family conflict experienced by employees when working remotely in the relationship between flexible schedules and work performance when working remotely. Exploring whether coping ability moderates the relationship between flexible schedules and work-family conflict, as well as between flexible schedules and work performance. Specifically referring to the condition where they work from home. As hypothesized, flexible schedules positively correlate with the work performance reported by employees while working from home (Zappala et al., 2024).

Autonomy is often regarded as the underlying psychological mechanism linking flexibility with job satisfaction. According to Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model, autonomy enhances intrinsic motivation by granting individuals greater control over how tasks are executed. In multinational environments, where employees operate under diverse regulatory and cultural conditions, the ability to self-regulate time fosters ownership and purpose, both of which are positively correlated with satisfaction. Autonomy has the strongest influence on psychological ownership of work, employees feel that if they have the freedom to determine how to complete their tasks, they will feel more emotionally engaged and responsible for the outcomes of their work (Thu, 2022).

However, the benefits of flexible scheduling are not uniformly experienced across all organizational contexts. Allen, Johnson, Kiburz, and Shockley (2013) observed that in firms with low managerial trust, flexible arrangements can become sources of stress rather than relief. Employees who perceive that their use of flexibility is scrutinized or penalized often experience increased pressure to overperform, leading to anxiety and burnout, which ultimately undermines satisfaction.

Another critical factor is perceived equity. When flexible options are inconsistently available or when access depends on managerial discretion, perceptions of favoritism may arise. This concern was addressed by Scandura and Lankau (1997), who emphasized that transparency in eligibility and application of flexibility policies is essential for maintaining organizational justice. Without such clarity, employees may become disillusioned, reducing the motivational effect of flexibility. Transparency in the evaluation process and internal policy communication increases the sense of fairness among lecturers, organizations including universities should implement a clear and fair information system, in order to retain a qualified workforce (Hofmann & Strobel, 2020).

The role of cultural expectations in multinational environments introduces further complexity. Hofstede's (1991) cultural dimensions theory highlights that preferences for autonomy and uncertainty vary across national cultures. In high power-distance cultures, employees may hesitate to request flexible arrangements, fearing that such behavior could be interpreted as a lack of commitment. Consequently, policy effectiveness must be evaluated in light of cross-cultural sensitivities and regional norms. In cultures with high power distance, rigid hierarchical structures can inhibit initiative and change, which is relevant to the context of work flexibility (Holy & Evan, 2022).

Team dynamics and task interdependence also influence how flexibility impacts job satisfaction. According to Golden and Veiga (2005), employees engaged in high-collaboration roles often find flexible scheduling to be disruptive, as asynchronous work patterns may hinder communication and reduce cohesion. In contrast, those in autonomous roles with minimal interdependence tend to benefit more from schedule variability. Firm-wide remote work caused the collaboration network of workers to become more static and siloed, with fewer bridges between disparate parts. Furthermore, there was a decrease in synchronous communication and an increase in asynchronous communication (Yang et al., 2022).

Technological infrastructure significantly moderates the impact of flexibility on satisfaction. Firms equipped with integrated communication platforms and collaborative tools are better positioned to support asynchronous workflows. As demonstrated by Hill, Ferris, and Mårtinson (2003), the presence of reliable digital support enhances the usability of flexible systems, thereby reducing stress and improving perceived efficiency. Reliable digital support makes the system more efficient, makes users more comfortable, and improves the efficiency of health monitoring (Perez et al., 2021).

The leadership style of supervisors plays a mediating function in this relationship. Transformational leaders, who emphasize individual consideration and inspirational motivation, are more likely to reinforce the positive effects of flexibility. According to Bass and Avolio (1994), employees under such leadership are more likely to interpret flexible arrangements as indicators of trust and developmental opportunity, enhancing job satisfaction. Transformational leadership can increase employee job satisfaction, including through approaches that support flexibility and individual development (Escortell et al., 2020).

Work-life boundary management is another key theme in the literature. Clark's (2000) work/family border theory asserts that flexible scheduling facilitates integration between personal and professional domains. In multinational settings, where time

zone differences and long work hours are common, this integration is particularly valuable. Employees who can harmonize these domains often report less emotional exhaustion and greater contentment. Individual-oriented working time flexibility helps employees balance their work and personal lives (Wohrmann et al., 2020).

Gender dynamics further influence the utility of flexible work systems. Kossek, Lautsch, and Eaton (2006) argued that women are more likely to value flexibility due to caregiving responsibilities, yet they may simultaneously face stigmatization for using such options. In male-dominated corporate cultures, this paradox can lead to dissatisfaction among female employees despite policy availability. Work cultures oriented towards long working hours and traditional gender norms can exacerbate the stigma against the use of flexible work arrangements, even if such policies are in place (Chung & Seo, 2024).

Employee tenure and position within the organization also affect how flexibility is perceived. Senior employees often enjoy greater autonomy and thus experience more meaningful benefits from flexible arrangements. Conversely, junior staff may face implicit barriers or managerial hesitation in approving flexibility, thereby limiting their access to its potential advantages (Pierce & Dunham, 1992). The flexible work system is the new normal in the workplace. Lack of social and face-to-face interactions reduces employees' social learning, jeopardizing managerial justice and weakening the culture (Seo & Kim, 2023).

The temporal framing of flexible work—such as daily versus weekly autonomy—shapes satisfaction outcomes as well. Studies indicate that micro-flexibility, or daily control over start and end times, tends to yield higher satisfaction than macro-flexibility, such as weekly hour adjustments (Kelly et al., 2011). The immediacy of control appears more psychologically rewarding than generalized temporal leeway (Nur et al., 2023).

Role clarity also emerges as a significant variable. In environments where expectations are clearly defined and performance metrics are transparent, flexible scheduling enhances satisfaction by reducing stress and increasing self-efficacy. In contrast, vague expectations coupled with flexibility often lead to ambiguity and disengagement, particularly in cross-border teams (Spreitzer et al., 2005). Role clarity can help reduce emotional exhaustion, especially for those who are highly task-dependent. Self-efficacy is also important for reducing the negative effects of role vagueness on emotional exhaustion (Mihalca et al., 2021).

Psychological contract theory suggests that flexibility influences satisfaction by fulfilling perceived obligations between employer and employee. Rousseau (1995) emphasized that when organizations meet employees' expectations for work-life support, a sense of reciprocity is triggered, fostering loyalty and satisfaction. This dynamic is particularly pronounced in multinational firms where employment relationships are shaped by global mobility and complex contracts. The company emphasizes the importance of work-life balance and gives employees the freedom to assess and plan their own work-life balance. This method can enhance employee loyalty and job satisfaction (Bouwmeester et al., 2021).

Finally, organizational identity plays a subtle yet meaningful role. Firms that brand themselves as progressive and human-centered often use flexibility as a cultural signal. When these values are authentically embedded and experienced by employees, satisfaction levels rise. However, when flexibility is used as a rhetorical device without structural support, it can result in cynicism and disengagement (Rapoport et al., 2002). A good work-life balance can help people become better suited to their jobs, which reduces negative impressions of the company. This shows how important it is to implement the right work-life policy and support employees' work-life balance (Kakar et al., 2022).

CONCLUSIONS

Work schedule flexibility has emerged as a significant organizational variable influencing job satisfaction in multinational corporations. The literature reviewed illustrates a consistent positive correlation between flexible arrangements and increased employee morale, provided that flexibility is implemented transparently, equitably, and within supportive organizational environments. Autonomy, role clarity, leadership style, and technological infrastructure are shown to mediate this relationship. Flexibility, when perceived as authentic and accessible, reinforces psychological empowerment, enhances work-life integration, and contributes to long-term engagement. However, inconsistent application or cultural misalignment can diminish these outcomes, revealing that flexibility is effective when contextually grounded and structurally supported.

The findings indicate that multinational firms should approach schedule flexibility not as a universal solution but as a policy requiring strategic integration. Effective deployment demands alignment with cultural expectations, employee roles, and organizational communication. Leaders must be trained to reinforce equitable usage and avoid reinforcing implicit biases. Furthermore, HR practitioners should embed flexibility within broader talent development frameworks to cultivate resilient, satisfied, and high-performing workforces across global teams.

Organizations are encouraged to adopt a data-informed approach when designing and evaluating flexible scheduling systems. This includes surveying employees across regions to identify barriers, assessing sector-specific compatibility, and monitoring satisfaction metrics longitudinally. Future studies should investigate the intersection of flexibility with digital transformation, generational expectations, and emerging remote work cultures. By continuously refining these systems through inclusive and evidence-based practices, firms can build adaptive structures that genuinely respond to evolving employee needs.

REFERENCES

- Agnoletto, M. (2024). Flexible Working and Well-Being: Evidence from the UK. *Journal of Demographic Economics*, 90(4), 589-625.
- 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.
- Andrade, M. S., Westover, J. H., & Kupka, B. A. (2019). The Role of Work-Life Balance and Worker Scheduling Flexibility in Predicting Global Comparative Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(2), 80-105.
- Baltes, B. B., Briggs, T. E., Huff, J. W., Wright, J. A., & Neuman, G. A. (1999). Flexible and Compressed Workweek Schedules: A Meta-Analysis of Their Effects on Work-Related Criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 496-513.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. CA: Sage. Thousand Oaks.
- Bouwmeester, O., Atkinson, R., Noury, L., & Ruotsalainen, R. (2021). Work-Life Balance Policies in High Performance Organisations: A Comparative Interview Study with Millennials in Dutch Consultancies. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(1), 6-32.
- Chung, H., & Seo, H. (2024). Flexibility Stigma across Europe: How National Contexts Can Shift the Extent to Which Flexible Workers are Stigmatised. *Social Indicators Research*, 174(3), 945-965.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/Family Border Theory: A New Theory of Work/Family Balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747-770.
- Darmawan, D. (2024). Distribution of Six Major Factors Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 22(4), 47-58.
- Escortell, R., Baquero, A., & Delgado, B. (2020). The Impact of Transformational Leadership on the Job Satisfaction of Internal Employees and Outsourced Workers. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1-15.
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80-92.
- Galinsky, E., Sakai, K., & Wigton, T. (2011). Workplace Flexibility: From Research to Action. *The Future of Children*, 21(2), 141-161.
- Golden, T. D., & Veiga, J. F. (2005). The Impact of Telecommuting on Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(3), 293-312.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Hariani, M., N. Aisyah, & Carolina da Cruz. (2023). Building a Work Environment that Supports Employee Engagement Through Effective Use of Social Media. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 65 - 68.
- Hill, E. J., Ferris, M., & Mårtinson, V. (2003). Does it Matter Where You Work? A Comparison of How Three Work Venues Influence Aspects of Work and Personal/Family Life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(2), 220-241.
- Hofmann, Y. E., & Strobel, M. (2020). Transparency Goes a Long Way: Information Transparency and its Effect on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions of the Professoriate. *Journal of Business Economics*, 90, 713-732.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. McGraw-Hill. London.
- Holý, V., & Evan, T. (2022). The Role of a Nation's Culture in the Country's Governance: Stochastic Frontier Analysis. *Central European Journal of Operations Research*, 30(2), 507-520.
- Kakar, A. S., Kruger, N., Durrani, D. K., Khan, M. A., & Meyer, N. (2022). Work-Life Balance Practices and Organizational Cynicism: The Mediating Role of Person-Job Fit. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1-13.
- Kelly, E. L., Moen, P., & Tranby, E. (2011). Changing Workplaces to Reduce Work-Family Conflict. *American Sociological Review*, 76(2), 265-290.
- Kossek, E. E., Latusch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, Control, and Boundary Management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(2), 347-367.
- Lasisi, T. T., Constanța, E., & Eluwole, K. K. (2022). Workplace Favoritism and Workforce Sustainability: An Analysis of Employees' Well-Being. *Sustainability*, 14(22), 14991.
- Mihalca, L., Lucia Ratiu, L., Brendea, G., Metz, D., Dragan, M., & Dobre, F. (2021). Exhaustion While Teleworking during COVID-19: A Moderated-Mediation Model of Role Clarity, Self-Efficacy, and Task Interdependence. *Oeconomia Copernicana*, 12(2), 269-306.
- Nur, Z., A. B. Ismail, & R. Mardikaningsih. (2023). The Managing Role in Creating Cultures of Innovation and Team Creativity. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 153 - 158.
- Oluwatosin, A. (2022). Examining Managerial Practices that Foster Sustainable and Health-Promoting Work Environments for Employees. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 305 - 310.
- Omondi, A. A., & K'Obonyo, P. (2018). Flexible Work Schedules: A Critical Review of Literature. *Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 5(4), 2069-2086.
- Pavlova, O. (2019). The Impact of Flexible Working Arrangements on Competitive Advantages of Organization. In 14th Prof. Vlasdas Gronska International Scientific Conference 5th December, 2019: Reviewed Selected Papers, 55-61.
- Pérez-Rodríguez, R., Villalba-Mora, E., Valdés-Aragónés, M., Ferré, X., Moral, C., Mas-Romero, M., Abizanda-Soler, P., & Rodríguez-Mañás, L. (2021). Usability, User Experience, and Acceptance Evaluation of CAPACITY: A Technological Ecosystem for Remote Follow-Up of Frailty. *Sensors*, 21(19), 6458.
- Pierce, J. L., & Dunham, R. B. (1992). The 12-Hour Work Day: What Happens When Employees Vote on it? *Organizational Dynamics*, 20(2), 45-61.
- Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J. K., & Pruitt, B. H. (2002). *Beyond Work-Family Balance: Advancing Gender Equity and Workplace Performance*. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. CA: Sage. Thousand Oaks.
- Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. J. (1997). Relationships of Gender, Family Responsibility and Flexible Work Hours to Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(4), 377-391.
- Seo, J. J., & Kim, E. E. K. (2023). Flexible Work Systems: Preparing Employees for the New Normal. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 45(2), 133-141.
- Spreitzer, G. M., Janasz, S. C., & Quinn, R. E. (2005). Empowered to Lead: The Role of Psychological Empowerment in Leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 511-532.
- Thu Trang, P. (2022). How do Work Characteristics Affect Job Performance? An Investigation in Vietnam. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9(1), 1-16.
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207-222.
- Wöhrmann, A. M., Dilchert, N., & Michel, A. (2020). Working Time Flexibility and Work-Life Balance. *Zeitschrift Für Arbeitswissenschaft*, 75(1), 74-85.
- Yang, L., Holtz, D., Jaffe, S., Suri, S., Sinha, S., Weston, J., Joyce, C., Shah, N., Sherman, K., Hecht, B., & Teevan, J. (2022). The Effects of Remote Work on Collaboration among Information Workers. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 6(1), 43-54.
- Zappalà, S., Toscano, F., Bharti, D., & Pietrantoni, L. (2024). Unveiling the Relationship between Flextime and Job Performance: The Role of Family-Work Conflict and the Ability to Cope in a Moderated Mediation Model. *Social Sciences*, 13(6), 1-15.
- Zettna, N., Yam, C., Kunzelmann, A., Forner, V. W., Dey, S., Askovic, M., Johnson, A., Nguyen, H., Jolly, A., & Parker, S. K. (2025). Crystal Clear: How Leaders and Coworkers Together Shape Role Clarity and Well-Being for Employees in Social Care. *Human Resource Management*, 64(1), 5-20.