

Flexible Working Arrangements and Organizational Performance: An Overview

AUSTIN-EGOLE, Ifeyinwa Stella¹, IHERIOHANMA, E. B. J²,
NWOKORIE, Chinedu³

¹*Directorate of General Studies, Federal University of Technology, Owerri.*

²*Directorate of General Studies, Federal University of Technology, Owerri.*

³*Department of Sociology Imo State University, Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria*

Abstract: Flexible working arrangements (FWA) are both important and significant to workplaces in this twenty first century. Organizations are burdened with how to balance their employees work-life balance to enable them reduce all the attendant problems associated with them while ensuring efficient and effective performance. Hence, a lot of organizations offer flexible working arrangements to employees due to the benefits associated with flexibility both for the employees and employers. Greatly improved employee cum organizational performance is one of the most common benefits. It equally facilitates balanced work-life resulting in reduced stress and increased wellbeing for the employees and reduced absenteeism and employee turnover for the organization. This paper aims at highlighting the various forms and general principles of flexible working arrangements and their effect on employee performance. Library research involving analytical discussion of secondary data is adopted as the methodology. It recommends that more research be conducted on the effects of employee-driven and employer-driven flexible work arrangements on organizational performance in order to substantiate the claim that effects of FWAs vary depending on the primary beneficiary.

Keywords: Flexible working arrangements, Performance, Employer-driven arrangements, Employee-driven arrangements

Date of Submission: 06-05-2020

Date of Acceptance: 19-05-2020

I. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

As organizations strive to achieve their aims and objectives which, most times, include meeting stakeholders' unending demand for capital appreciation, increasing market share, continued survival in the industry, sustained retention of valuable workers, all of which are indicatives of achieving optimal performance, they require the services of people who will help navigate the affairs of the organizations. Jackson (2007) avers that the employees are the most valuable assets that organizations have in hand. These workers are however regularly burdened with the dilemma of how to distribute their time among several competing needs such as attending to family issues, socio-political events and many other activities that sometimes conflict with organizational goals. This situation often creates work-life conflict for some workers whose private life is threatened by the disparity in the time they invest in their office work as against time spent at home. The resultant effect affects the organization and individual employees as well as the society as a whole (Fapohunda, 2014). For the organizations, the negative impact could be in the form of incessant absenteeism or inefficiency of some workers whereas the employee could experience increased marital conflicts, separation, divorce, and/or even ineffective parenting amongst other issues (Vlems, 2008).

In another vein, organizations are not static; rather they evolve in response to the changing technological and business environment. The on-going digitization of the workplace necessitated by information and communication technology, global market and trans nationalization has been noted to have brought radical changes in the human experience of work both in the nature of work performed, the time and how employees' performance are obtained in the organization. Technological advancements have enabled teleworking and played a critical prominent role in the creation and evolvement of 24-hour organizations where there is a very thin line separating work and non-work time, making it increasingly indistinct. This has equally resulted in a notable significant shift away from the normal or standard working week towards non-standard work schedules causing firms to consider the adjustment of actual working hours without affecting both employee wellbeing and practices relating to firm performance (Hashim, Ullah & Khan, 2017).

Flexible working arrangements (FWA) are those common practices used by organizations globally in response to various challenges resulting from these changes. They are those programmes, according to Klindzic and Marić (2019), designed by employers to allow employees have more scheduling freedom to enable them

perform the obligations required of their positions, with the aim of achieving increased flexibility for organizations, better work-life balance and improved organizational performance. Berkery, Morley, Tiernan, Purtilland Parry (2017) and Stavrou, (2005) list relevant FWA to include: flexible working hours, flexi-time, part-time work, overtime, job sharing, teleworking, shift and weekend work, paid parental leave, annual hours, temporary work, annual hours contracts, flexible leave arrangements, choice of rosters and shifts, variable year employment, fixed-term contract subcontracting, compressed working weeks and working from home. Lewis (2003) as well as Kotey and Sharma (2016), highlighted two main types of FWA practices: 1) the employee-driven practice which enables employees to manage their work-life balance by reducing work-life conflict (e.g. paid parental leave, flexible leave arrangements, choice of rosters and shifts, variable year employment); and, 2) the employer-driven practice which allows organizations to adjust costs of employment in line with production volume or to secure a more competitive and motivated workforce (e.g. shift work, weekend work, overtime work, annual hours count and fixed term contracts). Since the growth and success of organizations have been said to be dependent on the performance of their employees, this paper reviews these different forms of flexible working arrangements and how they have variously impacted on organizational performance. This review aims at unfolding the general principles rather than focusing on particular organization or economy since most developing economies have not adequately embraced the policies and need for flexible working arrangement, hence the benefits accruing from these technological advancements in the workplace.

Considering that the primary beneficiaries of FWA can either be the employees or employers, it is pertinent to find out if there is a difference in performance between organizations that apply flexible arrangements aimed at improving the performance of the different primary beneficiaries. Therefore, the general question this paper seeks to answer is: do flexible working arrangements affect employee performance? Other research questions are

- 1: Do employee-driven FWA have an effect on organizational performance?
- 2: Do employer-driven FWA have an effect on organizational performance?

The general objective of the paper is to examine if flexible working arrangements affect performance in organizations. The specific objectives are to:

- 1 Investigate the effect of employee-driven FWA on organizational performance.
- 2 Investigate the effect of employer-driven FWA on organizational performance.

The methodology adopted in this investigation is library research involving analytical discussion of secondary data. This approach is adopted since the focus is on general principles relating to flexible working arrangements vis-a-viz employees and organizational performance as necessitated by world-wide introduction of digital technology and the attendant devices.

II. FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS (FWA): A CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

Flexible, non-standard or alternative work arrangements, as the case may be, are basically options that allow an employee to work outside the traditional confines of a standard organization of work with respect to such different modalities as amount, distribution of working time and place of work (Kattenbach, Demerouti, & Nachreiner, 2010; Shockley & Allen, 2007; Spreitzer, Cameron & Garrett, 2017). This is in direct contrast with traditional work arrangements that require employees to work at a standard time and place daily. Flexible working arrangements include weekend work, shift work, overtime, annual hours contract, part-time work, job-sharing, flexi-time, temporary/ casual work, fixed-term contracts, home-based work, telework and compressed work week. Possenried and Plantenga (2011) in Shagvaliyeva and Yazdanifard (2014) aver that in the study of flexible work arrangements, researchers discussed three main categories of FWA- flexibility in scheduling of hours, flexibility in location and flexibility in length of the work. Chung (2009) posits that though each of the arrangements could be used individually, they are often combined to complement each other.

Flexibility in scheduling of hours includes teleworking, flexi-time, job share, phased retirement, contract work, part time jobs and term time working (Omondi & Obonyo, 2018). Flexi-time is notably more applicable to professional and higher-level employees than lower level employees and even workers in service and manufacturing jobs seem to have less access to it than jobs in other industries (Kossek and Distelberg, 2009). Flexibility in location relates to the place of work and involves employees working from a location outside of their physical organizational setting. It includes telecommuting, satellite offices, neighbourhood work centers and mobile workers (Kurland & Bailey, 1999). Pérez, Sánchez and de Luis Carnicer (2002) defined telework or flexi-place as a flexible work schedule that permits employees to work in varied locations, typically using information and communication technologies (ICT). It avails employees the opportunities to engage in regular tele- interactions with work colleagues, while reducing both the commuting time and the need to acquire urban office space. Flexibility in length of the work normally involves the relocation of work time into fewer

and longer blocks during the week and is most often associated with the idea of the compressed workweek. Here, employees may work for longer hours for a few days, for instance, four 10-hour-days instead of the normal five 8-hour days. Employees use their discretion to alter the times of their arrival to and departure times from work within management parameters, to meet their personal needs (Avery & Zabel, 2001). This is to ensure that they are available during the core hours to help managers with the coordination of meetings and supervision (Van Dyne, Kossek & Lobel, 2007). Incidentally, this enables the employees to use their initiatives, be creative, be independent and feel self-worth; thereby be more committed to the organization(s) that appreciate their efficiency and independence.

Another form of FWA that is receiving considerably less attention than others is short-term breaks in employment or time off such as part-year work, sabbaticals, vacations, and leaves. These flexible work arrangements allow for short-term breaks in employment without losing one's job (Etzion, 2003). These are considered increasingly important because while they enable individuals to maintain their relationships with their employers while on break from work responsibilities, it avails employees the opportunity to travel, acquire new skills and competences, attend to care giving and health demands as well as prevent burnout. Sabbaticals are traditionally associated with universities and academic positions. Below is a brief definition of some other FWA as cited by Klindzic and Marić (2019):

- a). *weekend work*- this type of arrangement enables employees to extend their work hours to the weekend to enable them take time off during the rest of the week (Stavrou, 2005).
- b). *shift work*-this allows for continuous production as workers are given different time periods (shifts) to work during one day (Kerin & Aguirre, 2005).
- c). *overtime*-these are additional working hours that are above standard workweek hours (ILO, 2011).
- d). *annual hours contract*- this is an agreement between employer and employee that specifies the number of hours the employee is required to work annually (Stavrou, 2005).
- e). *temporary/casual work*- this is an employment agreement for a limited short period of time (Thomas - Wandera, 2011)
- f). *fixed-term contracts* - these are short or long-term employment contracts with a specific duration of time (De Cuyper, De Witte, & Van Emmerik, 2011).
- g). *part-time work* - here employees agree to work fewer hours weekly than the standard workweek (Zeytinoglu, Cooke, & Mann, 2009).
- h). *job-sharing*- this is basically splitting work between two employees in such a way that their joint weekly work hours equals the standard week working hours of one employee (Kotey & Sharma, 2016).
- i). *flexi-time* - this type of FWA allows full-time workers to choose when to start and finish work (ILO, 2011).
- j). *telework*-here employees work from remote locations using technology devices (Mamaghani, 2012).
- k). *home-based work (also known as telecommuting)* - this is an agreement that allows employees to work from home (Kotey & Sharma, 2016).
- l). *compressed work week*- this is a working week which consists of less than the standard five days, but requires that employees work increased work hours during each workday while achieving same or better performance (Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright & Neuman, 1999).

Dalcos and Daley (2009) posit that flexible work arrangement allows employees to choose when, where and for how long they engage in work-related tasks, thus enhancing engagement and performance through commitment and dedication.

2.1 Job Performance

The growth and success of organizations can be said to be dependent on the performance of their employees hence organizations need highly performing individuals to be able to meet their goals, deliver the products and services they specialize in, and achieve competitive advantage. Igbino and Popoola (2016) depict job performance as a set of workers' behaviours that can be evaluated, monitored, measured and assessed, and the behaviours should be in accordance with the laid down goals of the organization. Organizational goals' achievements therefore, are the only criteria for evaluating the degree of an individual's performance. There is need for every success driven organization to regularly look into the job performance of its employees since not every action but only those relevant to organizational goals constitute performance. Job performance can be said to be achieved when such attributes as abilities, competencies, aptitude, creativity, independence, skills, motivation as well as commitment of individuals are combined for efficiency in focus. Other attributes include personal discipline, communication skills and abilities, organizational training and self-development of individuals in the organization. Basahuwa, Unegbu and Yemisi (2020) cited ability to give a qualitative and quantitative task performance, impressive interpersonal relationship, as well as the ability to work with minimal supervision as indicators of job performance.

Prasetya and Kato (2011) defined employee performance as the attained outcome of actions with the skills of employees who perform in such situations. Dessler (2008) views employee performance as work related task that is expected of employees and how well the task was done. Performance can be measured

monthly, quarterly, semi-annually or annually to enable employers provide means for improvement of identified segment in the business. Hence, employee performance could be summarized as the record of outcomes achieved for each job function, during a specified period of time. Employees' performance evaluation is a comprehensive analysis of a workers' performance, by observing their work during a certain period of time and examining all the objective manuscripts or documents relevant to how they have performed, so as to establish the extent to which these workers achieve the stipulated goals (USAID, 2009). Mwebi and Kadaga (2015) posit that employee performance refers to how a worker behaves towards his/her job.

There are a variety of criteria used to determine how an individual behaves towards his work which may vary from task to task. Employees with greater control over work schedules are more likely to show increased engagement, commitment, retention and job satisfaction (Muchiti and Gachunga, 2015). Yeh and Hong (2012) assert that employee's performance appears in the quality and the quantity of the job, which means that the performance of the employees is similar to their productivity. Quality without quantity smears both the performance and productivity of employees and organizations. The level of performance of employees in flexible working environment is measured through the degree of productivity, customer satisfaction, job satisfaction, employee commitment and retention (Nwokocha & Iheriohanma, 2012; Onyeizugbe, Nduka & Enaihi, 2019). Other performance measuring variables include worker morale, level of satisfaction, turnover and absenteeism (Ying, 2012). It must be stated from the onset that these indices of measurement of productivity must not all be present at a higher level but a combination of greater number of them can suffice.

Klindzic and Marić (2019) outlined two (2) classifications of the outcomes of FWA on organizational performance as non-financial performance and financial performance. They noted that absenteeism, turnover and retention are the most frequently studied non-financial performance variables in the context of flexible working arrangements. The idea is that without options for flexibility at the workplace, employees will try to improve their work-life balance by reducing the amount of work and/or calling in sick even when they are actually not (Battisti & Vallanti, 2013). Dalton and Mesch, (1990), noted that due to the negative consequences attributable to absenteeism by organizations, they are always on the lookout for practices that will help in reducing it as much as possible. It has been argued that absenteeism of employees should be able to decrease under the influence of FWA, because their stress levels will be lower (Baltes et al., 1999). Stavrou (2005) and Berkery et al. (2017) suggest that organizations that use FWA will benefit from both lower levels of absenteeism and turnover. Employees perceive employers who offer FWA as attentive to their well-being, and in turn they gain identification and motivation to be more committed to them, which could eventually lead to reduced levels of turnover, absenteeism and improved retention (Berkery et al., 2017). Accordingly, Stavrou (2005) and McNall, Masuda, and Nicklin (2010) confirm in their studies that the availability of FWA in organizations actually decreases employee turnover.

Besides non-financial measures of organizational performance, there is also a significant number of financial measures studied in the context of FWA such as profitability, productivity, profit, return on assets, return on equity and return on investment (Baltes et al., 1999; Stavrou, 2005; de Menezes & Kelliher, 2011). Berkery et al. (2017) posited that Human Resources Management (HRM) practices that increase workforce flexibility may boost productivity and innovativeness, and ultimately could lead to increased financial performance, which can manifest itself as increased profitability. Some of the studies on financial measures studied (44%) showed a positive relation whereas others reported no association with FWA (de Menezes & Kelliher, 2011).

2. 2. Empirical Review

Kattenbach, et al (2010) and Battisti and Vallanti (2013) are of the view that FWA have recently been receiving substantial amount of attention in mostly the European Union (EU) and Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. Klindzic and Marić (2019) note that large scale surveys such as the European Working Conditions Surveys (Eurofound, 2017), the Workplace Employment Relations Series and the Work Life Balance Study (de Menezes & Kelliher, 2011) and a recent comparative analysis by Gialis and Taylor (2016) affirm to the rising popularity of FWA in both highly developed countries such as UK, Italy, Netherlands and their less developed EU counterparts like Greece, Romania, Portugal. The increasing popularity of FWA is attributable to both the desire for more flexibility and institutional recommendations from the EU, OECD and International Labour Organization (ILO) (Kattenbach et al., 2010; Kottey & Sharma, 2016). Though the first attempts at exploring the impact of FWA date back to the 1970s and were focused on their general effect on individual worker performance (de Menezes & Kelliher, 2011), recent studies have explored the impact of specific FWA on firm performance in terms of productivity, profitability, turnover, absenteeism etc. (e.g. Dex & Smith, 2002; Berkery et al., 2017). Baltes et al. (1999) and Kauffeld, Jonas, and Frey (2004) reported positive effect of flexible work-time design on absenteeism.

de Menezes and Kelliher (2011), while pointing out the inconclusive outcome reached by previous studies deduced from their systematic literature review of 148 publications about the effects of FWA on firm performance, confirmed that 61% of studies are reporting that FWA are associated with lower levels of

absenteeism. Klindzic and Marić (2019) while working with data on 12 different FWA practices collected in 171 large-sized Croatian organizations by a questionnaire survey found out that organizational performance was higher in the employee-driven group of FWA practices where telework, work from home, compressed work week were positively related to various financial and non-financial organizational performance indicators whilst several employer-driven practices, such as shift-work, overtime work, weekend work, annual hours count and fixed term contracts were found to be significantly, but negatively related to organizational performance. Elke and Beblo (2004) examined the impact of flexible work time schedules on firm efficiency using representative establishment data for Germany and found out that whereas work time schedules with moderate flexibility is positively related to technical efficiency, highly flexible work time arrangements on the other hand appear to be negatively correlated with efficient organization of the work flow. These efficiencies, according to them, shouldn't be interpreted as causal effects because the highly flexible work time schedules are assumed to have most likely been introduced in struggling firms.

Mwebi, and Kadaga (2015) studied the effects of flexi-time work arrangement on employee performance and their findings revealed that flexi-time work arrangement is positively related to employee performance. Hashim, et al (2017) study on impact of time flexibility on staff performance of the Government Colleges of Management Sciences in Peshawar found out that there is a significant relationship between time flexibility and employee performance. Flexibility has a positive impact on employee performance.

2.3. Theoretical Framework: Self Determination Theory (SDT)

Self-determination theory is a theory of motivation that is concerned with the beneficial effects of intrinsic motivation and the harmful effects of extrinsic motivation. It proposes that people prefer to feel they have control over their actions to the extent that anything that makes a previously enjoyed task appears more like an obligation than a freely chosen activity that will undermine motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Self-determination theory also proposes that in addition to being driven by a need for autonomy, such as part time working and freelancing, people seek ways to achieve competence and positive connections to others. This theory extols the internal control of one's action rather than the effects of externality. The self-determination theory has its major implication relating to intrinsic rewards gotten out of work – the feeling of fulfillment an employee gets as a result of engaging in the work one loves to do. This therefore, infers the upholding of the self-esteem and self-actualization principles (measuring indices of intrinsic motivation) that motivate individual worker's action of competence and fulfillment in the workplace. Though the original authors of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002) acknowledge that extrinsic rewards such as verbal praise and feedback about competence can improve even intrinsic motivation under specific circumstance, the central theme of self-determination theory is that rewards and deadlines diminish motivation if people see them as coercive (Robbins, Judge & Vohra 2012). Some researchers suggest that employees who work toward organizational goals for intrinsic reasons are usually more satisfied with their jobs, and perform better because they feel like they fit into their organization better (Bono & Judge 2003). There is need to make the work interesting, provide recognition and support employee growth and development. Equally employees who feel what they do is within their control and a result of free choice are likely to be motivated by their work and committed to the employers (Meyer, Becker & Vandenberghe, 2004). These employees feel sense of independence, have control over their work, feel accepted and thus highly identify with their organizations that afford them freedom. As Berkery et al. (2017) point out, it is possible that employees will increase their efforts if their chosen flexible arrangements help them manage their work-life balance by reducing levels of stress, exhaustion, burnout etc. The reasons for choosing Self-determination theory as the framework for this study abound. According to Robbins et al (2012), self-determination theory is one of the contemporary theories of motivation and represents the current state of thinking in explaining employee motivation. Furthermore, the theory has been variously researched on and each research reinstates the efficacy of intrinsic motivators against extrinsic motivators. It has been shown that employees prefer these intrinsic motivators (Adonis, 2006). The fact that higher perceived level of autonomy (the possibility of flexi-time), helps workers to achieve competence could lead to the increased productivity (Berkery et al., 2017), and the impact on increased firm performance is in line with the tenets of the self-determination theory, hence, its choice as the framework for analyzing this investigation.

III. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

In an attempt to examine how the various FWA affect employees' level of commitment vis-a-viz their performance, it is essential to distinguish between employee-driven and employer-driven flexible working arrangements. Arrangements focused on employees' benefits are assumed to motivate them to put in more effort, which will eventually generate positive effects on organizational performance. In the course of analysing the differences in FWAs' provision with respect to organizational performance, Klindzic and Marić (2019) came up with several important conclusions amongst which are that companies that apply teleworking reported lower

levels of turnover and absenteeism. This could be attributed to teleworking being able to allow employees to minimize stress and cost of travel to work (Mamaghani, 2012) and by meeting their need for flexibility (Kotey & Sharma, 2016). This assertion is further reinforced in Lee and DeVoe (2012) study which reported that flexi-time increases profitability only when practiced within an employee-centred strategy. Positive effects of predominantly employee-driven arrangements have been highlighted in some other studies. Working remotely from home is positively associated with profit and perceptions of organizational performance (Meyer, Mukerjee, & Sestero, 2001). The employee working from remote home feels management has confidence in him and this boosts his self-worth, independence, self-discipline and control over his work. Further, the analysis opines that flexi-time is positively associated with profitability, employee retention, and negatively related to turnover and absenteeism (Dalton & Mesch, 1990; Lee & DeVoe, 2012; Richman, Stavrou & Kilaniotis, 2010, Nwokocho & Iheriohanma, 2012). In the same vein, it is argued here that, all things being equal with respect to infrastructural provisions and development, home-based work and telework are positively related to organizational performance though they do not have a significant association with turnover (Stavrou, 2005). The above argument relates to the need of organizations' drive for profit and therefore, authenticates the essence of employee-centred FWA. This evaluates research question one and objective one of this study which sought to investigate if employee-driven FWA have positive effects on organizational performance. There is the possibility that employees with keen volatility with intrinsic rewards will increase their efforts if their chosen flexible arrangements help them manage their work-life balance by reducing levels of stress, exhaustion, burnout etc. and increase their level of control, identification and motivation in the organization.

Although it is expected that employer-driven arrangements will be predominantly found to have positive effects on organizational performance to be able to justify its purpose of increased productivity, it is not always the case. The findings from studies are mixed with some actually showing their negative effects on organizational performance. For instance, Stavrou (2005) and Stavrou & Kilaniotis (2010) aver that though weekend work, shift work and overtime have a positive relationship with turnover, no significant association with organizational performance was found. Furthermore, Shen and Dicker (2008) aver that shift work is associated with increased absenteeism, and increased turnover of employees with higher tenure in organizations although Battisti & Vallanti (2013) reported lower levels of turnover in companies that apply more temporary work considering that having more fixed-term workers implies a lower dismissal probability for permanent workers. This evaluates research question two and objective two of this study which sought to investigate if employer-driven FWA have positive effects on organizational performance and shows that employer-driven FWA are more prone to adversely affect employees unlike the employee-driven FWA. This is because decisions about the scheduling of work are taken by the employers and might result in the schedules that do not allow the employees flexible arrangements to help address their particular needs. In the same vein the argument is in sync with the basic summation of the self-determination theory which is that people are motivated to do more when they feel they are in control of their actions. Scheduling work without the input of employees undermines motivation and an unmotivated employee cannot perform optimally. Performance will be adversely affected. Invariably, self-determination theory as an intrinsic motivator enables the employees to use their initiatives, be creative, be independent and feel self-worth, discarding the tendency for espionage in the workplace. They are more committed to the organization(s) that appreciate their efficiency and independence, thereby creating opportunities for more improved productivity and performance.

Though improved efficiency and competitiveness have frequently been cited as being the two major factors that influence employers' decision to use FWA, it can be deduced from the submissions above and reaffirmed by further research that FWA can equally be detrimental, particularly when not voluntarily or freely chosen by employees (Kotey & Sharma, 2016; Lewis, 2003). More precisely, employees being left out with little or no choice over their working time and locations, may result in their feeling (externally) controlled and as such less committed to the organization and eventually less compelled to give back to the organization (Berkery et al., 2017) and this might heighten the propensity for espionage and tendency to quit/exit. This makes it very important that organisations should be knowledgeable on the particular type of FWA they are imbibing because obviously the degree of acceptance of the two forms of FWA by the employees differ and this affects the performance level. Shepard III, et al (1996), however, argue that though FWA could have an impact on productivity due to increased effort, better cooperation and the ability to attract talented workers that prefer flexible work schedules, it is also possible that the costs of supervisors will increase due to more changes in the schedule. This calls for caution in the choice of particular type of FWA to apply and further research to further ascertain the effect of the additionally incurred cost on overall performance.

IV. SUMMARY

Flexible working arrangements (FWA) in place and time, especially those that are designed to aid the work-life balance and are employee-driven can generate positive organizational outcomes. The employees who opt for employee-driven FWA like home-based working and teleworking are often well-motivated, self-

sufficient, self-disciplined, well-organized and good communicators, hence they tend to generate higher performance for those firms which can offer such flexibility as a means to capture and retain them. Though employer-driven FWA have been portrayed to show positive effects on organizational performance as well, their efficacy has been shown not to be very consistent as the former. Therefore, there is need for every organization that wants to achieve optimal performance to appreciate her employees in decisions pertaining to their working arrangements.

V. CONCLUSION

Employers should find ways to implement these types of FWA that generate positive organizational outcomes such as lower absenteeism, turnover and espionage among employees while aiming at increased performance. This strategy should be upheld by developing economies, especially in the Third World, especially now that productivity and performance of their employees are descending to the lower ebb. They should not wait to be whipped into condescending as globalization did. Unlike the employee-driven FWA, arrangements that primarily benefit the employer, especially traditional arrangements, such as shiftwork, weekend work, annual hours count and fixed-term contracts, are most likely to generate negative relationships with both financial and non-financial organizational outcomes. Hence, the importance of generating and developing FWA that match both employers' and employees' needs that would improve both employee quality of life and organizational performance and this can never be over emphasized.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made

1. Organizations, especially in the developing economies, should imbibe employee-driven flexible work arrangements as they have been shown to help employees balance their work-life and this positively affects their abilities, interest and zealotness towards their jobs in the organization and indirectly enhances improved performance. This clarion call is critical now that information and communications technology (ICT) and associated technological devices have changed and challenged traditional work practices for improved performances and productivity.
2. There is the need for more research on the effects of employee-driven and employer-driven flexible work arrangements on organizational performance in order to substantiate that effects of FWA vary depending on the primary beneficiary.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adonis, J. (2006). *Building better performance through intrinsic motivation: Call centre helpers - the UK's most popular contact centre magazine*. <http://www.callcentrehelper.com/> Accessed 18th April, 2020
- [2]. Avery, C. & Zabel, D. (2001). *The flexible workplace: A sourcebook of information and research*. Westport, CT: Quorum
- [3]. Baltes, 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.
- [4]. Basahuwa, C. B., Unegbu, V. E. & Babalola, Y. T. (2020). ICT skills and job performance of librarians in public universities in North-Central, Nigeria, *Journal of Science, Technology and Education* 8(1): 154-166
- [5]. Battisti, M., & Vallanti, G. (2013). Flexible wage contracts, temporary jobs, and firm performance: Evidence from Italian firms. *Industrial Relations*, 52(3): 737–764.
- [6]. Berkery, E., Morley, M. J., Tiernan, S., Purtill, H., & Parry, E. (2017). On the uptake of flexible working arrangements and the association with human resource and organizational performance outcomes. *European Management Review*, 14(2): 165–183.
- [7]. Bono, J.E & Judge, T.A. (2003). Self –concordance at work: Towards understanding the motivational effects of transformational Leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(5): 554 – 571.
- [8]. Chung, H. (2009). *Flexibility for whom? Working time flexibility practices of European companies*, Tilburg University, Tilburg.
- [9]. Dalcos, S., & Daley, D. (2009). Pressure, workplace social resources and -family conflict: The tale of two sectors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 16(4): 291-311
- [10]. Dalton, D. R., & Mesch, D. J. (1990). The impact of flexible scheduling on employee attendance and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(2): 370-387.
- [11]. Deci, E & Ryan, R (2002). (eds) *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press
- [12]. De Cuyper, N., De Witte, H. & Van Emmerik, H. (2011). Temporary employment: Costs and benefits for (the careers of) employees and organizations. *Career Development International*, 16(2): 104–113.

- [13]. de Menezes, L. M., & Kelliher, C. (2011). Flexible working and performance: A systematic review of the evidence for a business case. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(4): 452–474.
- [14]. Dessler, G. (2008). *Human resource management*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Limited.
- [15]. Dex, S., & Smith, C. (2002). *The nature and pattern of family-friendly employment policies in Britain*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- [16]. Elke, W & Beblo.M. (2004) *Does work time flexibility work? An empirical assessment of the efficiency effects for German firms*.
- [17]. Etzion, D. (2003). Annual vacation: Duration of relief from job stressors and burnout. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping. An International Journal*. 16(2): 213-226
- [18]. Eurofound (2017). Sixth European working conditions survey – overview report (2017 update). Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- [19]. Fapohunda, T. M. (2014) An exploration of the effects of work life balance on productivity. *Journal of Human Resource Management and Labour Studies*, 2(2): 71-89.
- [20]. Gialis, S., & Taylor, M. (2016). A regional account of flexibilization across the EU: The 'flexible contractual arrangements' composite index and the impact of recession. *Social Indicators Research*, 128(3): 1121–1146.
- [21]. Hashim, M, Ullah, M & Khan, M.A (2017). Impact of Time Flexibility on Employees' Performance: A study of Teaching Faculty in Government Colleges of Management Sciences, Peshawar, *City University Research Journal*. 206-207
- [22]. Igbinovia, M. O. & Popoola, S. O. (2016). Organizational culture and emotional intelligence as predictors of job performance among library personnel in Edo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice*,4(2): 34-52.
- [23]. ILO. (2011). International Labour Organization Working time in the twenty-first century: Discussion report for the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Working-Time Arrangements 2011. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- [24]. Jackson, P. (2007). Knowledge asset management; A systems approach for human capital management, *The Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*.
- [25]. Kattenbach, R., Demerouti, E., & Nachreiner, F. (2010). Flexible working times: Effects on employees' exhaustion, work-non-work conflict and job performance. *Career Development International*, 15(3): 279–295.
- [26]. Kauffeld, S., Jonas, E., & Frey, D. (2004). Effects of a flexible work-time design on employee and company-related aims, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13(1): 79–100.
- [27]. Kerin, A. & Aguirre, A. (2005). Improving health, safety and profits in extended hours' operations (shiftwork). *Industrial Health*, 43(1): 201–208.
- [28]. Klindzic, M. & Marić, M. (2019). Flexible work arrangements and organizational performance – The difference between employee and employer-driven practices, *Društvena Istraživanja / Journal for General Social Issues*. 28(1): 89-108.
- [29]. Kottey, B. & Sharma, B. (2016). Predictors of flexible working arrangement, provision in small and medium enterprises (SMEs), *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(22): 2753–2770.
- [30]. Kossek E, & Distelberg B. (2009) Work and family employment policy for a transformed work force: Trends and themes. In: Crouter N, Booth A, editors. *Work-Life Policies*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press; 2009. 1–51
- [31]. Kurland, N. B. & Bailey, D. E. (1999). Telework: The advantages and challenges of working here, there, anywhere, and anytime. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28: 53-68.
- [32]. Lee, B. Y. & DeVoe, S. E. (2012). Flextime and profitability. *Industrial Relations*, 51(2):298–316.
- [33]. Lewis, S. (2003). Flexible Working arrangements: Implementation, outcomes, and management. In C. Cooper, & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 18: 1–28.
- [34]. McGuire, J. N., & Liro, J. R. (1986). Flexible work schedules, work attitudes, and perceptions of productivity. *Public Personnel Management*, 15(1): 65–73.
- [35]. McNall, L. A., Masuda, A. D., & Nicklin, J. M. (2010). Flexible work arrangements, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: The mediating role of work-to-family enrichment. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 144(1): 61–81.
- [36]. Mamaghani, F. (2012). Impact of telecommuting on organization productivity, *European Journal of Management*, 12(3): 175–182.
- [37]. Meyer, C., Mukerjee, S., & Sestero, A. (2001). Work-family benefits: Which ones maximise profits? *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(1): 28–44.
- [38]. Meyer, J.P, Becker, T.E. & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(6): 991-1007.

- [39]. Mwebi, M.B & Kadaga, M.N (2015). Effects of flex-time work arrangement on employee performance in Nairobi CBD Commercial Banks, *International Journal of Novel Research in Marketing Management and Economics* 2(3): 111-121
- [40]. Muchiti, E. & Gachunga, H. (2015). Influence of work life balance on employee productivity in Kenya; A case of Milimani Law Courts Nairobi. *Journal of Business and Change Management*, 2(48):1-20
- [41]. Nwokocha, I. & Iheriohanma, E. B. J. (2012) Emerging trends in employee retention strategies in a globalizing economy: Nigeria in focus. *Asian Social Science*, 8(10): 198 – 207. Website: www.ccsenet.org/ass
- [42]. Omondi, A. & Obonyo, K. (2018). Flexible work schedules: A critical review of literature. *Strategic Journals*, 5(4): 2069-2086.
- [43]. Onyeizugbe, C. U., Nduka, S. O., & Enaihi, S. O., (2019). Flexible time and employee performance in manufacturing firms in Anambra State of Nigeria *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 7(5):42-56.
- [44]. Pérez, M.& Sánchez, A. & de-Luis, P. (2003). The organizational implications of human resources managers' perception of teleworking. *Personnel Review*. 32(6): 733-755.
- [45]. Possenried, D. & Plantenga, J. (2011). *Access to flexible work arrangements, working-time fit and job satisfaction*, Tjalling C. Koopmans Research Institute, Utrecht.
- [46]. Prasetya, A. & Kato, M. (2011). The effect of financial and non-financial compensation to the employee performance, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The 2nd International Research Symposium in Service Management.
- [47]. Robbins, S.P, Judge T.A & Vohra, N. (2012). *Organisational behaviour* 14th Edition; India: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [48]. Shagvaliyeva, S. & Yazdanifard, R. (2014). Impact of flexible working hours on work-life balance. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 4(1): 20-23.
- [49]. Shen, J., & Dicker, B. (2008). The impacts of shift work on employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(2): 392–405.
- [50]. Shepard III, E. M., Clifton, T. J., & Kruse, D. (1996). Flexible work hours and productivity: Some evidence from the pharmaceutical industry. *Industrial Relations*, 35(1): 123–139.
- [51]. Spreitzer, G. M., Cameron, L., & Garrett, L. (2017). Alternative work arrangements: Two images of the new world of work. *The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, 4(1): 473–499.
- [52]. Stavrou, E. T. (2005). Flexible work bundles and organizational competitiveness: A cross-national study of the European work context. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26(8): 923–947.
- [53]. Stavrou, E. T., & Kilaniotis, C. (2010). Flexible work and turnover: An empirical investigation across cultures. *British Journal of Management*, 21(2): 541–554.
- [54]. Thomas-Wandera, H. (2011). The effects of short-term employment contracts on an organization: A case of Kenya Forrest Service. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(21): 184–204.
- [55]. Shockley, K. M., & Allen, T. D. (2007). When flexibility helps: Another look at the availability of flexible work arrangements and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 71(3): 479–493.
- [56]. Van Dyne, L. Kossek, E. & Lobel, S. (2007). Less need to be there: Cross-level effects of work practices that support work-life flexibility and enhance group processes and group-level OCB. *Human Relations* 60 (8): 1123-1154.
- [57]. Vlems (2008). *"Balance matters: Turning burnout into balance"*. R&B Publishing, TX: 2008.
- [58]. Yeh, H & Hong, D, (2012), The mediating effect of organizational commitment on leadership type and job performance. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 8(2):50-59
- [59]. Zeytinoglu, I. U., Cooke, G. B., & Mann, S. L. (2009). Flexibility: Whose choice is it anyway? *Industrial Relations*, 64(4): 555–574.

AUSTIN-EGOLE, Ifeyinwa Stella, et. al. "Flexible Working Arrangements and Organizational Performance: An Overview." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(5), 2020, pp. 50-59.