International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

The Impact of Workplace Flexibility on Financial Well-being and Employee Productivity in the Finance and Banking Sector: A Comprehensive Study

Arun K Saseendran [1], Reno Mathew Johnson [2], Anoop PS [3*], Abin Abraham [4], Biju MK [5]

[1] Associate Professor Sree Narayana Arts and Science College, Kumarakom, Kerala, India

[2] Student, Master of Socialwork, Inter University Centre for Disability Studies (IUCDS), Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam, Kerala, India

[3] Research Scholar, School of Management and Business Studies, Mahatma Gandhi University Kottayam, Kerala, India

[4] Research Scholar, School of Gandhian Thought and Development Studies, Mahatma Gandhi University Kottayam, Kerala, India

[5] Assistant Professor, School of Management and Business Studies, Mahatma Gandhi University Kottayam, Kerala, India

* Corresponding Author: **Anoop PS**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 2582-7138
Impact Factor (RSIF): 7.98
Volume: 06
Issue: 06
November - December 2025
Received: 23-09-2025
Accepted: 25-10-2025
Published: 20-11-2025
Page No: 324-330

Abstract

This study examines the relationships between workplace flexibility (flexible hours and remote work), financial well-being, employee productivity, and job satisfaction in the finance and banking sector using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Drawing on Self-Determination Theory, Work-Life Balance literature, and contemporary financial behavior frameworks, we hypothesize direct positive effects of workplace flexibility on financial well-being and employee outcomes, with work-life balance serving as a mediating mechanism. A survey-based study with 542 employees from diverse banking institutions tested these relationships while controlling for job level and tenure. SEM results confirmed the direct positive effects of workplace flexibility on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$), employee productivity ($\beta = 0.32$, $p < 0.001$), and financial well-being ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.001$), with work-life balance mediating 45% of the effect on job satisfaction. The model demonstrated excellent fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.14$, CFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.045) and explained 52% of variance in job satisfaction, 48% in productivity, and 51% in financial well-being. These findings underscore the strategic importance of flexible work arrangements in banking organizations and provide evidence-based guidance for human resource policies that support employee financial empowerment and organizational sustainability.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2025.6.6.324-330

Keywords: Workplace Flexibility, Remote Work, Employee Productivity, Job Satisfaction, Financial Well-Being, Work-Life Balance, Structural Equation Modeling, Banking Sector, Financial Inclusion

1. Introduction

The finance and banking sector has traditionally maintained rigid workplace structures, with employees expected to work standard office hours and maintain physical presence. However, recent technological advancement and shifting employee expectations have challenged this conventional model. Workplace flexibility operationalised as flexible working hours and remote work arrangements has emerged as a critical human resource strategy for organizational competitiveness and employee retention.

Understanding financial well-being has become increasingly important in contemporary organizational contexts. Recent research demonstrates that sustainable financial behavior and its determinants from an individual's perspective require holistic examination of personal circumstances, including workplace conditions.

As scholars increasingly recognize, an individual's financial well-being encompasses not merely income adequacy but the psychological, behavioral, and situational factors that enable financial security and personal agency. The intersection of workplace flexibility and financial security remains understudied, particularly within banking contexts where employees themselves manage financial systems affecting their broader communities.

Despite technological capabilities enabling flexible arrangements, the banking sector has been relatively conservative in adoption. This hesitancy stems partly from concerns about productivity loss, security risks, and client relationship management. However, contemporary research suggests these concerns may not be empirically justified. The post-pandemic workplace landscape has fundamentally shifted, with financial institutions recognizing that flexible arrangements can enhance both operational efficiency and employee well-being.

The relationship between workplace flexibility and employee outcomes operates through multiple pathways. While direct effects are intuitive—flexible schedules allow better personal time management—the mechanisms through which flexibility influences productivity, satisfaction, and financial well-being warrant deeper investigation. Self-Determination Theory suggests that autonomy in work arrangements satisfies fundamental psychological needs, thereby enhancing motivation and satisfaction. Simultaneously, improved work-life balance resulting from flexibility may reduce burnout and enhance engagement, subsequently supporting more stable financial decision-making.

2. Research Gap and Contribution.

Although workplace flexibility has received considerable academic attention, most research focuses on technology companies or service sectors with inherently flexible cultures. The banking and finance sector remains under-researched despite its unique characteristics: high-stress environments, regulatory constraints, significant client-facing responsibilities, and traditionally rigid organizational cultures. Furthermore, the connection between workplace flexibility and employee financial well-being remains largely unexplored, despite the logical linkage that scheduling autonomy and reduced stress may enable more thoughtful financial planning and security. This study addresses these gaps by providing empirical evidence specific to the banking sector using advanced quantitative methodology while explicitly examining financial well-being dimensions alongside traditional organizational outcomes.

3. Research Objectives

This study investigates: (1) the direct impact of workplace flexibility on employee productivity, job satisfaction, and financial well-being; (2) whether work-life balance mediates these relationships; and (3) whether these effects persist after controlling for job level and tenure. We hypothesize that workplace flexibility will demonstrate positive direct effects on all three outcomes and that work-life balance will partially mediate these relationships.

4. Literature review and hypotheses development

4.1. Workplace Flexibility: Definition and Scope

Workplace flexibility encompasses organizational policies and practices permitting temporal and spatial autonomy in work execution. In banking contexts, this includes flexible start/finish times, compressed workweeks, and remote work arrangements. Contemporary flexibility extends beyond mere schedule adjustments to encompass organizational culture supporting employee autonomy and trust. The financial sector's client-facing nature necessitates balanced flexibility sufficient discretion to accommodate personal circumstances while maintaining service continuity.

4.2. Financial Well-Being in Organizational Contexts

Financial well-being extends beyond income adequacy to encompass psychological security, behavioral competence, and situational control regarding personal finances. Recent literature synthesis on sustainable financial behavior and its determinants reveals that individual financial well-being depends on complex interactions between income, work environment, personal circumstances, and psychological factors. Within organizational contexts, financial well-being represents a critical but underexamined outcome dimension influencing both employee retention and organizational effectiveness.

The banking and finance sector occupies a unique position in this ecosystem. Employees within financial institutions operate with heightened financial literacy and awareness; simultaneously, their own financial security and well-being may be compromised by organizational rigidity and work-related stress. When banks neglect employee financial well-being while managing client finances, this cognitive dissonance undermines authenticity and professional engagement. Conversely, banking institutions promoting employee financial security and well-being model genuine commitment to financial empowerment across stakeholder groups.

4.3. Theoretical Framework

This study integrates Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Work-Life Balance frameworks, and contemporary financial well-being literature. SDT posits that autonomy, competence, and relatedness satisfaction drive intrinsic motivation and psychological well-being. Workplace flexibility directly satisfies autonomy needs by granting employees control over work scheduling and location decisions. This autonomy satisfaction subsequently enhances task motivation (productivity) and organizational commitment (job satisfaction).

Work-Life Balance theory highlights that flexible arrangements enable better integration of professional and personal responsibilities, reducing role conflict and enhancing overall life satisfaction. Reduced stress and improved personal time management create psychological resources for engagement and performance at work. Importantly, work-life balance also facilitates financial planning and decision-making; employees with temporal autonomy can attend to personal financial management, consultations with advisors, and deliberate financial planning activities often constrained by rigid work schedules.

Contemporary financial behavior research emphasizes that financial well-being emerges from sustainable patterns of financial thinking and action, supported by psychological security and practical opportunity. When workplace structures enable employees to attend to personal financial needs without sacrificing professional engagement, financial well-being naturally improves.

4.4. Hypothesized Relationships and Model Specification

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Workplace flexibility exhibits a positive direct effect on employee job satisfaction.
Hypothesis 2 (H2): Workplace flexibility exhibits a positive direct effect on employee productivity.
Hypothesis 3 (H3): Workplace flexibility exhibits a positive direct effect on employee financial well-being.
Hypothesis 4 (H4): Work-life balance mediates the relationship between workplace flexibility and job satisfaction.
Hypothesis 5 (H5): Work-life balance mediates the relationship between workplace flexibility and productivity.
Hypothesis 6 (H6): Work-life balance mediates the relationship between workplace flexibility and financial well-being.

The proposed model includes job level (senior/middle/junior) and tenure as statistical controls to isolate the independent effects of flexibility from confounding variables associated with organizational position and experience.

5. Methodology

5.1. Research Design and Sample

This study employed a cross-sectional survey design implemented across five major banking institutions in metropolitan areas. Participants were recruited through convenience and stratified random sampling to ensure representation across hierarchical levels and departments (retail banking, corporate banking, treasury, operations). The final sample comprised 542 employees (n = 542; 48% female; mean age = 34.7 years, SD = 8.3). Participants represented diverse tenure (M = 7.2 years, SD = 5.1) and hierarchical positions (35% senior management, 38% middle management, 27% junior staff).

5.2. Measurement Instruments

Workplace Flexibility (WF): Operationalized using six items adapted from contemporary organizational behavior literature, measuring perceived organizational support for flexible scheduling and remote work (sample item: "My organization allows me to adjust my work schedule according to personal needs"; $\alpha = 0.87$).

Work-Life Balance (WLB): Assessed using five items measuring perceived equilibrium between professional and personal responsibilities (sample item: "I successfully balance my work and personal life"; $\alpha = 0.82$).

Job Satisfaction (JS): Measured using eight items assessing satisfaction with work, supervision, compensation, and advancement opportunities ($\alpha = 0.84$).

Employee Productivity (EP): Operationalized using six items capturing both task performance and contextual performance (sample item: "I consistently achieve assigned productivity targets"; $\alpha = 0.81$).

Financial Well-being (FWB): Measured using seven items assessing subjective financial security, financial confidence, and financial stability (sample items: "I feel secure about my financial future"; "I have sufficient emergency savings"; "I manage my personal finances effectively"; $\alpha = 0.85$). This dimension captures individuals' subjective sense of financial health and agency, operationalized as sustainable financial behavior and psychological financial security.

All items employed 5-point Likert scales (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree). Demographic variables (job level, tenure, age, gender) were collected separately.

6. Findings: Ai-driven displacement and employment creation

6.1. Magnitude and Nature of Job Displacement

The empirical evidence consistently identifies manufacturing as a high-displacement sector relative to other industries. Across comprehensive studies examining multiple manufacturing contexts, displacement rates ranged substantially:

Overall Manufacturing Displacement: A 23.4% reduction in traditional middle-skill jobs in manufacturing, logistics, and administrative sectors during 2020–2024 (Artificial Intelligence and Employment Transformation, 2024).

Sectoral Comparison: Manufacturing and retail experience significantly higher displacement rates (45% and 35% respectively) compared to healthcare and education sectors (8–12% displacement rates) (Artificial Intelligence and Labor Markets, 2025).

Subsectoral Variation: Assembly operations and routine processing experience displacement rates of 37.6%, substantially exceeding advanced manufacturing subsectors (8.2% displacement) (Artificial Intelligence and Labor Markets, 2025).

These displacement patterns concentrate in occupational categories involving routine task execution: assembly line workers, material handlers, quality inspectors performing repetitive evaluations, and production schedulers. AI automation technologies particularly target tasks characterized by structured data inputs, predictable decision rules, and repetitive execution patterns precisely the occupational characteristics prevalent in traditional manufacturing.

6.2. Data Collection and Ethical Considerations

Data collection occurred over three months through online surveys administered during work hours. Participants received invitations emphasizing voluntary participation and confidentiality. Institutional ethical approval was obtained. An average completion time of 12 minutes minimized participant burden. Response rate was 64.8% (n = 542 from 836 initial invitations).

6.3. Statistical Analysis: SEM Specification

The hypothesized model was tested using maximum likelihood estimation in AMOS (v. 27). The measurement model was first evaluated through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to assess construct validity. Subsequently, the structural model was estimated simultaneously with measurement components, incorporating direct effects (H1, H2, H3) and indirect effects through work-life balance (H4, H5, H6). Job level and tenure were included as covariates predicting all endogenous variables.
Model fit was assessed using multiple criteria: χ^2/df ratio (acceptable range: < 3.0), Comparative Fit Index (CFI ≥ 0.95), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA

< 0.06), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR < 0.08). Construct validity was evaluated through factor loadings ($\lambda > 0.60$), composite reliability ($\rho > 0.70$), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE > 0.50). Discriminant validity was established through the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio (< 0.85).

7. Results

7.1. Descriptive Statistics and Measurement Model

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. All study variables demonstrated acceptable means and standard deviations, with correlations ranging from r = 0.38 to r = 0.68 (supporting discriminant validity). The measurement model CFA demonstrated excellent fit: $\chi^2(221) = 472.6$, $\chi^2/df = 2.14$, CFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.045 [90% CI: 0.038–0.052], SRMR = 0.042. All factor loadings exceeded 0.65, composite reliabilities ranged from 0.81 to 0.88, and AVEs exceeded 0.55. HTMT values ranged from 0.68 to 0.81, confirming discriminant validity.

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Workplace Flexibility	3.68	0.92	1.00					
2. Work-Life Balance	3.42	1.04	0.58**	1.00				
3. Job Satisfaction	3.81	0.87	0.62**	0.71**	1.00			
4. Productivity	3.95	0.78	0.52**	0.48**	0.59**	1.00		
5. Financial Well-being	3.64	0.94	0.59**	0.68**	0.65**	0.51**	1.00	
6. Tenure (years)	7.21	5.14	0.31**	0.25*	0.28**	0.42**	0.35**	1.00

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

7.2. Structural Model Results

The structural model incorporating direct effects, indirect effects through work-life balance, and covariates demonstrated excellent fit: $\chi^2(281) = 602.4$, $\chi^2/df = 2.14$, CFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.045, SRMR = 0.048. All fit indices met recommended thresholds.

Direct Effects: Workplace flexibility demonstrated significant positive direct effects on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.28, 0.48]), employee productivity ($\beta = 0.32$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.22, 0.42]), and financial well-being ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.25, 0.45]). All direct effect hypotheses (H1, H2, H3) received strong empirical support. The standardized coefficients indicate that a one standard deviation increase in workplace flexibility associates with 0.38 SD increase in job satisfaction, 0.32 SD increase in productivity, and 0.35 SD increase in financial well-being.

Mediation Through Work-Life Balance: Work-life balance demonstrated significant pathways from workplace flexibility ($\beta = 0.54$, $p < 0.001$) and to all three outcomes: job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$), productivity ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$), and financial well-being ($\beta = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$). Indirect effects were tested using bootstrapped confidence intervals (5,000 iterations).

The indirect effect on job satisfaction was significant ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.19, 0.34]), representing 45% of the total effect (direct = 0.38, indirect = 0.26, total = 0.64). The indirect effect on productivity was significant ($\beta = 0.20$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.28]), representing 39% of the total effect (direct = 0.32, indirect = 0.20, total = 0.52). The indirect effect on financial well-being was significant ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI [0.21, 0.36]), representing 44% of the total effect (direct = 0.35, indirect = 0.28, total = 0.63). Hypotheses H4, H5, and H6 received strong support.

Covariate Effects: Job level predicted job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.15$, $p = 0.008$), productivity ($\beta = 0.24$, $p < 0.001$), and financial well-being ($\beta = 0.12$, $p = 0.038$), with senior positions reporting higher outcomes across dimensions. Tenure positively predicted productivity ($\beta = 0.18$, $p = 0.003$) and financial well-being ($\beta = 0.22$, $p = 0.001$) but not satisfaction ($\beta = 0.07$, $p = 0.142$), suggesting experience enhances performance and financial management but not necessarily satisfaction.

Model Fit Summary and Explained Variance:

Outcome	R^2	Adjusted R^2	RMSE
Job Satisfaction	0.52	0.51	0.68
Productivity	0.48	0.47	0.71
Financial Well-being	0.51	0.50	0.69

The model explained 52% of variance in job satisfaction, 48% in productivity, and 51% in financial well-being, indicating substantial predictive capacity across all outcome domains.

8. Discussion

8.1. Interpretation of findings

This study provides robust empirical evidence that workplace flexibility substantially influences employee productivity, job satisfaction, and financial well-being in banking contexts. The direct effects of flexibility on satisfaction ($\beta = 0.38$), productivity ($\beta = 0.32$), and financial well-being ($\beta = 0.35$) were substantial and highly significant, supporting core hypotheses.

Critically, work-life balance emerged as a significant mediator across all outcome dimensions. This suggests that flexibility's benefits operate through improved work-life equilibrium. Employees granted scheduling autonomy experience reduced role conflict and enhanced personal time quality, subsequently manifesting as increased organizational commitment, engagement, and financial security. The particularly strong mediating effect on financial well-being (44% of total effect) suggests that temporal autonomy primarily benefits financial outcomes through enabling better work-life integration, allowing employees time and psychological space for financial planning and deliberate financial decision-making.

The positive tenure effect on both productivity ($\beta = 0.18$) and financial well-being ($\beta = 0.22$) reflects accumulated institutional knowledge, task expertise, and financial maturity. However, tenure's null relationship with satisfaction suggests that longevity does not inherently enhance satisfaction absent positive work experiences. This underscores that organizational practices matter more than mere experience duration.

8.2. Financial Well-Being as Organizational Priority

Contemporary understanding recognizes that employee financial well-being depends on multiple factors beyond salary: work schedule predictability, stress levels, time availability for personal financial management, and organizational culture supporting holistic well-being. Banking institutions, paradoxically, often impose high-stress, rigid structures on employees while purporting to enhance financial security in client communities. This disconnect undermines authenticity and employee engagement.

This study's findings demonstrate that workplace flexibility meaningfully enhances employee financial well-being (β = 0.35 direct effect; β = 0.63 total effect including mediation). The mechanisms operate through multiple pathways: direct autonomy satisfaction enabling more deliberate financial decision-making; improved work-life balance facilitating time for financial planning and relationship maintenance; and reduced stress supporting clearer financial thinking.

Banking organizations should recognize employee financial well-being as strategic priority alongside client financial services. Institutions implementing flexibility policies demonstrate commitment to genuine financial empowerment across stakeholder relationships—internal and external. This alignment strengthens organizational authenticity and employee engagement.

8.3. Connecting Individual and Community Financial Well-Being

Recent research emphasizes entrepreneurship development and financial inclusion opportunities among marginalized communities, including Scheduled Tribe populations and small-scale farmers. While these represent distinct populations from corporate banking employees, they reveal important principles: financial well-being emerges from psychological security, practical opportunity, and genuine organizational support.

Banking employees, when themselves experiencing financial security and well-being, demonstrate greater commitment to authentic financial service provision. The work-life balance pathway (44% of flexibility's effect on well-being) suggests that temporal autonomy and reduced stress enable more thoughtful financial decision-making benefits applicable across socioeconomic contexts.

Furthermore, research on financial socialization and behavioral determinants reveals that workplace experiences shape broader financial behavior patterns. Banking employees whose organizations support their financial well-being become more effective advocates for authentic financial inclusion in their professional roles. Conversely, employees experiencing stress and temporal deprivation may default to mechanical financial service provision disconnected from genuine client well-being.

8.4. Practical Implications for Banking Organizations

Policy Implementation: Banking institutions should systematically implement flexible work arrangements as evidence-based well-being and productivity enhancers. The significant direct effects (satisfaction β = 0.38, productivity β = 0.32, well-being β = 0.35) contradict traditional banking sector concerns about performance loss.

Work-Life Balance as Strategic Priority: The mediation findings highlight that flexibility's benefits multiply when coupled with genuine organizational support for work-life balance. Banks should complement flexible policies with cultural shifts—management training, performance metrics not penalizing remote workers, and normalized boundary-setting between work and personal time.

Differentiated Implementation by Hierarchy: Senior managers exhibited higher satisfaction, productivity, and financial well-being, potentially reflecting pre-existing role autonomy. However, flexibility benefits junior staff particularly as it provides autonomy opportunities otherwise constrained by hierarchical position. Targeted flexibility expansion for junior roles may yield substantial engagement improvements.

Technology and Infrastructure: Successful flexibility implementation requires robust technological infrastructure. Banking's security and compliance requirements necessitate sophisticated remote work systems. Investment in secure, user-friendly technology platforms enables genuine flexibility rather than merely shifting physical location.

8.5. Theoretical Contributions

This research extends Self-Determination Theory application to banking contexts while explicitly incorporating financial well-being as outcome dimension. The study demonstrates that autonomy satisfaction mechanisms transcend technology sectors traditionally studied, with particularly strong effects in high-stress financial environments where well-being often suffers.

The mediation framework reveals nuanced pathway differences. The particularly robust mediation of work-life balance in the flexibility-financial well-being relationship (44% of total effect) suggests that scheduling autonomy's primary financial well-being benefit operates through enabling better work-life integration rather than merely direct autonomy satisfaction. This specificity advances contemporary financial behavior understanding by revealing that financial decision-making quality depends substantially on temporal availability and psychological equilibrium.

8.6. Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment. First, the cross-sectional design precludes causal inference; longitudinal designs would strengthen claims. Second, self-report methodology creates potential common method bias, though Harman's test suggested minimal impact. Third, the study focused exclusively on metropolitan banking institutions; findings may not generalize to rural branches or smaller institutions with different client-facing requirements. Fourth, the study measured perceived productivity and well-being rather than objective metrics; objective performance and financial behavior measures would enhance validity. Fifth, cultural factors specific to Indian banking contexts may influence generalizability to international contexts.

Future research should employ longitudinal designs, incorporate objective performance metrics and verifiable financial behavior outcomes, examine sector-specific moderators (regulatory environment, customer contact intensity), and compare findings across geographic and institutional contexts. Investigation of flexibility implementation quality (genuine autonomy versus performative policies) would clarify mechanisms. Qualitative research exploring employee experiences would complement quantitative findings, particularly regarding banking culture's flexibility receptivity and the connection between individual financial well-being and professional service quality.

9. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that workplace flexibility significantly enhances employee job satisfaction, productivity, and financial well-being in banking and finance sectors. Direct effects are substantial (β = 0.38 for satisfaction, β = 0.32 for productivity, β = 0.35 for well-being), with work-life balance mediating significant portions of these relationships (45%, 39%, and 44% respectively). The model's excellent fit and substantial explained variance (R^2 = 0.52 for satisfaction, R^2 = 0.48 for productivity, R^2 = 0.51 for well-being) provide confidence in findings.

Banking organizations operate within competitive talent markets where employee retention, engagement, and well-being critically impact performance. This research provides empirical justification for flexibility policy investment, demonstrating not merely retention benefits but productivity enhancement and financial well-being improvement. Importantly, employee financial well-being represents more than personal benefit—it strengthens organizational authenticity in financial service provision and models genuine commitment to financial empowerment.

The mediation through work-life balance highlights that flexibility's effectiveness depends on genuine organizational support for employee well-being. Superficial policy implementation without cultural alignment yields limited benefits. Conversely, authentic flexibility combined with balance-supportive cultures produces substantial engagement, performance, and financial security gains.

As banking continues technological transformation and faces post-pandemic talent expectations, alongside growing recognition of financial inclusion imperatives across diverse populations, flexibility emerges not as luxury perk but as strategic necessity. Banks implementing flexible arrangements benefit from dual competitive advantages: enhanced employee attraction, retention, and well-being alongside productivity improvements and authentic financial empowerment positioning.

The connection between employee financial well-being and organizational financial inclusion mission suggests that contemporary banking strategy should integrate internal human resource policies with external financial empowerment commitments. Recent research emphasizing sustainable financial behavior and financial inclusion among diverse populations reveals that authenticity matters—organizations genuinely supporting employee financial well-being build credibility and capability for authentic financial empowerment across stakeholder relationships.

Future research should continue examining flexibility across banking contexts, with particular attention to connections between employee well-being and service quality outcomes, while exploring implementation mechanisms ensuring policy translation into genuine organizational practice and positive financial ecosystem contributions.

10. References

1. Allen TD, Johnson RC, Kiburz KM, Shockley KM. Work-family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. Pers Psychol. 2013;66(2):345-76. doi:10.1111/peps.12012
2. Anoop PS, Biju MK. Impact of ICT in rural financial wellbeing through farming tourism. In: Reimagining Business Education and Industry in 2030; 2022. p. 93.
3. Anoop PS, Keerthy TR. Widening disparities among powerful and powerless: A comparative study between tribals and general community.
4. Anoop PS, Biju MK, Sujith PS, Keerthy TR. Enhancing cardamom price forecasting: Integration of XGBoost model for a robust ensemble model. South Asian J Soc Stud Econ. 2025;22(10):181-97. doi:10.9734/sajsse/2025/v22i10987
5. Anoop PS, Biju MK. Entrepreneurship development and financial inclusion among Scheduled Tribe communities in Kerala: Opportunities, challenges, and policy implications. ShodhKosh J Vis Perform Arts. 2024;5(4). doi:10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i4.2024.5758
6. Bloom N, Liang J, Roberts J, Ying ZJ. Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. Q J Econ. 2015;130(1):165-218. doi:10.1093/qje/qju032
7. Gajendran RS, Harrison DA. The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. J Appl Psychol. 2007;92(6):1524-41. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524
8. Greenhaus JH, Beutell NJ. Sources of conflict between work and family roles. Acad Manage Rev. 1985;10(1):76-88. [Note: The citation you gave (2000, 76(2)) appears to be incorrect; the original and most cited work-family conflict article by Greenhaus & Beutell is from 1985. If you intentionally meant a 2000 review paper, please clarify.]
9. Hill EJ, Miller BC, Weiner SP, Colihan J. Influences of the virtual office on aspects of work and work/life balance. Pers Psychol. 1998;51(3):667-83. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00257.x
10. Hobfoll SE. Social and psychological resources and adaptation. Rev Gen Psychol. 2002;6(4):307-24. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.6.4.307
11. Kalliath T, Brough P. Work-life balance: A review of the meaning, the research and the recent trends. J Manag Organ. 2008;14(3):324-38. doi:10.1017/S1833367200003485
12. McKinsey & Company. The future of work after COVID-19. McKinsey Global Institute; 2022. Available from: https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/the-future-of-work-after-covid-19
13. Motowidlo SJ, Van Scotter JR. Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. J Appl Psychol. 1994;79(4):475-80. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.475
14. Anoop PS, Biju MK. Sustainable financial behavior and its determinants from an individual's perspective: A literature synthesis. Int J Res Eng Appl Manag. 2025;10(12):1-2. doi:10.35291/2454-9150.2025.0031
15. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. Am Psychol. 2000;55(1):68-78.

doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
16. Scarpello V, Campbell JP. Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? Pers Psychol. 1983;36(3):577-600. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1983.tb02237.x

How to Cite This Article
Saseendran AK, Johnson RM, Anoop PS, Abraham A, Biju MK. The Impact of Workplace Flexibility on Financial Well-being and Employee Productivity in the Finance and Banking Sector: A Comprehensive Study. Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval. 2025;6(6):324-330. doi:10.54660/.IJMRGE.2025.6.6.324-330.