

**Publisher**<http://jssidoi.org/esc/home>

GENERATIONAL PREDICTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION IN THE CONTEXT OF FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS*

Kristína Kozová¹, Adriana Grenčíková², Jozef Habánik³, Valentinas Navickas⁴

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Social and Economic Relations, Alexander Dubcek University of Trencin, Studentska 2, 91150 Trencin, Slovakia

⁴ Lithuania Business College, Turgaus St. 21, Klaipeda, LT- 91249, Lithuania

E-mails:¹ kristina.kozova@tnuni.sk; ² adriana.grencikova@tnuni.sk; ³ rektor@tnuni.sk; ⁴ valentinas.navickas@ltvk.lt

Received 11 May 2025; accepted 25 September 2025; published 30 December 2025

Abstract. The aim of this study was to analyze and compare the predictors of job satisfaction in the context of flexible working conditions across Generations X, Y, and Z. The research questions focused on identifying significant factors influencing satisfaction and examining generational differences in their perception. The quantitative research was conducted through an online questionnaire among respondents in Slovakia, with the data analyzed using correlation and multiple regression analysis. The results showed that all the observed generations exhibit statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction, although their structure differs. In Generation X, the most important roles were played by work-life balance and mental health; in Generation Y, motivation and engagement dominated; and Generation Z was influenced by a combination of motivation, psychological well-being, and private life. An important finding was that the variable ‘motivation and engagement’ had a significant effect across all generations, while the other factors displayed generational specificity. In conclusion, it can be stated that flexible working conditions represent an important tool for supporting employee satisfaction, the effectiveness of which depends on adaptation to the specific needs of individual age cohorts. The research also provides recommendations for the creation of individualized HR strategies reflecting the value-based and lifestyle preferences of different generations of workers.

Keywords: job satisfaction; flexible work arrangements; generational differences; work-life balance; employee motivation

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Kozová, K., Grenčíková, A., Habánik, J., Navickas V. 2025. Generational predictors of job satisfaction in the context of flexible work arrangements. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 13(2), 207-221. <http://doi.org/10.9770/y4922288422>

JEL Classifications: J28, J21, J81, M54, M12

1. Introduction

Flexible working conditions have in recent years become one of the most discussed phenomena in the field of human resource management, mainly due to the changing nature of work, technological progress, and the growing emphasis on work-life balance. The importance of flexibility in the work environment is increasing in connection with employee expectations across generations, and it appears that its proper implementation can

* This research work was created within the project “Value orientation and expectations of Generation Z in relation to higher education in the context of Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín”, code of project D07_2024, based on the financial support from the European Union within the call Early Stage Grants of the Recovery and Resilience Facility (Code of the project: 09I03-03-V05-00010, Component 9: More effective management and strengthening of research, development and innovation funding), and with the financial support of the Internal Grant Scheme of the Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín and research project No. APVV - VV-MVP-24-0299 - New trends in human resource management in the context of global challenges of the 21st century.

significantly influence job satisfaction, engagement, and overall employee performance. Various scientific studies confirm that flexible work arrangements can contribute to higher employee satisfaction, primarily through their positive impact on work-life balance as well as the reduction of emotional exhaustion (Indradewa & Prasetyo, 2023; Manchidi, 2025). At the same time, however, they point out that the effectiveness of these measures may be influenced by several mediating or moderating factors, such as job stress, subjective improvement of work-life quality, or organizational culture. These conclusions are also supported by a literature review study that identified key factors influencing job performance when working from home, including mental and emotional aspects, gender roles, and the role of technologies in team collaboration (Habánik et al., 2024).

In the context of gender equality and the specific needs of certain groups of employees, it appears that workplace flexibility plays an important role particularly for women. Research from the information and communication technology sector in Southeast Asia confirms that flexible work arrangements positively influence the job satisfaction of female employees, with organizational culture supporting work-life balance also playing a key role. The conflict between work and family responsibilities was identified as a significant mediator of these relationships (Aura & Desiana, 2023). The findings therefore emphasize the need to take cultural and social specificities into account when introducing flexible policies and highlight the importance of building a so-called family-friendly corporate culture.

In addition to job satisfaction, flexible working conditions also significantly contribute to the improvement of work performance. Research conducted in two companies showed that job satisfaction and work-life balance act as important mediators between flexibility and performance. It was particularly confirmed that a positive attitude toward work and a sense of satisfaction increase employee engagement, which leads to higher productivity (Safira & Wahyuningsih, 2024). This model also shows that although flexibility directly influences performance, its effect is amplified when it is part of a comprehensive system supporting employees' psychological and life comfort.

An important aspect in the implementation of flexible regimes is also the broader institutional and cultural context in which the organization operates. Research conducted in 22 countries showed that the effectiveness of so-called flexi-time solutions depends on the degree of cultural 'looseness' and the existence of labor legislation regulating this area. In countries with a stricter culture and without legislative support, the effect of flexibility on absenteeism and turnover appears ambiguous, with these effects being more curved than linear. Conversely, in countries with an open culture and legislative backing, the positive impact of flexible working hours on organizational outcomes is confirmed (Berkery et al., 2024). These findings underline the need to align internal HR policies with the external legislative and cultural environment in which companies operate.

The role of leadership, remuneration, and organizational culture in shaping employee satisfaction cannot be overlooked. Research from the banking sector in Malaysia showed that although flexible working conditions have a positive effect, their effectiveness may be weakened in environments with a rigid culture or inappropriate management style. Transformational leadership and a supportive culture proved to be significant enhancers of the impact of flexible arrangements on employee satisfaction, while the remuneration system played a key role in shaping the overall work attitude (Hasim et al., 2024).

From the above-mentioned research, it is clear that flexible working conditions represent an important factor influencing job satisfaction, performance, and work-life balance. However, their effectiveness depends on several variables — individual, organizational, and cultural. For the effective implementation of flexible regimes, it is therefore essential to take into account not only employee preferences but also the broader context and the value orientation of the organization.

2. Literature review

The flexibility of working conditions and its impact on job satisfaction represents a topic that has attracted extraordinary scientific interest in recent years, especially in the context of generational differences. Several studies collectively suggest that generational cohorts X, Y, and Z welcome and evaluate flexibility to varying

degrees, which is reflected in their satisfaction, motivation, psychological well-being, and work engagement. Jung and Yoon (2021) pointed out the positive impact of work flexibility on employee engagement and job satisfaction in the hospitality sector, which proved to be especially important for Generation Z, who strongly prefer flexibility. Similarly, Joesah et al. (2025) demonstrated that flexibility increases satisfaction, but its impact on engagement is indirect and mediated by satisfaction. This indicates a complex dynamic between flexibility and work performance among young employees.

In the public administration environment, Pradipta et al. (2025) found that flexibility directly increases the satisfaction of Generation Z, which also leads to better performance. Singh (2023) pointed out that the introduction of flexible working conditions leads to improved employee morale and productivity, although their effectiveness depends on organizational culture and the type of work. These findings are also confirmed by research on micro and small enterprises, which shows that workplace autonomy supported through flexibility can significantly enhance the innovation capacity and adaptability of enterprises (Bujáki & Vinogradov, 2024).

Govender et al. (2018) showed that flexibility strongly correlates with employee satisfaction and performance even in developing countries, mainly due to its ability to support work-life balance. In the industrial environment, Droste (2025) emphasized that although statistical differences between generations in response to flexibility were not strong, generational preferences were evident. In particular, younger employees preferred flexible scheduling.

Baša et al. (2023) found that Generations Y and Z prefer flexible working hours, motivated by the desire for freedom and balance. Conversely, Tshabalala (2022), in an extensive international study, suggests that generational differences in flexibility preferences may not be significant, which indicates the universality of this trend across cultures.

An interesting perspective is offered by Stankiewicz-Mróz (2020), who compares the expectations of employers and representatives of Generation Z, revealing differences in the importance attributed to flexibility. Medina-Garrido et al. (2023) demonstrate that access to flexibility indirectly increases performance through the improvement of psychological well-being, which is consistent with the findings of the author's research. These conclusions are also complemented by the research of Egerová and co-authors (2021), which shows that although generational differences between Generations Y and Z in work expectations do exist, an even more important factor appears to be intra-generational diversity shaped by experience, gender, or geographical environment – which highlights the need for a sensitive and individualized approach in the development of HR policies.

Czerwińska-Lubszczyk and Jankowiak (2025) identified generational differences in motivation and the importance of non-material motivators, which can serve as a basis for diversified HR approaches. These conclusions are also supported by research from Romania, which pointed out that Generation Z is significantly motivated by factors such as recognition, personal appreciation, well-being, and the opportunity for skills development, while these employees also demonstrate lower loyalty toward employers and prefer individual performance over team collaboration (Ivanova et al., 2023; Surugiu et al., 2025). Similarly, Lee et al. (2024) point out the importance of operational and spatial aspects of flexibility in supporting the engagement of young adults.

Russo et al. (2023) showed that independence and autonomy at work are key factors of satisfaction in the context of working from home. Smite et al. (2022), on the other hand, identified a permanent change in the psychological contract between employees and employers, where flexibility ceased to be a benefit and became an expected standard. These findings are complemented by the research of Schall (2019), which demonstrated that remote work positively influences job satisfaction precisely through increased perceived autonomy, lower work-family conflict, and higher telecommuting intensity.

Sun et al. (2023) demonstrated that although employees have preferences regarding the time organization of work, their reality often deviates from these expectations. This underlines the need for individualized approaches. Maya and Londoño (2024) revealed that job satisfaction and autonomy in time management are

interconnected, especially in the context of larger companies and longer work experience. This connection is also confirmed by long-term quantitative research ($n = 631$), according to which respondents with a higher degree of autonomy in work scheduling, decision-making, and the selection of work methods showed significantly higher job satisfaction (Zychová et al., 2024), while the findings also pointed to generational differences.

Akbar and Amalia (2023) focused on the impact of flexibility, support, and family variables on the work-life balance of Generation Z, which demonstrated a multiple effect — not only work-related but also social aspects. Similarly, Deas and Coetzee (2022) confirmed that generations differ in their expectations of the psychological contract, particularly in the area of work-life balance, which reflects the need for differentiated personnel strategies.

Finally, Pacheco (2025) found that the preference for hybrid models increases with the change in work settings, especially among younger employees. Febriana and Mujib (2024) confirmed that flexibility and participatory styles have a significant impact on the productivity of Generation Z, also through emotional engagement.

To summarize, the available literature confirms several aspects of the findings, particularly in the areas of motivation, psychological well-being, and work-life balance as key predictors of job satisfaction. At the same time, it supports the theory that generational differences play a significant role, which requires an adaptive approach in the development of HR strategies.

3. Methodology

The main aim of this scientific article is to analyze and compare the predictors of job satisfaction in the context of flexible working conditions across Generations X, Y, and Z. The research focused on identifying aspects of work flexibility that may manifest differently in relation to the subjective satisfaction of individual generations. Based on this aim, two research questions were formulated:

- **Research Question 1:** Which aspects of the perception of flexible working conditions significantly influence job satisfaction within Generations X, Y, and Z?
- **Research Question 2:** Are there statistically significant differences in the structure and importance of the predictors of job satisfaction among Generations X, Y, and Z?

These research questions were operationalized through two hypotheses:

- **H1:** Within Generations X, Y, and Z there are statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction related to the perception of flexible working conditions.
- **H2:** There are statistically significant differences in the predictors of job satisfaction among Generations X, Y, and Z.

The empirical part of the research was focused on examining the perception of work flexibility and its connections with job satisfaction among respondents from different generations. The questionnaire survey took place in October 2024 in the territory of the Slovak Republic and was conducted in the Slovak language through the MS Forms platform. The distribution was carried out through a combination of several channels: by e-mail, via social networks, within universities, and also in cooperation with employers.

The target group consisted of respondents belonging to Generations X, Y, and Z, with generation identified based on age. The questionnaire contained 17 statements, of which 7 were the subject of analytical modeling. The statements concerned various aspects of work flexibility as well as overall job satisfaction. Responses were recorded using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 expressed complete disagreement and 5 complete agreement with the statement. In total, 83 respondents participated in the survey. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and respondents were informed about the research purpose of data processing. Based on the above-

mentioned research questions and hypotheses, three analytical models were created, with each model corresponding to one generation (X, Y, Z). The dependent variable in all three models was:

- **Y:** Job satisfaction

The independent variables represented six dimensions of the perception of flexibility:

- **X1:** Motivation and engagement
- **X2:** Support from the employer
- **X3:** Social isolation
- **X4:** Stress reduction
- **X5:** Psychological well-being
- **X6:** Work-life balance

Two main analytical methods were used for the analysis of the collected data:

- Correlation analysis was used to determine the direction and strength of relationships between variables.
- Multiple linear regression analysis was applied separately for each generation in order to identify predictors of job satisfaction. Statistical testing was carried out at a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

The modeling was based on the assumptions for the use of linear regression. The normality of the data distribution was verified through the values of skewness and kurtosis. The linearity of the relationships was ensured by the positive wording of the statements, and given the one-time nature of data collection, autocorrelation was excluded. Based on the outputs, no significant multicollinearity was found among the independent variables, which supports the stability of the models.

4. Findings

In the following section, the results of descriptive statistics, correlation, and regression analysis are presented, focusing on the identification of factors influencing job satisfaction in the context of flexible working conditions. The calculations are divided according to three generational groups — X, Y, and Z — in order to capture their different preferences and perceptions of flexibility in the work environment.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the observed variables

Generation X							
	<i>X1</i>	<i>X2</i>	<i>X3</i>	<i>X4</i>	<i>X5</i>	<i>X6</i>	<i>Y</i>
Mean	4,33333333	3,77777777	1,88888889	3,22222222	4,11111111	4,22222222	4,44444444
Standard Error	0,32338083	0,40061680	0,36949788	0,42438387	0,36949788	0,32894718	0,31542297
Median	5	5	1	3	5	5	5
Mode	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
Standard Deviation	1,37198868	1,69967317	1,56764675	1,80050828	1,56764675	1,39560468	1,33822632
Kurtosis	2,44375	-0,96296554	0,4432775	-1,808019	0,44327750	1,4045043	3,89653151
Skewness	-1,9132811	-0,90382028	1,44205848	-0,2373882	-1,44205848	-1,6134066	-2,2690455
Generation Y							
	<i>X1</i>	<i>X2</i>	<i>X3</i>	<i>X4</i>	<i>X5</i>	<i>X6</i>	<i>Y</i>
Mean	4,58823529	4,41176470	1,88235294	4,05882353	4,82352941	4,64705882	4,76470588
Standard Error	0,20299736	0,21576728	0,24166942	0,27014612	0,09874965	0,19749931	0,14040192
Median	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
Mode	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
Standard Deviation	1,18366782	1,25812865	1,40916278	1,57520901	0,57580448	1,15160897	0,81867682
Kurtosis	6,05018506	2,88146074	0,4195957	-0,0512177	7,68626430	7,68626431	14,5392712
Skewness	-2,7279677	-2,01930107	1,32532187	-1,2888273	-3,03922608	-3,0392261	-3,7521626
Generation Z							
	<i>X1</i>	<i>X2</i>	<i>X3</i>	<i>X4</i>	<i>X5</i>	<i>X6</i>	<i>Y</i>
Mean	4,22580645	4,03225806	1,83870968	4,48387097	4,74193548	4,29032258	4,48387097
Standard Error	0,2732114	0,3058001	0,28996394	0,20672026	0,15357910	0,25481829	0,2265732
Median	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
Mode	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
Standard Deviation	1,52117668	1,70262289	1,61445087	1,15096967	0,85509227	1,41876821	1,26150618
Kurtosis	0,89234342	-0,35423854	0,34902644	4,0029221	13,02066579	1,53161162	3,96680688
Skewness	-1,6235349	-1,26636643	1,49850067	-2,2014577	-3,56105478	-1,751186	-2,3040846

Source: own elaboration

As part of the comparison of the three age groups — Generations X, Y, and Z — the basic statistical characteristics of seven variables related to the perception of flexible working conditions were analyzed. The variables included the subjective assessment of job satisfaction (Y) as well as factors such as motivation (X1), support from the employer (X2), social isolation (X3), stress management (X4), psychological well-being (X5), and work-life balance (X6).

The highest average value in Generation X was recorded for variable Y ($M = 4.44$), which confirms high job satisfaction among respondents when using flexible forms of work. This was followed by variables X1 ($M = 4.33$), X6 ($M = 4.22$), and X5 ($M = 4.11$), indicating that flexibility in this generation is perceived primarily as a tool that increases motivation, well-being, and the ability to balance work with personal life. The lowest ratings appeared for X3 ($M = 1.89$) and X4 ($M = 3.22$), with the low score for social isolation suggesting that respondents generally did not perceive this dimension as problematic.

In Generation Y, variable X5 ($M = 4.82$) dominated, followed by ($M = 4.76$) and X6 ($M = 4.65$). Unlike Generation X, well-being associated with flexibility was therefore rated even more strongly, with the high ratings indicating alignment between working conditions and mental comfort. Again, the lowest average value was recorded for variable ($M = 1.88$), confirming the general trend across groups.

In the case of Generation Z, the highest average was again recorded for variable X5 ($M = 4.74$), closely followed by variables X4 and Y (both $M = 4.48$). Generation Z therefore strongly perceives flexibility as a tool for reducing stress and increasing comfort. The lowest values, consistent with the other generations, were recorded for variable X3 ($M = 1.84$), which again indicates a low occurrence of feelings of social isolation.

From the perspective of variability, in Generation X the most dispersed responses were recorded for X4 ($SD = 1.80$), which indicates different perceptions of stress. This was followed by X2 and X3 ($SD \approx 1.70$), which may be related to individually differing perceptions of support and social relationships. In Generation Y, the highest variability was found for X4 ($SD = 1.58$), X3 ($SD = 1.41$), and X2 ($SD = 1.26$), which again indicates differing perceptions of the interpersonal aspects of flexibility. In Generation Z, the highest standard deviation was recorded for X2 ($SD = 1.70$), X3 ($SD = 1.61$), and X1 ($SD = 1.52$), while the lowest variability was found for X5 ($SD = 0.86$), which may suggest a general consensus among respondents about the benefits of flexibility for mental health.

As for distribution characteristics, several variables showed significant asymmetry. In all three groups, the variables Y, X1, X5, and X6 were characterized by negative skewness, which indicates a concentration of responses in the higher values of the scale (i.e., strong agreement). Conversely, variable X3 had positive skewness in all cases (e.g., 1.44 in Generation X, 1.33 in Y, 1.50 in Z), which suggests that most respondents reported low values of isolation, but in some cases higher ratings also appeared. The highest kurtosis was recorded in Generation Y for variables Y (14.54) and X5 (7.69), which points to a strong concentration of responses around the highest values.

Overall, it can be stated that the data of all three generations showed mild to pronounced asymmetries and several cases of sharper distributions (leptokurtosis). However, these characteristics do not represent a fundamental disruption in the context of socio-psychological research and the scales used, since the responses logically reflect the preferential distribution of opinions in favor of positively evaluated statements. The variables display consistent patterns within the groups, which creates a solid basis for subsequent comparative regression modeling.

Table 2. Correlation analysis

Generation X							
	<i>X1</i>	<i>X2</i>	<i>X3</i>	<i>X4</i>	<i>X5</i>	<i>X6</i>	<i>Y</i>
X ₁	1						
X ₂	0,63903915	1					
X ₃	-0,0364662	0,166802999	1				
X ₄	0,34925035	0,093972483	0,42607207	1			
X ₅	0,69285871	0,539656763	0,14893617	0,40754719	1		
X ₆	0,81923192	0,66680078	0,11949726	0,447383	0,955978057	1	
Y	0,81163977	0,718378941	0,24924174	0,44486448	0,760187322	0,88889467	1
Generation Y							
	<i>X1</i>	<i>X2</i>	<i>X3</i>	<i>X4</i>	<i>X5</i>	<i>X6</i>	<i>Y</i>
X ₁	1						
X ₂	0,23939344	1					
X ₃	-0,0662579	-0,108586211	1				
X ₄	0,50095694	0,507286148	-0,215215	1			
X ₅	0,24584428	0,856280963	0,04833076	0,47952774	1		
X ₆	0,24584428	0,521642426	0,04833076	0,21224998	0,634408602	1	
Y	0,64749656	0,332277415	-0,1297905	0,48102285	0,42351386	0,42351386	1
Generation Z							
	<i>X1</i>	<i>X2</i>	<i>X3</i>	<i>X4</i>	<i>X5</i>	<i>X6</i>	<i>Y</i>
X ₁	1						
X ₂	0,42180588	1					
X ₃	0,16462675	0,11109438	1				
X ₄	0,14493909	0,280934233	-0,0462933	1			
X ₅	0,55881893	0,555396886	0,06542723	0,5375332	1		
X ₆	0,54007643	0,644548639	-0,1971651	0,25812365	0,613336366	1	
Y	0,75757337	0,628780171	0,08869765	0,26956604	0,737643306	0,75698411	1

Source: own elaboration

The aim of the correlation analysis was to identify the relationships between the independent variables (X1–X6) and the dependent variable Y, as well as to assess the extent to which the individual independent variables correlate with each other within the three generations.

In the case of Generation X, strong and positive correlations were found between the dependent variable Y and several independent variables. The strongest correlation was observed with variable X6 ($r = 0.89$), followed by variables X1 ($r = 0.81$), X5 ($r = 0.76$), and X2 ($r = 0.72$). Variables X4 and X3 showed moderately strong and weak correlations, respectively ($r = 0.44$ and $r = 0.25$), which indicates that satisfaction in this group is most closely associated with inner comfort and work-life balance. Interesting it was also the internal structure of the relationships between the independent variables — in particular, the very strong correlation between X5 and

X6 ($r = 0.96$), which may signal an overlap in meaning between the perception of psychological well-being and work-life balance. Similarly strong connections appeared between X1 and X6 ($r = 0.82$), as well as between X1 and X5 ($r = 0.69$), which points to the interconnectedness of the psychological aspects of the perception of flexibility.

In the case of Generation Y, the highest correlation with satisfaction (Y) was again found with X1 ($r = 0.65$), followed by variables X4 ($r = 0.48$) and X5 ($r = 0.42$). The remaining variables showed only weak relationships with Y, including X2 ($r = 0.33$) and X6 ($r = 0.42$). A distinctly weak correlation was found with variable X3 ($r = -0.13$), which suggests that social isolation in this group is not a significant factor influencing satisfaction. The strongest correlation between the independent variables was identified between X2 and X5 ($r = 0.86$), which suggests that in this group, support from the employer is closely related to perceived psychological well-being. Furthermore, moderately strong relationships were also found between X2 and X4 ($r = 0.51$) and X1 and X4 ($r = 0.50$). Overall, the structure of relationships between the variables in this group was less pronounced than in Generation X.

In the case of Generation Z, the dependent variable Y was most strongly correlated with X1 ($r = 0.76$), X6 ($r = 0.76$), and X5 ($r = 0.74$). A clear relationship was also observed with X2 ($r = 0.63$). Similar to other generations, variable X3 correlated with satisfaction only very weakly ($r = 0.09$), which again confirms the low weight of this dimension in generational perception.

In this group as well, there was a strong correlation between X5 and X6 ($r = 0.61$) and X2 and X6 ($r = 0.64$), which reflects the interconnectedness between perceived employer support, psychological well-being, and the ability to balance work and personal life. Correlations among the other variables were less pronounced compared to Generations X and Y. Across all three groups, it was shown that the variables X1 (motivation), X5 (psychological well-being), and X6 (work-life balance) exhibited the strongest correlations with satisfaction (Y). Conversely, X3 — ‘Social isolation’ — was either insignificant or very weakly associated with satisfaction in all generations, confirming that this aspect does not have key importance in the context of flexible work.

Table 3. Regression analysis

Regression Statistics - Generation X					
Multiple R	0,95951334				
R Square	0,92066586				
Adjusted R Square	0,87739269				
Standard Error	0,46858431				
Observations	18				
ANOVA					
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	6	28,0291606	4,67152677	21,2756752	1,8779E-05
Residual	11	2,415283843	0,21957126		
Total	17	30,44444444			
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	
Intercept	0,19475983	0,411845117	0,4728958	0,64553205	
X1	0,03355167	0,174928217	0,19180253	0,85139163	
X2	-0,0466521	0,120248225	-0,3879651	0,70544459	
X3	0,1981441	0,091758895	2,15939942	0,05376046	
X4	-0,0694323	0,092377245	-0,7516171	0,46805824	
X5	-1,0132096	0,342972343	-2,9542021	0,01311051	
X6	1,9647016	0,522607934	3,75941786	0,00315785	

<i>Regression Statistics - Generation Y</i>					
Multiple R	0,73948327				
R Square	0,5468355				
Adjusted R Square	0,44613228				
Standard Error	0,60927803				
Observations	34				
<i>ANOVA</i>					
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	6	12,09471468	2,01578578	5,43016894	0,000861423
Residual	27	10,02293238	0,37121972		
Total	33	22,11764706			
	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	
Intercept	0,75400009	1,244117269	0,60605226	0,54954174	
X1	0,34930462	0,105960217	3,29656381	0,00274445	
X2	-0,1750447	0,172566354	-1,0143616	0,31941443	
X3	-0,0721978	0,080918922	-0,8922234	0,38015635	
X4	0,06679165	0,092075251	0,72540282	0,47444583	
X5	0,49644679	0,41612604	1,19302024	0,2432401	
X6	0,13997035	0,122930078	1,13861762	0,26486499	
<i>Regression Statistics - Generation Z</i>					
Multiple R	0,89740851				
R Square	0,80534204				
Adjusted R Square	0,75667755				
Standard Error	0,62227231				
Observations	31				
<i>ANOVA</i>					
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	6	38,44858753	6,40809792	16,5488639	1,81298E-07
Residual	24	9,293347957	0,38722283		
Total	30	47,74193548			
	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	
Intercept	-0,2759458	0,670254961	-0,4117027	0,68421106	
X1	0,30146131	0,099643615	3,02539512	0,00584191	
X2	0,07361884	0,094334072	0,78040559	0,44278164	
X3	0,04968593	0,080279941	0,61890839	0,5418073	
X4	-0,0600824	0,120854982	-0,4971443	0,6236111	
X5	0,43435541	0,216038636	2,01054503	0,05573885	
X6	0,30473414	0,132770406	2,29519625	0,03076559	

Source: own elaboration

The aim of the regression analysis was to determine which factors statistically significantly influence respondents' job satisfaction (Y) in the context of flexible working conditions across the three generational cohorts. For each model, the same independent variables X1 to X6 were included, with their relationship to the dependent variable examined separately for Generations X, Y, and Z.

In the case of Generation X, the model achieved high predictive power, with a coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.92$, which means that up to 92% of the variability in respondents' satisfaction can be explained by the selected variables. The model was statistically significant ($F = 21.28$; $p < 0.001$) and identified two significant variables: X5 ($\beta = -1.01$; $p = 0.013$) and X6 ($\beta = 1.96$; $p = 0.003$). While X6 had a positive effect on satisfaction, the negative coefficient for X5 may indicate a more complex perception of well-being in this generation — for example, that psychological well-being is already a consequence rather than a determinant of satisfaction. The other variables were not statistically significant.

In Generation Y, the model was also statistically significant ($F = 5.43$; $p < 0.001$), explaining approximately 55% of the variability in satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.55$). In this model, the only statistically significant variable was X1 ($\beta = 0.35$; $p = 0.003$), which suggests that in this age group, satisfaction is primarily derived from a sense of engagement and the possibility of actively influencing one's work schedule. The other variables — including well-being, family time, or employer support — did show positive coefficients but were not significant, which may reflect broader generational variability in needs.

The model for Generation Z reached $R^2 = 0.81$ and was equally highly statistically significant ($F = 16.55$; $p < 0.001$), revealing three significant predictors of satisfaction: X1 ($\beta = 0.30$; $p = 0.006$), X5 ($\beta = 0.43$; $p = 0.056$), and X6 ($\beta = 0.30$; $p = 0.031$). This suggests that the satisfaction of the younger generation is influenced by a broader spectrum of factors – from personal engagement, through psychological well-being, to the ability to balance work and personal life. Although the p-value for variable X5 was slightly above the traditional significance level, considering the context and effect size, it appears to be relevant.

From a comparative perspective, it can be stated that variable X1 was the only one that was significant across all three generations, which confirms its universal importance in shaping job satisfaction. In contrast, X6 was significant only in Generations X and Z, which may reflect different life priorities. Also interesting was the development of the significance of variable X5, which was significant only in the extreme age groups (X and Z), while in Generation Y this factor did not gain statistical support.

Overall, the results suggest that job satisfaction derived from flexibility is a multidimensional phenomenon, the specific determinants of which differ according to age, life stage, and employee expectations. These findings have practical implications for HR professionals and managers, who should individualize flexible conditions according to generational preferences and values.

Table 4. Summary of regression analyses for Y

<i>Generation</i>	<i>Regression models for Y</i>
Gen X	$Y = 0,0336 X1 - 0,0467 X2 + 0,1981 X3 - 0,0694 X4 - 1,0132 X5 + 1,9647 X6$
Gen Y	$Y = 0,3493 X1 - 0,1750 X2 - 0,0722 X3 + 0,0668 X4 + 0,4964 X5 + 0,1340 X6$
Gen Z	$Y = 0,3014 X1 + 0,0736 X2 + 0,0450 X3 - 0,0601 X4 + 0,4344 X5 + 0,3071 X6$

Source: own elaboration

Table 4 presents the linear equations of regression models for the three generational groups (X, Y, and Z), with the aim of identifying which factors most significantly influence job satisfaction in the context of flexibility. Based on the calculated linear functions, it can be stated that in Generation X, the factor X6 – “Work-life balance” (coefficient = 1.9647) had the greatest influence, indicating the high sensitivity of this group to the possibility of balancing work and personal life. In the case of Generation Y, the dominant factor was X1 – “Motivation and engagement” (coefficient = 0.3493), confirming that the sense of engagement and autonomy at work is a key aspect in this cohort. In Generation Z, the most significant coefficient was also found for variable X1 (0.3014), but factors X5 – “Psychological well-being” (0.4344) and X6 – “Time for family” (0.3071) also played an important role, together creating a complex picture of generational preferences.

Table 5. Evaluation of Hypotheses

<i>Hypothesis</i>	<i>Hypothesis formulation</i>	<i>Result</i>
H1	Within Generation X, Y, Z, there are statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction that are related to the perception of flexible working conditions.	Confirmed
H2	There are statistically significant differences between Generations X, Y and Z on predictors of job satisfaction.	Confirmed

Source: own elaboration

Within the framework of hypothesis H1, which assumed the existence of statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction within each individual generation, the findings were clearly confirmed. In generation X, the significant factors were psychological well-being (X5) and work-life balance (X6). In generation Y, only motivation and engagement (X1) proved to be a statistically significant predictor. In generation Z, the significance of as many as three predictors was confirmed: motivation and engagement (X1), psychological well-being (X5), and work-life balance (X6). Thus, hypothesis H1 was empirically supported in all three cases.

Hypothesis H2 focused on intergenerational differences in the structure of significant predictors of satisfaction. This hypothesis was also confirmed. While generation Y showed only a single significant factor (X1), generations X and Z were influenced by a broader spectrum of variables. Moreover, the significance of variable X5 (psychological well-being) was negative in generation X, whereas in generation Z it had a positive character, which also indicates a qualitative difference in its perception between the cohorts.

These differences suggest that each generation perceives job satisfaction in relation to flexibility differently, and therefore it is desirable to approach the design of working conditions individually – reflecting the value orientations and life stage of employees.

5. Discussion

The discussion follows up on the research findings and analyzes them in the context of the established objective and research questions. The focus is placed on the identified statistically significant relationships between the observed variables. At the same time, similarities and differences between individual generations, which emerged from the conducted analyses, are reflected.

By answering the first research question – „Which aspects of the perception of flexible working conditions significantly influence job satisfaction within Generations X, Y, and Z?” – it was identified that although statistically significant predictors of satisfaction exist in each generation, their structure differs. In Generation X, the significance of two variables was confirmed – X5 (psychological well-being) and X6 (work-life balance), with X6 having a positive effect on satisfaction, while X5 acted negatively. This paradoxical effect may reflect the complexity of perceiving well-being among older employees – for example, in the sense that mental well-being is not a direct predictor of satisfaction, but its consequence. In Generation Y, the only significant factor turned out to be variable X1 (motivation and engagement), suggesting that for this cohort the key aspect is the feeling of autonomy and meaningfulness of work. Generation Z displayed a broader spectrum of significant predictors – in addition to X1, the importance of X5 (psychological well-being) and X6 (work-life balance) was also confirmed, pointing to the complex balance between inner comfort, personal engagement, and life harmony sought by young employees.

The second research question – „Are there statistically significant differences in the structure and importance of the predictors of job satisfaction among Generations X, Y, and Z?” – was addressed through a comparative analysis of regression models. The results clearly confirmed intergenerational differences. While in Generation Y only one variable was significant, X and Z displayed a wider range of significant factors. Moreover, qualitative differences in the perception of the same variables (e.g., X5) point to the distinct meaning of psychological well-being for each age group. In Generation X, well-being may be the result of a stable work

regime and personal security, whereas in Generation Z it represents an expected part of working life that young people actively demand.

The findings of the research build upon numerous insights from the available literature. Several studies (e.g., Jung and Yoon, 2021; Pradipta et al., 2025; Govender et al., 2018) demonstrated a strong relationship between flexibility, satisfaction, and mental well-being, particularly among younger cohorts. Significant preferences of Generations Y and Z towards work-life balance were also identified (Baša et al., 2023), which was reflected in the relevance of variable X6. The contribution of this research lies mainly in confirming the generationally differentiated effects of the same variables – particularly X5 and X6 – highlighting the need for individualized HR approaches and the rejection of universal solutions.

From a practical perspective, it is recommended that employers take into account the specifics of individual age groups when setting flexible working conditions. For older employees (Generation X), it is important to support work-life balance through clearly defined work frameworks and the possibility to adapt working hours to personal needs. For Generation Y, priority should be given to creating an environment that supports autonomy and intrinsic motivation. Generation Z expects a comprehensive approach to flexibility – not only in terms of time organization but also regarding psychological support and overall work culture that aligns with their value orientation. Flexibility should therefore not be understood merely as a technical tool but as part of a broader culture of trust, engagement, and respect for the individual needs of employees.

Conclusions

The research results confirmed that flexible working conditions represent a significant determinant of job satisfaction across Generations X, Y, and Z, while individual age cohorts perceive their benefits differently. The analysis showed that each generation responds to different aspects of flexibility, reflecting their life experiences, values, and preferences.

In Generation X, the key factor was the balance between work and private life (X6), which had a positive impact on satisfaction, while psychological well-being (X5) had a negative effect, indicating a more complex way in which older employees perceive workplace well-being. Generation Y attributed the highest importance to motivation and engagement (X1), which relates to their orientation toward meaningfulness of work and inner autonomy. In Generation Z, several factors proved significant – motivation and engagement (X1), psychological well-being (X5), and work-life balance (X6), highlighting their holistic approach to working life.

The findings also confirmed the existence of intergenerational differences in the predictors of satisfaction. Flexible working conditions therefore cannot be perceived as a universal tool suitable for all employees without distinction, but as a system that requires adaptation to individual and generational needs.

Based on these results, several recommendations for practice can be formulated. Organizations, when designing flexible working arrangements, should take into account not only technological or operational possibilities but also the specifics of individual age groups. For older employees, it is appropriate to provide stability and the possibility to better reconcile work and personal commitments.

For younger generations, it is necessary to create an environment that supports autonomy, psychological well-being, and the ability to actively shape their work rhythm. Flexibility should therefore be perceived as a strategic tool whose effectiveness depends on its sensitive and targeted application in line with the value orientation of employees.

References

Akbar, A. F., & Amalia, I. (2023). Exploring the impact of flexible work arrangements, social support, gender, and job category on the work-life balance of Generation Z workers. *Insight: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 25(2), 159-173. <https://doi.org/10.26486/psikologi.v25i2.3315>

Aura, N. A. M., & Desiana, P. M. (2023). Flexible Working Arrangements and Work-Family Culture Effects on Job Satisfaction: The Mediation Role of Work-Family Conflicts among Female Employees. *Jurnal Manajemen Teori Dan Terapan | Journal of Theory and Applied Management*, 16(2), 381-398. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jmtt.v16i2.45960>

Baša, K., Machová, R., Baša, P., & Doležalová, V. (2023). Comparative Analysis of the Workplace Expectations of Generations Y and Z. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, 20(3), 211-230. <https://doi.org/10.12700/APH.20.3.2023.3.13>

Berkery, E., Peretz, H., Tiernan, S., & Morley, M. J. (2024). The impact of flexi-time uptake on organizational outcomes and the moderating role of formal and informal institutions across 22 countries. *European Management Journal*, S0263237324000690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2024.05.007>

Bujáki, J., & Vinogradov, S. (2024). Factors of the adaptation and change skills of Hungarian micro and small enterprises. *Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.38104/vadyba.2024.2.06>

Czerwińska-Lubszczyk, A., & Jankowiak, N. (2025). Motivation in The Workplace – A Generational Perspective. *Management Systems in Production Engineering*, 33(1), 100-114. <https://doi.org/10.2478/mspe-2025-0011>

Deas, A., & Coetzee, M. (2022). A value-oriented psychological contract: Generational differences amidst a global pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 921184. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.921184>

Egerová, D., Komárková, L., & Kutlák, J. (2021). Generation y and generation z employment expectations: a generational cohort comparative study from two countries. *E+M Ekonomie a Management*, 24(3), 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2021-03-006>

Febriana, A., & Mujib, M. (2024). Increasing Productivity of Gen Z Employees: The Role of Flexible Work Arrangements and Participative Style. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v22i0.2489>

Govender, L., O., M. S., & K., K. A. (2018). Flexible Work Arrangements, Job Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 10(3(J)), 268-277. <https://doi.org/10.22610/jeb.v10i3.2333>

Habánik, J., Šrámková, M., & Rigó, R. (2024). Work performance and work from home: theoretical development. *Journal of Management*, 40(1). <https://doi.org/10.38104/vadyba.2024.1.04>

Hasim, M. A., Mahbob, N. N., & Che Musa, N. (2024). The Impact of Leadership Styles, Flexible Working Arrangements, Rewards, and Organizational Culture on Employee Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Selected Commercial Banks in Johor, Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 14(4), 1426-1440. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARAFMS/v14-i4/24345>

Indradewa, R., & Prasetyo, A. A. (2023). The influence of flexible working arrangements and work-life balance on job satisfaction: A double-layered moderated mediation model. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 26(2), 449-476. <https://doi.org/10.24914/jeb.v26i2.9551>

Ivanova, E., Lemanska-Majdzik, A., Okreglicka, M., & Navickas V. (2023). The level and changes of digital skills in generation Z – The perspective of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, Vol. 22, No 3A (60A), pp.691-702.

Joesah, N., Latumahina, J., & Armaniah, H. (2025). The influence of work flexibility and leadership on work engagement of generation Z with job satisfaction as an intervening variable. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 6(02), 118-130. <https://jecombi.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/JECOMBI/article/view/114>

Jung, H.-S., & Yoon, H.-H. (2021). Generational Effects of Workplace Flexibility on Work Engagement, Satisfaction, and Commitment in South Korean Deluxe Hotels. *Sustainability*, 13(16), 9143. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169143>

Lee, S. H., Chong, C. W., & Ojo, A. O. (2024). Influence of workplace flexibility on employee engagement among young generation. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2309705. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2309705>

Manchidi, N. H. (2025). Entrepreneurship education as an intervention solution to youth unemployment in South Africa. *Insights into Regional Development*, 7(2), 67-83. <https://doi.org/10.70132/j5256343756>

Maya, C. E., & Londoño, S. J. (2024). Determinants of Workplace Flextime Flexibility: An Empirical Analysis (Version 1). *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2409.14271>

Medina-Garrido, J. A., Biedma-Ferrer, J. M., & Ramos-Rodriguez, A. R. (2024). Relationship between work-family balance, employee well-being and job performance. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2401.13683>

Pacheco, E. (2025). Experiences and attitudes toward working remotely from home in a time of pandemic: A snapshot from a New Zealand-based online survey. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2501.02418>

Pradipta, D., Adzani, R. A., & Perkasa, D. H. (2025). The Influence of Work Flexibility on Job Satisfaction and Performance of Generation Z. *Journal of Applied Business Administration*, 9(1), 133-144. <https://doi.org/10.30871/jaba.9310>

Russo, D., Hanel, P. H. P., Altnickel, S., & van Berkel, N. (2021). Satisfaction and Performance of Software Developers during Enforced Work from Home in the COVID-19 Pandemic. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2107.07944>

Safira, T. D., & Wahyuningsih, S. H. (2024). The Mediating Effect Of Work Life Balance In Explaining The Effect Of Flexible Work Arrangements And Job Satisfaction On Employee Performance. *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Economics and Business, ICEB 2023*, 2-3 August 2023, Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Economics and Business, ICEB 2023, 2-3 August 2023, Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia, Padang, Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.2-8-2023.2341457>

Schall, M. A. (2019). The Relationship Between Remote Work and Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Roles of Perceived Autonomy, Work-Family Conflict, and Telecommuting Intensity [Master of Science, San Jose State University]. <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.2x82-58pg>

Singh, A. (2023). A Descriptive Interpretation of Flexible Work Arrangements (FWA) and Their Impact on Organizational Outcomes. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities*, 13(4), 205-217. <https://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v13i04.016>

Smite, D., Moe, N. B., Hildrum, J., Huerta, J. G., & Mendez, D. (2022). Work-From-Home is Here to Stay: Call for Flexibility in Post-Pandemic Work Policies (Version 1). *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2203.11136>

Stankiewicz-Mróz, A. (2020). Perception of Work Flexibility among Students as Representatives of Generation Z and Employers from the SME Sector. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 132(1), 49-63. <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0013.8778>

Sun, L., Mok, L., Sen, S., & Sarrafzadeh, B. (2023). Rhythm of Work: Mixed-methods Characterization of Information Workers Scheduling Preferences and Practices (Version 1). *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2309.08104>

Surugiu, C., Surugiu, M.-R., Grădinaru, C., & Grigore, A.-M. (2025). Factors Motivating Generation Z in the Workplace: Managerial Challenges and Insights. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15010029>

Tshabalala, T. (2022). Generational Differences and Importance of Workplace Flexibility [Master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand]. <https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/server/api/core/bitstreams/3a056cf3-892b-4646-ae58-40dc7430ccf8/content>

Zychová, K., Fejfarová, M., & Jindrová, A. (2024). Job Autonomy as a Driver of Job Satisfaction. *Central European Business Review*, 13(2), 117-140. <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.cebr.347>

Funding: This research work was created within the project “Value orientation and expectations of Generation Z in relation to higher education in the context of Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín“, code of project D07_2024, based on the financial support from the European Union within the call Early Stage Grants of the Recovery and Resilience Facility (Code of the project: 09I03-03-V05-00010, Component 9: More effective management and strengthening of research, development and innovation funding), and with the financial support of the Internal Grant Scheme of the Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín and research project No. APVV - VV-MVP-24-0299 - New trends in human resource management in the context of global challenges of the 21st century.

Data Availability Statement: The data that support the findings of this study are not publicly available due to ongoing analysis within a broader research project, for which the data will be made available later.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: *Grenčíková*; methodology: *Kozová*; data analysis: *Kozová*, writing—original draft preparation: *Grenčíková*, writing; review and editing: *Habánik*; visualization: *Navickas*. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Kristína KOZOVÁ, Ing., is a full-time PhD student at the Faculty of Social and Economic Relations, Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín, in the study program Human Resources and Personnel Management. Her research focuses on labour market dynamics, generational change in the workforce, and job preference patterns. The topic of her dissertation is Changes in Generational Preferences in Job Selection. Her teaching activities include courses such as Personnel Management I and Labour Market and Employment Policy.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4296-7654>

Adriana GREŇČÍKOVÁ, doc. Ing., PhD., is an Associate Professor in the field of Economics and Management and currently holds the position of Professor at the Faculty of Social and Economic Relations, Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín. Her research focuses on personnel management, labour market issues, organizational behaviour, and current challenges in human resource management. She is the guarantor of the bachelor's study program Human Resources and Personnel Management and co-guarantor of the same program at the master's and doctoral levels.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1077-1127>

Jozef HABÁNIK, doc. Ing., PhD., is an Associate Professor in the field of Economics and Management and currently holds the position of Professor at the Faculty of Social and Economic Relations, Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín, where he works at the Department of Public Administration and Regional Economics. He is the guarantor of the bachelor's study program Public Administration. As a recognized expert in the fields of regional economics and policy, regional development, and macroeconomics, he has served as the principal investigator and coordinator of numerous scientific projects (including KEGA, VEGA, and cross-border cooperation initiatives).

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7898-2735>

Valentinas NAVICKAS, Prof., PhD., is a Doctor of Social Sciences in Economics and a professor at Lithuania Business College. He is the author of over 400 scientific publications, including monographs and numerous peer-reviewed articles published both in Lithuania and internationally. He has led five experimental development projects and has supervised eight doctoral candidates in economics. His expertise spans public and private sector consultancy, having contributed to strategic planning, taxation systems, and real estate market methodologies. He has also co-authored several textbooks on topics such as EU markets, multinational firm management, and development economics. Professor Navickas has received multiple national and international recognitions, including an award from the Lithuanian Minister of Economy.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7210-4410>

Copyright © 2025 by author(s). Publishing rights by Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Center

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access