Remote work endows with flexibility, and this flexibility makes or breaks work-life balance. This research establishes the association of flexible work arrangements with the work-life balance of gig workers. Besides, the moderation of Ryff's six-factor psychological well-being model is also investigated. The quantitative research method was used to collect data via an adapted questionnaire. The target population was the freelancers of selected five Facebook groups. SPSS-21 was used for descriptive and inferential statistics. For moderation, Peacher's and Hayes' process macro was performed. Data were collected from 384 respondents. After pilot testing, we performed data screening and data normality. Later, descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and correlation) and inferential statistics (hypotheses testing through regression) were performed. Flexible work arrangements have a direct and significant influence on work-life balance. The moderating role of Ryff's six-factor model of psychological well-being is not established. This research endows valuable recommendations to the gig economy and other home-shored businesses/organizations to provide flexible work arrangements during the COVID pandemic, so that they could balance their work and life responsibilities. The policy implications are provided in detail in the respective section. This study is unique as the gig sector is less explored in the South Asian context.
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1. Introduction

The global workforce is an ever-changing framework. Conventionally, gig workers are considered a source of unskilled, incompetent, and low-priced employment. They are considered as a substitute for permanent employees and are mainly contemplated as a shadow workforce and have increased researchers' interest (Watson, Kistler, Graham, & Sinclair, 2021). Nevertheless, the framework of the labor market is changing. In the contemporary gig economy, there is a rise of a class of freelance and self-employed workers. Technological advancements drive them. Henceforth, this trend is observable across a broad range of industries. It has been recognized that freelance workers help shape the modern economy to be more flexible, responsive, innovative and entrepreneurial. Hence it is known as the gig economy (Zheng & Yang, 2020). They assist in a dynamic role in organizations. They are essentially employed as a companion of the workforce. They
often accept innovation that generates employment (A. E. Burke, 2015). As a result, freelancing is a field of highly skilled individuals with high income now (A. Burke & Cowling, 2015). Compared to the employment relationship, gig workers are not obliged to their clients; instead, they are autonomous in their work (Cappelli & Keller, 2013).

Friedman (2014) described the gig economy as “an economy with a long-term connection with a company, the workforce is no longer employed in jobs, an employment ladder, and shared interest in the well-being of both the company and the worker”. The employees, who perform this type of gig work, are called ‘gig workers. Whilst Pompa (2017) refers to these people as “gig workers”. (Kuhn & Maleki, 2017) defined gig workers as the "people who perform online work and find their work through online platforms are not real employees, as they do not fit in the definition of traditional concepts of independent contractors or self-employed". The flexibility of time is among the obscurity that the organization is facing, and it has become challenging to combine business requirements with the flexibility need of employees. Flexible Working Arrangements (FWAs) are stated as workforce practices required to execute employees' daily work with flexible structures (Masuda et al., 2012). People who are psychologically fit and strong may take part in activities to assist others or provide benefits to others. Consequently, the workforce with a high level of PWB is expected to resolve their clients’ queries. This study examines the impact of flexible work arrangements and WLB in the gig economy with the moderation of psychological well-being.

In recent times, the COVID pandemic has been the most acute crisis. This virus is affecting companies and workers. However, during the COVID pandemic, social distancing has been adopted, forcing many employees to do home-based work (Bodewits, 2020). The pandemic of coronavirus has led the most significant number of workers all over the world bound to work remotely. The affected countries of coronavirus have shifted their office work to home arrangements. It was previously known as telework (Huws et al., 1990). This term nowadays is discussed as "work from home". This virus also pushes firms to work virtually instead of a frontal meeting. Nowadays, the virtual collaboration and switch to work from home might create demand for online labor platforms. There is substantial buoyant demand for information technology workers. These contractors will assist firms with establishing and maintaining remote work and virtual collaboration. Gig workers and independent contractors who use the online labor platform are the least professionals who suffer from this pandemic (Bodewits, 2020). The following research questions are devised for this study:

RQ1: What is the impact of flexible work arrangements on gig workers' work-life balance?

RQ2: Does psychological well-being moderates the relationship between flexible work arrangements and gig workers' work-life balance?

To answer the above research questions, the following research objectives has been designed:

RO1: To examine the effect of flexible work arrangements on the work-life balance of gig workers of Pakistan.

RO2: To determine the moderating effect of psychological well-being on the relationship between flexible work arrangements and the work-life balance of gig workers of Pakistan.

Pakistan is an emerging economy and developing nation; therefore, a study on flexible work arrangement with a sample from a developing population furnishes the valuable insights. The gig economy is expanding fast, and Freelancing has become a fast-growing sector in Pakistan. It is vigorous to upsurge and intensify the familiarity about utilization/benefits of flexible work arrangement within/across cultures. The gig economy covers different flexible work arrangements and relationships. It is pertinent to offer gig workers a compelling reason for the execution of FWAs. Due to pandemics, many people have shifted their work online, i.e., in the gig economy. This research highlights the job flexibility thus, giving them more control over their pace, work, and schedule. It is valuable
towards new gig workers of Pakistan. It will enable them to work according to flexible schedules with less stress, and in return, their work and personal life will be balanced. It evaluates FWAs in freelancing (gig economy), its relationship with work-life balance, and the moderating impact of psychological well-being in this relationship. However, this study is not limited to gig workers only; instead, it is correspondingly vital for workers of other industries. Due to the pandemic, workers of different industries are obliged to work from home. This research is significant for the gig economy thus, helpful in reshaping the crucial aspects of the labor market. Workers can now complete their tasks according to their flexible plans. In this way, this research is blurring the lines between personal and work life.

2. Literature Review

Work-Life Balance (WLB) refers to effectively and efficiently managing several duties at home, at work, and in other parts of life (Naithani, 2009). Some studies refer to WLB as work or family balance, while some call it a life role balance. However, there exists one point that there is a need to create a necessary balance in different aspects of one's life. Two critical aspects of WLB are work-family conflict and work-family enrichment (Barber, Conlin, & Santuzzi, 2019). Work-family conflict arises when there is an imbalance between work and home demands (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). Negative consequences happen in the work domains when time, stress, and behaviour from the job affect the home (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). The experience of conflict is closely related to job demands. It seems that people's daily opinions of jobs assume their stages of work-family conflict (Ilies et al., 2007). Thus, the place of work stress may be a reason for work-family conflict. Earlier researches show a connection between the utilization of technology for determining work during off-work hours and work-family issues (Butts, Becker, & Boswell, 2015). Therefore, work-family conflict is a practice of inter-role conflict. It is bidirectional as both work and family can interfere with each other (Frone, 2003).

Work-family enrichment discusses the degree to which involvement in one domain increases the quality of life in other fields. Work-family enrichment happens when positive and inspiring involvements at work deliver a workforce with resources that improve the performance at home (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). They suggested that enrichment happens when resources (for instance, skills, flexibility, and material resources) are generated in one role directly or indirectly positively influence individual performance in the second domain. Rothbard (2001) suggested that more extensive engagement in one field is indirectly linked with increased attentiveness in the second field in a progressive direction. Some researchers suggested that employees consider their families have trained them in innovative methods of cooperating with companions. They have enhanced their skill to multitask in the workplace. For instance, workers might get clash resolution expertise in training at work. Using this training in their families will enable them to solve conflicts more successfully and efficiently with their offspring, partners, or other family members.

With the widespread adoption of information and communication technology and advancement in the World Wide Web, new working arrangements have been made general (Allen, Golden, & Shockley, 2015). Flexible Work Arrangements (FWA) can be stated as proper or casual arrangements that help workers work according to their choices and have some flexibility so that employees can rearrange their employed hours and work location (Ciarniene & Vienazindiene, 2018). Nowadays, the workforce gains the advantage of working more flexibly; that's why FWA usage is increasing rapidly (Regus, 2017). FWA further contain diverse working arrangements. These are flexitime (workforce flexibility in options of the employed hour) (De Menezes & Kelliher, 2017), job sharing, adaptive working hours, part-time (fewer hours per week) (Possenriede & Plantenga, 2011), and various short-term contracts (Berkery, Morley, Tieman, Purtill, & Parry, 2017), telecommuting or teleworking (remote work or work from home). Flexitime and telecommuting are the two most common and popular working arrangements (Peters, Blomme, De Jager, & Van Der Heijden, 2020). Flexible working arrangements can be essential for keeping the premium expertise because many of the workforces have related a better worth to flexibility in time and workplace.

Atkinson and Hall (2011) have confirmed by linking flexible working practice with happiness that there is an opinion among the workforce that employed flexibly generates happiness. The scholars also demonstrated that this pleasure would improve performance
results. One top upshots management should mull over after adopting FWA is that it facilitates decreasing the issues of WLB of workforces. Few scholars have an immediate link among FWAs and WLB previously (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010). FWAs help individuals manage the stress between personal and work domains. FWAs help improves the workforce experience and their interaction between the roles of personal and work life (Campbell, 2015).

Boundary theory proposes the outcomes of employees' work and life domains (Nippert-Eng, 2008). The term "Flexibility" refers to the degree to which location and time, such as working hours, and workplace, could be changed (Hall & Richter, 1988). Boundary theory suggests the management of boundaries of individuals’ work and personal life i.e., flexibility and permeability. Individuals integrate/segment their home and work life (Nippert-Eng, 2008). This study has used the theoretical lens of boundary theory. (Clark, 2000) also developed the same concept and named it work-family border theory. The strength of these boundaries gave an impact on the interaction between work and personal life e.g., work-family conflict or work-family enrichment (Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007).

Freelancing has the beauty of work flexibility and no formal restrictions. Gig workers can design their work schedules as they are free to make decisions. They decide what time to work and in what way to work. With no time restrictions, gig workers must create balance by themselves. Sometimes it is also feasible that gig workers could not accomplish their work and overdo it by taking multiple projects simultaneously. They overdo work for monetary advantages, which leads them to anxiety. It is challenging for gig workers to manage the schedule at their initial level. Therefore, they get exhausted very soon. Sometimes, gig workers have to come across inflexible targets. They might not spend time with their family, leading to negative WLB. Previous research also proposed that deadlines play a significant part in work strain and the WLB of freelancers (Shevchuk, Strebkov, & Davis, 2018).

In previous research, researchers studied FWA with different outcomes like employee performance and satisfaction. Nevertheless, there is a gap in the literature that further exploration and more wide-ranging research are required on the consequences of FWA by focusing on other industries, other kinds of employees, and emerging economies (Conradie & De Klerk, 2019) and other countries outside Europe (Masselink, 2019). Moreover, further research was needed on activities that enhance work-leisure balance (Orel, 2019) and different operationalization of work-family conflict and enrichment (Barber et al., 2019). This study will study FWAs with WLB outcomes by focusing on gig workers. It is predicted in this study that a flexible work arrangement and WLB have a relation with each other. According to Peters et al. (2020), it is beneficial to study the freelancing context and the impact of flexible workplace design on WLB.

PWB refers to "the overall effectiveness of individuals' psychological functioning based on subjective experience" (Wright, Cropanzano, & Bonett, 2007). Gig workers work in a stressful environment. Daily assignments and projects with high-stress conditions may discourage their progression into thoroughly performing persons with high psychological well-being levels. The conception of PWB is similar to the concept of prosperity and cheerfulness. It is not easy to define PWB clearly, because its definition may vary according to individuals, place, and time. In the 1960s, PWB was viewed negatively, such as stress and sadness (Thoits, 1983). While in the 1970s, positive research on PWB began. PWB states, "accepting oneself positively, forming a relationship with others who have confidence, and making autonomous decisions and actions following the principles and standards set by them" (Ryff, 1989). Work-lives of people significantly affect their well-being when individuals spend a considerable amount of time at work. The majority of employees are experiencing a high level of stress, and this stress influences their cognitive and health outcomes. According to Ryff (1989), PWB consists of six dimensions: self-acceptance, autonomy, positive relationship with others, purpose in life, environmental mastery, and personal growth.

Self-acceptance refers to a positive attitude toward one own self. It includes self-evaluation in a positive direction. One can describe self-acceptance as being aware of own strengths and weaknesses (Henriques, 2014). Autonomy refers to a wholly compelling and
operative person who is independent and self-directing. Third, individuals who are experts in making positive relations with others show care for the well-being of other persons. They develop and maintain interpersonal bonds with others. Positive Relations are the link-ups that mirror the Commitment in significant associations with others while incorporating proportional sympathy, closeness, and affective associations (Seifert, 2005). A firm purpose in life shows that people consider their life significant and determined. It is because they have reasons to live. Individuals with a purpose in life believe that life consists of some ambitions and objectives. They are goal-oriented and self-sufficient people (Seifert, 2005). Environmental mastery allows people to satisfy their personal needs. It discusses the capability of individuals to manage their lives and surroundings efficiently (Van Horn, Taris, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2004). Personal growth refers to a fully operative individual who focuses on personal improvement. He takes advantage of new experiences and tries to solve various problems. Personal growth is the form of self-improvement, which covers exercises that help to improve mindfulness and personality.

Gig workers who work in non-standard shifts have more risk of having physiological and psychological health issues. It is due to a disturbance in eating and sleeping patterns. Previous research discussed psychological problems such as depression, tiredness, headaches, and stress (Øyane, Pallesen, Moen, Åkerstedt, & Bjorvatn, 2013). Gig workers often work at night because they have a flexible schedule. According to an estimate, 66% of online gig workers work after 9 PM daily (Shevchuk, Strebkov, & Davis, 2019). According to (Fenwick & Tausig, 2004), gig work affects gig workers negatively due to flexible schedules and control. They further explained that physical and mental health problems did not negatively influence the outcome of gig workers.

While (Shevchuk et al., 2019) found the adverse effects of freelancers' work. Even though gig workers are self-employed and have a high level of autonomy, they suffer from working at night. According to Iskra-Golec, Barnes-Farrell, and Bohle (2016), there is a lack of synchronization between the social and personal life of non-standard workers. Due to working in an irregular pattern, they do not perform well in social and family activities (Tuttle & Garr, 2012). Women have more stress than men when working as gig workers. They keep on performing duties of household even while working (Barthe, Messing, & Abbas, 2011). Non-standard hours undermine family relations, particularly for married individuals and parents. It lessens their family time, consequently, hindering the formation of satisfying relations. It amplifies social and health-related issues (Tuttle & Garr, 2012).

In today's environment, due to mounting psychological illness, the foremost defy for organizations is to create a healthy workplace for employees (Grawitch, Ballard, & Erb, 2015). According to (Guest, 2017), human resource management is essential in improving employees' well-being. The health-related Human Resource Management (HHRM) system is designed to maintain and encourage psychological well-being (Guest, 2017). Many types of research have been conducted on health-related HR systems, but according to Huettermann and Bruch (2019), it is valuable to study the impact of health-related HR activities (such as PWB) in other national and cultural contexts outside of Germany. According to this gap in the literature, this study is worth designing to determine the influence of PWB on the relationship between FWAs and WLB of gig workers in Pakistan. Below-mentioned is the theoretical framework and list of hypotheses:

![Theoretical Framework](image)

**Figure 1: Theoretical Framework**
H1: Flexible work arrangements are positively associated with the work-life balance of gig workers.

H2: Psychological well-being moderates the relationship between flexible work arrangements and the work-life balance of gig workers.

3. Methodology

This type of research was quantitative because the questionnaire was used as a data collection technique. Moreover, it is an explanatory study and uses both primary and secondary data. The primary data was collected from the gig workers using an adapted questionnaire, whereas the secondary data sources were from journal articles, books, and internet sources.

The target population is the gig workers of five Facebook groups nominated based on their creation date and the highest number of members. Only those freelancing groups with more than 10,000 members were selected and created between 2014 and 2020. The data was collected using convenience sampling from a sample size of 384 respondents. With the help of Google Docs, the questionnaire ("pinned" for one month for the respondents) was posted in the five selected Facebook groups. The data was collected via an adapted questionnaire having 57 closed-ended questions. The first part of the questionnaire includes a few demographic questions; the second part comprises the measuring items from previous studies. The details of adopted measuring items and their references are mentioned in the table below. A 5-point Likert scale was used where ‘1’ symbolizes strongly disagree and ‘5’ depicts strongly agree.

Table 1
Measurement of Variables

| Variable | No. of items | Reference |
|----------|--------------|-----------|
| WLB      | Work-family conflict | 6 | Matthews, Kath, and Barnes-Farrell (2010) |
|          | Work-family enrichment | 18 | Carlson et al. (2000) |
| FWA      | Tele homeworking | 3 | Conradie and De Klerk (2019) |
|          | Flexi-time | 3 |  |
|          | Part-time work | 4 | Albion (2004) |
|          | Adaptive working hours | 5 |  |
| PWB      | Self-acceptance | 3 | Ryff and Keyes (1995) |
|          | Autonomy | 3 |  |
|          | Positive relationship with others | 3 |  |
|          | Purpose in life | 3 |  |
|          | Environmental mastery | 3 |  |
|          | Personal growth | 3 |  |

4. Results

The reliability analysis for each variable indicates that items are highly reliable (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2009). The combined value of Cronbach’s alpha of all variables is >0.7 which means the items are reliable. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) has been also performed in AMOS-22. The path diagram of the whole model is shown in figure 2.

Table 2 illustrates the factor loading of all items. The estimates values (factor loading) must be greater than 0.30. It has been observed that no value of factor value is less than 0.3 except WLB3 which has factor loading of 0.24 that is why WLB3 has been deleted and rest of the items have been incorporated for further analysis.
Additionally, the mean values and normal distribution of data are definite. The low standard deviation value shows that data is not so much separate from the mean; instead, it is very close to the mean value. Moreover, the correlation coefficient of the WLB-PWB relationship shows that both have positive and moderate to weak ties. FWA-PWB relationship leads to a positive and moderate-weak relationship.

Figure 2: Path Diagram and Standardized Regression Weights

Table 2

| Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) |
|-----------------------------------|
| Items               | Factor Loading | Items               | Factor Loading | Items               | Factor Loading |
|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| FWA1                 | .48            | PWB5                | .60            | WLB6                | .49            |
| FWA2                 | .50            | PWB6                | .47            | WLB7                | .51            |
| FWA3                 | .48            | PWB7                | .51            | WLB8                | .49            |
| FWA4                 | .47            | PWB8                | .42            | WLB9                | .49            |
| FWA5                 | .47            | PWB9                | .36            | WLB10               | .41            |
| FWA6                 | .49            | PWB10               | .48            | WLB11               | .45            |
| FWA7                 | .40            | PWB11               | .49            | WLB12               | .52            |
| FWA8                 | .43            | PWB12               | .42            | WLB13               | .39            |
| FWA9                 | .51            | PWB13               | .47            | WLB14               | .52            |
| FWA10                | .52            | PWB14               | .51            | WLB15               | .47            |
| FWA11                | .39            | PWB15               | .41            | WLB16               | .43            |
| FWA12                | .43            | PWB16               | .35            | WLB17               | .47            |
| FWA13                | .48            | PWB17               | .55            | WLB18               | .55            |
| FWA14                | .52            | PWB18               | .44            | WLB19               | .49            |
| FWA15                | .46            | WLB1                | .51            | WLB20               | .41            |
| PWB1                 | .47            | WLB2                | .49            | WLB21               | .43            |
| PWB2                 | .51            | WLB3                | .24            | WLB22               | .55            |
| PWB3                 | .42            | WLB4                | .49            | WLB23               | .49            |
| PWB4                 | .52            | WLB5                | .44            | WLB24               | .43            |
Table 3  
**Descriptive Statistics**

| Variable | Mean | SD   | WLB | FWA | WB  |
|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| WLB      | 3.3435 | .48978 | 1   |     |     |
| FWA      | 3.3886 | .50429 | .838** | 1   |     |
| PWB      | 3.0714 | .22410 | .485** | .449** | 1   |

The linear regression analysis was performed to analyze the first hypothesis. The following tables show linear regression analysis:

Table 4  
**Model Summary H1**

| R         | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-----------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| .838a     | .702     | .701              | .26783                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), FWA

R square is identified as the coefficient of determination. It is used to give information about the percentage of variation in the dependent variable, described by the independent variable. According to the above table, R-value shows a high degree of correlation. In this table, the value of R square means that 70.2% of the outcome variable (WLB) is explained by the predictor variable (FWA). The adjusted R square shows that it is a good fit model. A good model would be predicted a minimum 60% variation from the dependent variable (Imna & Hassan, 2015).

Table 5  
**ANOVA**

| Sum of Squares | f   | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Regression     | 60.606 | 1          | 60.606 | 844.869 | .000b |
| Residual       | 25.753 | 359        | .072   |       |
| Total          | 86.359 | 360        |        |       |

According to the above table, the regression model significantly anticipates the outcome variable (WLB). The value for statistical significance is less than 0.05. This value indicates that overall, regression predicts WLB significantly, which means that it is best for the data.

Table 6  
**Coefficients**

| Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t    | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|
| (Constant)                  | .586                      | .096 | .838 | .000 |
| FWA                         | .814                      | .028 | .000 |     |

The above coefficients table gives the information on the prediction of WLB from flexible work arrangements. Moreover, it determines whether WLB contributes significantly and statistically to the model by observing significant values. According to the above table, the beta coefficient value of FWA is 0.838, with a significant value (p) of 0.000. It means that FWAs have a positive and significant impact on WLB. The unstandardized coefficients column indicates the regression equation i.e., WLB = .586 + 0.814 (FWA). For moderation analysis, Preacher's and Hayes' process macro was performed. Following is the statistical model for moderation analysis:

**Figure 3: Statistical Model for Moderation**
The following table presents the model summary of moderation analysis. Overall model: $F(3,357) = 300.88$, $p<.001$. The value of $R$ square for the moderation model is 0.7166. It means overall moderation described 71% of the variation. It is a good fit model as, according to Imna and Hassan (2015), a good model would show a minimum 60% variation.

Table 7  
**Model Summary H2**

|     | R      | R Square | F      | df1   | df2    | p       |
|-----|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|---------|
|     | .8465  | .7166    | 300.8841 | 3.0000 | 357.0000 | .0000   |

According to table 8, the direct effect of FWA on the outcome variable (WLB) is 0.6976, while PWB has a value of 0.2160 of immediate impact. The confidence interval (95%) for $b$ is produced to find the significance of relationships among variables. CI is an indication of relevance. For significant relationships, both upper and lower confidence intervals should have the same signs, either negative or positive (Hayes, 2012). The direct effect of FWA and PWA shows an insignificant impact on WLB as both upper and lower confidence intervals show different signs. The combined impact of PWB and FWA on WLB is 0.237. This combined effect shows an insignificant relationship with the dependent variable (WLB) as LLCI and ULCI have different signs (i.e., LLCI is negative while ULCI is positive). Therefore, no moderation of PWB exists.

Table 8  
**Output of Moderation Model**

| Model | Coefficient(b) | T     | P     | LLCI* | ULCI* |
|-------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Constant | .1287     | .0935 | .9255 | -2.5770 | 2.8344 |
| FWA  | .6796 | 1.6922 | .0915 | -.1102 | 1.4694 |
| PWB  | .2160 | .4900 | .6244 | -.6510 | 1.0831 |
| Int_1* | .0237 | .1865 | .8522 | -.2267 | .2742 |

*Int_1: FWA x PWB, LLCI=lower level of confidence interval, ULCI= upper level of confidence interval. Level of confidence for all Confidence intervals in output: 95.000

The calculated value of the regression coefficient is 0.838, and $p<0.05$ shows a significant and positive relationship between FWAs and WLB. According to Hinton, McMurray, and Brownlow (2014), the relationship between variables is essential when $t$-values are more significant than 1.96 and $p$-values are lower than 0.5. Therefore, H1 is supported.

Table 9  
**Summary of Hypotheses Testing**

| Hypotheses | P-value (<0.05) | t-value (>1.96) | Verdict |
|------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| H1         | 0.000          | -              | Accepted |
| H2         | .8522          | .1865          | Rejected |

The statistical $t$-values for moderation analysis for both direct and combined effects are 1.692, 0.490, and .1865, which shows that the $t$-value is smaller than 1.96. The $p$-values for the direct impact of FWA and PWB are .0915 and .6244, respectively, while the $p$-value of their combined effect is .8522. It shows that these values are more significant than 0.05. Hence, no moderation of PWB exists. For the acceptance of the hypothesis, the recommended values must be $p>1.96$ and $p<0.05$ (Hinton et al., 2014). Consequently, H2 is rejected.

4.1. Discussion

This research aimed to investigate the relationship between flexible work arrangements and the work-life balance of gig workers in Pakistan and the moderation of PWB on the relationship between them. Two objectives of the study were drawn to achieve the purpose of the research. Then, according to the designed theoretical framework, two hypotheses were developed. The first objective was to examine the effect of flexible work arrangements and the work-life balance of gig workers. The results have shown that all measures of FWAs and WLB are significant. Both are directly and positively related to each other. The benefits recognized from the implementation of FWAs are substantial.
Flexi-time, tele homeworking, part-time work, and adaptive working hours offer gig workers a balance in life and work domains. As an emerging economy, Pakistan considers FWAs a vital factor for work-life balance implementation. The second objective was to determine the moderating effect of PWB on the relationship between flexible work arrangements and the work-life balance of gig workers. The outcomes have revealed that the impact of moderation of PWB is insignificant when investigating the relationship between flexible work arrangements and work-life balance. Gig workers are autonomous and have flexible schedules. Sometimes, they work in a stressful environment. They have tight deadlines for their assignments. This flexibility and stressed situation sometimes make their work and home life disturbed. However, the results show no role of PWB in improving gig workers' work-life balance.

This study has investigated the positive relationship between FWAs and WLB according to H1. It is confirmed that FWAs have a positive association with WLB. The finding of the present research is consistent with prior studies (De Menezes & Kelliher, 2017). The results are also compatible with the previous analysis of Thompson, Payne, and Taylor (2015) that FWAs are more effective and yield positive outcomes when applied collectively (For example, combining flexi-time with part-time work) in an emerging economy. This study also supports the research of Spreitzer, Cameron, and Garrett (2017), i.e., in the emerging economy, either FWAs impact WLB or not. It is usually recognized that FWAs improve workforce satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB (Fenwick & Tausig, 2004). It also supports the study (Shahzadi, 2021), which found an optimistic relationship between PWB and performance outcomes. This study does not support the research of Rosli, Padilla Ismail, Rashid, and Kadir i.e., the negative impact of adaptive working hours on WLB and the findings negate this statement. This is because flexibility allows gig workers to manage how much time and when they work. It further positively progresses the work and life duties.

H2 was about the moderating impact of Ryff's six-factor model of PWB on the relationship between FWAs and WLB. Nonetheless, the findings demonstrate the insignificant moderation of PWB. Therefore, H2 was rejected (insignificant p and t-values i.e., t<1.96 and p> 0.05 respectively). The findings of this research are consistent with the research of Tuttle and Garr (2012), that PWB has an insignificant impact on the life of freelancers. Although freelancers are self-employed, autonomous, and have flexible arrangements, they suffer psychologically. The finding on H2 does not support previous research by Cieri, Holmes, Abbott, and Pettit (2002), Campbell (2015) and Klainin-Yobas et al. (2016).The possible reasons for H2 rejections are mentioned subsequently. The nature of the gig economy is entirely different from that of other industries. The work nature of gig workers is different from other workers, i.e., they have the flexibility to do their work by following their deadlines. For example, if a freelancer has a deadline to complete work in ten days, then it means that he can overcome his psychological issues within ten days. Consequently, his PWB will not affect his work-related deadlines and life because of the flexible work nature. Secondly, he can reject the project offers if he is psychologically unwell. It's his discretion to accept or reject any work within a specified deadline. Thirdly, he can temporarily inactivate his profile so that it will not affect their profile. Fourthly, he can delegate his client's work to his subordinates if he doesn't have time to accept more projects or is psychologically unwell. The gig economy is a new trend prevailing during pandemics where people become employers; they are more towards entrepreneurship and creating jobs instead of finding them. In this research, the five selected Facebook groups are from geographic localities, not any particular city.

5. Conclusion

This research aimed to investigate the relationship between flexible work arrangements and the work-life balance of gig workers of Pakistan and the moderation of psychological well-being on the relationship between them was also investigated. Hence, two research objectives were designed to answer the research questions. To answer the research questions, two hypotheses were developed which were statistically tested. It has been concluded that the flexible work arrangements of gig workers are optimistically associated with their work life balance. The flexible work nature makes their work and life
easy to manage. However, their psychological wellbeing does not impact the relationship of their flexible work nature and their work life balance.

5.1. Theoretical and Policy/Practical Recommendations

This study contributes to the stream of research in three critical ways: Firstly, it helps explain previous diverse findings by investigating the relationship of flexible work arrangements with the dependent variable of WLB. Parallel to prior studies, results have shown that flexible work arrangements have a positive and direct relationship with WLB even in the life of gig workers and in an emerging economy like Pakistan. Secondly, the analysis of this research extends the findings of previous studies by considering more dimensions of flexible work arrangements with the relationship of WLB. Thirdly, this study enhances the theoretical discussion by giving a different perspective on the theoretical framework with the addition of PWB as a moderator. This research's finding for moderation analysis contrasts with some prior studies (Klainin-Yobas et al., 2016). Results indicate that PWB does not boost the relationship between FWAs and WLB. However, it shows that this study enables gig workers to manage their work-life balance using flexible work arrangements.

This research makes valuable contributions to understanding the work life balance of gig workers. This study provides valuable insights into the fast-growing sector of freelancing. In this pandemic, most of the work has been digitized. Since, the workers from other industries are also working remotely, the findings of this research are equally beneficial for them as they are obliged to work from home. They can now work according to flexible schedules, thus blurring the lines between home and work. Freelancing is an emerging field in third-world countries, and more studies are encouraged to illuminate every aspect of this field. This study creates an opportunity for gig workers and other home-shored organizations to benefit from this research. The findings of this research will help policymakers take practical actions to create a flexible work environment to maintain their WLB. There is a significant demand for workers in technology-based work in Pakistan, since the advent of COVID pandemic and industrial revolution. The changing nature of future of jobs (from conventional to more digitized) put an accelerated pressure on organizations to pace up the process of industrial reforms and restructuring. The policy makers of gig economy and all other home-shored (full/partial) organizations are recommended to ensure the flexible work arrangements because those workers are residing in their homes with other responsibilities. It is tough for them to differentiate their time for work and life. It is therefore recommended to show some flexibility while meeting the deadlines. Though the study also concludes that the psychological wellbeing does not moderate gig worker’s FWA and their WLB, the results contradict when the workers are not freelancers. There is mixed literature pertaining to the role of psychological wellbeing. It is therefore recommended to the policy makers of other home-shored businesses to make such policies keeping in view the psychological wellbeing of employees.

5.2. Limitations and Future Recommendations

The current research has provided powerful outcomes along with academic contributions and implications. Nevertheless, there are some limitations as well. This study is only limited to five freelancing groups. Therefore, future research should also focus on other Facebook groups. Consequently, future researchers are advised to conduct a country-wise comparative study on freelancers to find the difference. They can also investigate if different culture makes a difference or not (e.g., collectivist, individualist cultures, or other cultural dimensions). Secondly, the mono method was used to collect data, i.e., questionnaire; therefore, it is recommended for the future that the researcher choose a mixed-method approach for triangulation. Thirdly, due to time limitations, this study only focused on collecting data simultaneously. However, it is recommended to conduct multi-time data analysis. Fourthly, it is strongly encouraged to replicate these findings in other industries and other countries. Furthermore, this research was limited to only one moderating variable. It will be interesting to investigate if other variables (psychological capital, COVID-induced occupational stress, different personality types, gender, age) can moderate the relationship or not can also be used for this framework in future research. Additionally, investigating the mediation will be a fascinating insight for prospective authors.
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