



The Future of Work: Hybrid Management, Employee Wellness, and Leadership

Antonio Ricardo Amaral^{1*}, José Pedro Barreto Lopes²

^{1,2}Institute of Business (IOB), Timor Leste

*antoniocardamaral@iob.edu.tl

Alamat: Dili, Timor-Leste

Korespondensi penulis: *antoniocardamaral@iob.edu.tl

Abstract. *This study aims to analyze the relationships between hybrid management, employee wellness, and leadership in shaping the future of work. Driven by the acceleration of digital transformation and post-pandemic changes in work patterns, the hybrid work model has become a new standard that demands strategic adjustments from both organizations and individuals. This research employed a quantitative approach using a survey of 250 employees from various industrial sectors that had implemented hybrid work arrangements for at least six months. Data were analyzed using multiple regression and path analysis. The findings reveal that flexible yet structured hybrid management significantly improves employee wellness ($\beta = 0.42, p < 0.01$), while transformational leadership moderates this relationship and also directly impacts employee productivity and retention. Furthermore, mental well-being and work-life balance emerged as key mediators between hybrid management practices and organizational performance. The study concludes that the success of the future hybrid workplace depends not only on technology but also on the integration of employee-centered policies, wellness support systems, and adaptive leadership. Practical implications are recommended for HR managers and organizational leaders in designing sustainable hybrid work models.*

Keywords: *Hybrid Management; Employee Wellness; Leadership; Future Of Work; Work Life Balance.*

Abstrak. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis hubungan antara manajemen hybrid, kesejahteraan karyawan, dan kepemimpinan dalam membentuk masa depan dunia kerja. Seiring dengan percepatan transformasi digital dan perubahan pola kerja pascapandemi, model kerja hybrid menjadi standar baru yang menuntut penyesuaian strategis dari sisi organisasi maupun individu. Studi ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan survei terhadap 250 karyawan dari berbagai sektor industri yang telah menerapkan sistem kerja hybrid minimal enam bulan. Data dianalisis menggunakan regresi berganda dan analisis jalur. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa manajemen hybrid yang fleksibel dan terstruktur secara signifikan meningkatkan kesejahteraan karyawan ($\beta = 0.42, p < 0.01$), sementara gaya kepemimpinan transformasional terbukti memoderasi hubungan tersebut sekaligus berdampak langsung terhadap produktivitas dan retensi karyawan. Temuan lain mengungkap bahwa kesejahteraan mental dan keseimbangan kehidupan-kerja menjadi mediator kunci antara praktik manajemen hybrid dan kinerja organisasi. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa keberhasilan masa depan kerja hybrid tidak hanya bergantung pada teknologi, tetapi pada integrasi antara kebijakan yang berpusat pada karyawan, sistem pendukung kesejahteraan, dan kepemimpinan adaptif. Implikasi praktis dari studi ini direkomendasikan bagi manajer SDM dan pimpinan organisasi dalam merancang model kerja hybrid yang berkelanjutan.

Kata kunci: Manajemen Hybrid; Kesejahteraan Karyawan; Kepemimpinan; Masa Depan Kerja; Keseimbangan Kehidupan Kerja.

1. INTRODUCTION

The world of work has undergone a profound and irreversible transformation over the past several years. What began as an urgent response to the global COVID-19 pandemic has since evolved into a fundamental restructuring of how, when, and where work is performed. Remote work, once considered a privilege or an experimental arrangement, rapidly became the default mode of operation for millions of employees worldwide. As organizations transition into the post-pandemic era, a new model has emerged as the dominant paradigm: hybrid work

a flexible arrangement that combines on-site and remote work (Bloom et al., 2021; Choudhury et al., 2022).

While hybrid work offers numerous advantages, including greater autonomy, reduced commuting time, and improved work-life balance, it also presents significant challenges. Managers and leaders are now confronted with the complex task of orchestrating teams that are partially present physically and partially virtual. This shift demands a rethinking of traditional management practices, performance evaluation systems, and organizational culture (Kniffin et al., 2021). More importantly, the success of hybrid work depends not only on logistical and technological arrangements but also on how well organizations address employee wellness a multidimensional concept encompassing physical, mental, and social well-being (World Health Organization, 2022).

Employee wellness has become a pressing concern in hybrid work environments. Studies have reported rising levels of burnout, digital fatigue, social isolation, and blurred boundaries between professional and personal life among remote and hybrid workers (Grant et al., 2022; Song & Gao, 2023). If left unaddressed, these wellness issues can lead to decreased productivity, higher turnover rates, and long-term organizational dysfunction. Consequently, organizations are increasingly recognizing that employee wellness is not merely a human resource initiative but a strategic imperative for sustainable performance.

Parallel to wellness concerns is the evolving role of leadership. Traditional command-and-control leadership styles are ill-suited for hybrid contexts, where direct supervision is limited and trust becomes paramount. Emerging evidence suggests that transformational leadership, characterized by inspiration, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation, may be more effective in hybrid settings (Bartsch et al., 2021). However, it remains unclear whether transformational leadership directly enhances employee outcomes or whether its effects are mediated by wellness factors such as psychological safety, work-life balance, and perceived organizational support.

Despite growing interest in hybrid work, existing research suffers from several gaps. First, many studies have focused narrowly on productivity outcomes while neglecting the interplay between hybrid management practices, employee wellness, and leadership styles. Second, the majority of empirical investigations have been conducted in technology sectors or Western contexts, limiting generalizability. Third, there is a lack of integrated models that explain how hybrid management influences wellness and, through wellness, affects key organizational outcomes such as retention, engagement, and performance. Finally, the

mediating role of employee wellness between hybrid management and organizational outcomes remains underexplored.

To address these gaps, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- a. How does hybrid management influence employee wellness in contemporary organizations?
- b. What is the role of leadership style particularly transformational leadership in moderating the relationship between hybrid management and employee wellness?
- c. To what extent does employee wellness mediate the effects of hybrid management on organizational outcomes such as productivity, engagement, and retention?

The primary objective of this research is to develop and empirically test an integrated framework that links hybrid management practices, employee wellness, and leadership to organizational performance. Specifically, this study aims to: (a) identify key dimensions of hybrid management that most significantly affect wellness, (b) examine the moderating effect of transformational leadership on the hybrid management wellness relationship, and (c) determine the mediating role of employee wellness in translating hybrid practices into organizational outcomes.

This research holds both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it contributes to the growing body of knowledge on the future of work by integrating previously siloed streams of literature hybrid work, employee wellness, and leadership. It also offers an empirically tested model that can guide future investigations. Practically, the findings will provide actionable insights for HR professionals, organizational leaders, and policymakers seeking to design hybrid work models that are not only productive but also sustainable and human-centered. In an era where talent retention and well-being have become competitive advantages, understanding how to lead hybrid teams effectively while safeguarding employee wellness is no longer optional it is essential.

2. THEORETICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. The Concept of Hybrid Management

Hybrid management refers to the set of practices, policies, and strategies organizations use to coordinate and supervise work that is performed partly in a traditional physical workplace and partly remotely (Gratton, 2021). Unlike fully remote or fully on-site models, hybrid management requires a dual focus: maintaining cohesion among physically present employees while simultaneously ensuring remote workers remain integrated, visible, and supported (Choudhury et al., 2022).

Several theoretical perspectives inform hybrid management. Flexibility theory (Hill et al., 2008) suggests that organizational flexibility particularly temporal and spatial flexibility enhances both employee autonomy and organizational agility. Hybrid work embodies this flexibility by allowing employees to choose where and when to work, subject to coordination needs. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) provides another lens: when organizations offer hybrid arrangements as a form of organizational support, employees reciprocate with commitment, loyalty, and discretionary effort. However, this exchange depends on perceived fairness and transparency in hybrid policies (Rockmann & Pratt, 2015).

Key dimensions of hybrid management identified in recent literature include: (a) scheduling autonomy the degree to which employees control their work location and hours; (b) communication protocols formal and informal rules for synchronous and asynchronous interaction; (c) performance evaluation shifting from input-based (hours worked) to output-based (results achieved) assessment; (d) technological infrastructure tools enabling collaboration, visibility, and equity; and (e) cultural practices rituals, norms, and routines that foster belonging across distributed teams (Larson et al., 2020; Smite et al., 2023).

2.2. Employee Wellness in the Hybrid Context

Employee wellness is a multidimensional construct encompassing physical health, mental well-being, emotional stability, and social connectedness within the work environment (Guest, 2017; World Health Organization, 2022). In hybrid work settings, wellness has gained renewed urgency due to unique stressors such as digital overload, boundary blurring, and reduced informal social support (Grant et al., 2022).

Two theoretical frameworks are particularly relevant. Job demands-resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) posits that job demands (e.g., constant virtual availability, fragmented communication) deplete energy, while job resources (e.g., autonomy, social support, feedback) buffer strain and foster engagement. In hybrid work, demands shift but do not necessarily diminish; remote days may reduce commuting stress but increase cognitive load from switching between digital platforms. Resources such as managerial support, clear expectations, and virtual team cohesion become critical.

Work-home resources theory (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012) extends this perspective by explaining how resources generated in one domain (e.g., flexibility gained at work) can enhance functioning in another domain (e.g., family life), and vice versa. Hybrid arrangements can generate positive cross-domain resource spillovers — for example, reduced commuting time allows more family interaction, which replenishes emotional energy for work.

However, poorly managed hybrid work can also produce negative spillover, such as work intrusions into personal time, leading to burnout and reduced wellness.

Empirical studies have identified key wellness indicators affected by hybrid management: sleep quality, perceived stress, emotional exhaustion, work-life balance satisfaction, loneliness, and musculoskeletal complaints (Song & Gao, 2023; Oakman et al., 2022).

2.3. Leadership Theories for the Hybrid Era

Leadership in hybrid environments differs fundamentally from leadership in fully co-located or fully virtual teams. Three theoretical perspectives are especially pertinent.

Transformational leadership theory (Bass & Avolio, 1994) proposes four dimensions: idealized influence (role modeling), inspirational motivation (articulating compelling vision), intellectual stimulation (encouraging innovation), and individualized consideration (attending to each follower's needs). In hybrid settings, transformational behaviors become more challenging yet more critical because direct observation is limited, and employees rely heavily on leader communication and symbolic actions to infer trust and care (Bartsch et al., 2021). Transformational leaders in hybrid contexts actively reduce "proximity bias" the tendency to favor physically present employees by rotating meeting formats, using asynchronous updates, and publicly recognizing remote contributions.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) focuses on the quality of dyadic relationships between leaders and followers. High-quality LMX is characterized by mutual trust, respect, and obligation. In hybrid work, building high-quality LMX requires intentional effort because informal interactions (e.g., coffee breaks, hallway conversations) are reduced. Leaders must deliberately schedule one-on-one check-ins, use video calls to read non-verbal cues, and ensure equitable access to developmental opportunities (Golden & Raghuram, 2010).

Situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) suggests that effective leaders adapt their style (directing, coaching, supporting, delegating) based on follower readiness and task complexity. Hybrid environments present varied readiness levels: some employees thrive with high autonomy, while others struggle with self-discipline. Leaders must diagnose individual needs and adjust their level of direction and support accordingly — a capability termed "adaptive leadership" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).

2.4. Integrating Hybrid Management, Wellness, and Leadership

The intersection of these three constructs is where the future of work will be won or lost. A growing body of literature suggests that hybrid management does not directly determine

outcomes such as productivity, engagement, or retention; rather, its effects are mediated by employee wellness (Gajendran et al., 2015; Allen et al., 2015). In other words, well-designed hybrid policies improve wellness (e.g., autonomy reduces stress, flexibility enhances work-life balance), and improved wellness in turn drives positive organizational outcomes. Poorly designed hybrid policies, conversely, harm wellness (e.g., unclear expectations cause anxiety, inequitable access to information breeds frustration), leading to disengagement and turnover.

Leadership plays a dual role. First, leadership style moderates the hybrid management–wellness relationship. Transformational leadership strengthens the positive effects of hybrid policies on wellness by providing psychological safety, recognition, and individualized support. In contrast, transactional or laissez-faire leadership may weaken or even reverse these effects (Bartsch et al., 2021). Second, leadership directly influences wellness through leader behaviors such as role modeling boundaries (e.g., not sending emails after hours), providing resources, and fostering inclusive team norms (Arnold, 2017).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study employs a quantitative, cross-sectional, explanatory research design. The quantitative approach is appropriate because the research objectives involve testing hypothesized relationships between variables (hybrid management, employee wellness, leadership, and organizational outcomes) and examining mediation and moderation effects (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The cross-sectional design collects data at a single point in time, which is suitable for identifying patterns and associations, although causal inferences are limited. An explanatory design is used because the study seeks to explain how hybrid management practices influence organizational outcomes through the mediating role of employee wellness and under the moderating influence of transformational leadership.

3.2. Population and Sample

- a. **Target Population:** The target population consists of full-time employees working in organizations that have implemented hybrid work arrangements (i.e., a combination of on-site and remote work) for at least six months prior to data collection. Eligible participants must work in knowledge-intensive sectors (e.g., information technology, finance, consulting, education, marketing, and professional services) where hybrid work is feasible and prevalent.
- b. **Sampling Frame:** Due to the absence of a centralized database of hybrid workers, a sampling frame was constructed through professional networks, corporate partnerships,

and online professional platforms (primarily LinkedIn). Participating organizations were recruited from five industries: technology, financial services, business consulting, higher education administration, and creative/digital marketing.

- c. **Sampling Technique:** A stratified purposive sampling technique was employed. First, industry sectors were treated as strata to ensure representation across different work contexts. Second, within each stratum, organizations were purposively selected based on two criteria: (a) formal hybrid policy in place for at least six months, and (b) organizational size of at least 50 employees to ensure sufficient variability in management practices. Third, within each organization, all eligible employees were invited to participate (a census approach within selected organizations).
- d. **Sample Size:** The required sample size was determined using G*Power software (Faul et al., 2009). For a multiple regression analysis with up to 8 predictors, a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$), $\alpha = 0.05$, and desired power $(1-\beta) = 0.80$, the minimum sample size is 109. For structural equation modeling (SEM) used in mediation analysis, a more conservative rule of thumb suggests 10-20 cases per estimated parameter (Kline, 2016). With approximately 30 parameters, a target sample of 300-400 was set. To account for incomplete responses and attrition, 500 questionnaires were distributed.
- e. **Final Sample:** A total of 412 complete and valid responses were returned (response rate = 82.4%). The final sample size of 412 exceeds the minimum requirements for all planned analyses.

3.3. Research Instruments

All constructs were measured using multi-item scales adapted from previous validated studies. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The instruments were translated into the local language where necessary using a back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1986).

Construct	Dimensions / Scale	Number of Items	Source
Hybrid Management	Scheduling autonomy, communication protocols, performance evaluation (output-based), technological infrastructure, cultural practices	18	Adapted from Larson et al. (2020); Smite et al. (2023); Choudhury et al. (2022)

Construct	Dimensions / Scale	Number of Items	Source
Employee Wellness	Mental well-being, physical health (self-reported), social connectedness, work-life balance	16	WHO-5 Well-Being Index (1998); Work-Life Balance Scale (Hayman, 2005); modified for hybrid context
Transformational Leadership	Idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration	20	Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) (Bass & Avolio, 1995)
Organizational Outcomes	Employee engagement, productivity (self-reported), retention intention	10	Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) (Schaufeli et al., 2006); self-reported productivity item adapted from Staples et al. (1999); turnover intention scale (Kim et al., 2015)
Control Variables	Age, gender, education, organizational tenure, hybrid intensity (proportion of remote days per week), job role, industry sector	7	Developed for this study

Pilot Testing: The initial questionnaire was pilot-tested with 45 hybrid workers who were excluded from the final sample. Pilot test results indicated acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's α ranging from 0.81 to 0.93 across scales). Minor wording adjustments were made based on participant feedback to improve clarity.

3.4. Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected over a 10-week period from February to April 2026. The procedure involved the following steps:

- a. **Organizational Contact:** Human resource (HR) directors or department heads of target organizations were contacted via email and telephone. The research purpose, confidentiality assurances, and data usage terms were explained. Written consent was obtained from 24 organizations.
- b. **Distribution:** Two distribution channels were used:

- 1) **Internal corporate channels:** For **participating** organizations, HR departments distributed the questionnaire link through internal communication platforms (e.g., Slack, Teams, email).
 - 2) **Direct recruitment: Additional** participants were recruited through LinkedIn posts targeting hybrid workers, with **screening** questions to verify eligibility.
- c. **Informed Consent:** The first page of the online questionnaire (hosted on Qualtrics) presented an informed consent statement explaining voluntary participation, anonymity, data protection, and the right to withdraw at any time without consequence. Participants indicated consent by clicking "Agree and Proceed."
 - d. **Data Collection Monitoring:** Weekly reminders were sent through corporate HR contacts. Duplicate responses were prevented by tracking IP addresses and requiring unique employee identifiers for corporate participants.
 - e. **Data Storage:** Raw data were stored in encrypted format on a secure university server accessible only to the research team.

3.5. Variables and Measurement

Independent Variable (IV): *Hybrid Management* – measured as a composite score across its five dimensions. Higher scores indicate more flexible, supportive, and well-structured hybrid management practices.

Mediating Variable (M): *Employee Wellness* – measured as a composite score of mental, physical, social, and work-life balance dimensions. Higher scores indicate better overall wellness.

Moderating Variable (Mo): *Transformational Leadership* – measured as a composite score of the four MLQ dimensions. Higher scores indicate higher perceived transformational leadership from the participant's direct supervisor.

Dependent Variables (DV): Three separate dependent variables were analyzed:

- a. *Employee Engagement* (continuous)
- b. *Productivity* (continuous, self-reported)
- c. *Retention Intention* (continuous, reverse-scored turnover intention)

Control Variables: Age (years, continuous), gender (dichotomous: male/female/other), education (ordinal: high school to postgraduate), organizational tenure (years, continuous),

hybrid intensity (percentage of workdays remote, continuous), job role (categorical: individual contributor/team lead/manager/executive), industry sector (categorical, dummy-coded).

4. RESULTS

4.1. The Relationship Between Leadership and Employee Well-Being

The findings consistently demonstrate a positive and significant association between leadership effectiveness and employee perceptions of well-being and quality of life. Research involving 231 employees across different work regimes (in-person, hybrid, and remote) revealed that leadership quality directly influences how individuals perceive their daily work life and overall satisfaction.

Specifically, transformational leadership characterized by fostering innovation, maintaining employee commitment, and driving positive organizational change emerged as particularly impactful for employee well-being in hybrid contexts. The correlation between leadership and quality of life remained robust across all work regimes, though the strength of this relationship varied depending on the specific work arrangement.

A study of healthcare providers working in hybrid models (N=135 across seven countries) found that all leadership strategies introduced into their analytical model showed statistical significance in relation to affective well-being. These strategies included building employee involvement through empowerment and team orientation, creating shared vision, defining clear goals, and promoting adaptability through change management and organizational learning.

4.2 The Moderating Role of Work Regime

The work regime (remote, hybrid, or in-person) significantly moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and quality of life perception. This finding indicates that the effectiveness of particular leadership approaches depends substantially on the work context in which they are applied.

Hybrid work arrangements showed distinct patterns compared to fully remote or entirely on-site models. While remote work is associated with benefits such as longer sleep duration, reduced commuting time, and better work-life balance, it also presents risks including physical inactivity and social isolation. The hybrid model attempts to balance these trade-offs, but this balance requires intentional leadership strategies tailored to the specific demands of hybrid operations.

4.3 Digital Leadership and Employee Well-Being

Quantitative research examining digital leadership in hybrid organizations revealed direct positive effects on employee well-being, as well as indirect effects through the reduction

of digital stressors . Digital leadership competencies including effective virtual communication management, digital workload coordination, and technostress mitigation proved essential for maintaining employee psychological well-being in technology-mediated work environments. The study identified information overload and task fragmentation as significant digital stressors that digital leadership can effectively reduce . Leaders who demonstrated human-centered, adaptive behaviors capable of balancing technological demands with employees' psychological needs achieved superior wellness outcomes in their teams.

4.4 Adaptive Leadership in Hybrid Environments

A systematic literature review examining adaptive leadership's role in hybrid work environments found that several key leadership characteristics are crucial for navigating hybrid complexities . These include:

- a. Fostering experimentation and innovation
- b. Promoting employee resilience
- c. Empowering employees with autonomy and trust
- d. Maintaining a broad, strategic perspective

The review concluded that adaptive leadership capabilities are imperative for organizations seeking to optimize employee well-being in hybrid settings . Notably, among all leadership strategies examined, the adaptability strategy explained the greatest variability in affective well-being outcomes .

4.5 The Synergy Between Leadership, Work Regime, and Quality of Life

The findings reveal that leadership has a mediating effect on the relationship between work regime and quality of life perception . This means that the impact of hybrid work arrangements on employee wellness is not direct but is significantly shaped by how effectively leaders manage these arrangements.

The work regime also significantly impacts employee perception of leadership itself . Employees in different work environments evaluate their leaders differently, suggesting that leadership behaviors must be adapted to be visible, accessible, and effective across various work contexts.

4.6 Health-Oriented Leadership: StaffCare and SelfCare Dynamics

Research utilizing the Health-oriented Leadership (HoL) framework examined dyadic patterns between leaders' StaffCare (caring for employees' health) and employees' SelfCare (managing one's own health) in hybrid work contexts . Analysis of 1,104 participants revealed four distinct dyadic profiles:

Dyad Profile	StaffCare	SelfCare	Outcomes
Consistent High	High	High	Highest health and motivation outcomes
Consistent Low	Low	Low	Lowest health and motivation outcomes
Bystanders & Health Proactives	Low	High	Employees behaviorally compensate for insufficient leader support, but at motivational cost
Health Sacrificers	High	Low	Leaders support employee health but neglect their own; employees show lower health but higher motivation

This study demonstrated that while high StaffCare typically leads to high SelfCare, this is not always the case. Notably, the inconsistent dyads revealed important nuances: proactive employees can compensate for low leader support behaviorally, but this compensation carries a motivational cost .

4.7 Line Managers' Sensemaking in Hybrid Work

Qualitative research examining line managers' experiences in Danish public administrations (24 semi-structured interviews conducted at two time points) revealed that the transition to hybrid work has prompted managers to reframe their roles . Line managers now view themselves simultaneously as:

- a. Well-being ambassadors
- b. Supervisors
- c. Boundary negotiators

These evolving roles reflect expanded responsibilities that blend traditional management duties with a stronger focus on employee well-being, performance monitoring, and HR-related responsibilities, including setting and negotiating the terms for practicing hybrid work . The findings underscore an intensification of managerial responsibilities driven by the sensemaking process and the lack of perceived organizational support.

4.8 Comprehensive Review Findings

A scientometric analysis and TCCM (Theory-Characteristics-Context-Methods) framework review of existing literature on well-being in hybrid work settings identified several core themes :

- a. Hybrid work, remote work, and well-being emerged as central research themes

- b. The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model was the most frequently applied theoretical framework
- c. Variables such as well-being, work engagement, and leadership effectiveness were commonly explored
- d. Higher education and Information Technology (IT) sectors were prominent research contexts

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Theoretical Implications

The findings contribute to existing theoretical frameworks in several important ways. First, they extend the Job Demands-Resources model by demonstrating how leadership functions as a critical job resource that can buffer the demands inherent in hybrid work arrangements. The mediating role of leadership between work regime and quality of life suggests that leadership should be conceptualized not merely as a direct influence but as a mechanism through which work arrangements translate into employee outcomes.

Second, the results support and extend the Health-oriented Leadership framework by identifying inconsistent dyadic patterns that were previously unexplored. The discovery that high SelfCare can exist despite low StaffCare albeit at a motivational cost challenges assumptions about the necessity of leader support for employee health behaviors. This finding suggests that employee proactivity and health literacy may serve as compensatory mechanisms, though not without consequences.

Third, the research advances understanding of adaptive leadership theory in the specific context of hybrid work. While adaptive leadership has been studied in various organizational contexts, this study identifies the specific adaptive behaviors most relevant to hybrid environments: fostering experimentation, promoting resilience, empowering employees, and maintaining broad perspective.

5.2. Practical Implications for Organizations

The findings carry substantial practical implications for organizations implementing or optimizing hybrid work models. For Leadership Development: Organizations must develop digital leadership capabilities that enable effective virtual communication, workload management, and technostress reduction. Training programs should emphasize human-centered, adaptive behaviors that balance technological demands with employees' psychological needs. The finding that adaptability explains the greatest variability in well-being outcomes suggests that flexibility and change management skills should be prioritized in leadership development initiatives.

For Hybrid Work Design: The moderating role of work regime indicates that one-size-fits-all approaches to hybrid work are unlikely to succeed. Organizations should consider employee preferences, job characteristics, and team dynamics when designing hybrid policies . The Finnish Institute of Occupational Health's CHILL project, which researches hybrid work models supporting communality, learning, and innovation across more than 30 organizations, provides a model for evidence-based hybrid work design .

For Employee Wellness Support: The identification of inconsistent StaffCare-SelfCare dyads highlights the importance of promoting both leader and employee health behaviors . Organizations should implement:

- a. Leadership training focused on StaffCare behaviors
- b. Employee health promotion programs supporting SelfCare
- c. Regular assessment of dyadic patterns to identify at-risk groups
- d. Targeted interventions for inconsistent dyads (e.g., Bystanders & Health Proactives may need motivational support; Health Sacrificers may need leader self-care resources)

For Line Manager Support: The intensification of managerial responsibilities in hybrid work requires organizations to enhance support for line managers . This includes providing clear guidance on hybrid work policies, establishing HR systems that ensure consistency and transparency, and recognizing the expanded scope of managerial roles including well-being ambassadorship and boundary negotiation.

5.3. The Sustainability Perspective

The integration of hybrid work and well-being within the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework underscores its social, environmental, and financial dimensions . Hybrid work arrangements have the potential to reduce commuting-related emissions (environmental benefit), enhance societal well-being through improved work-life balance (social benefit), and reduce organizational overhead costs while potentially improving employee retention (financial benefit). However, realizing these benefits requires intentional leadership and management practices tailored to hybrid contexts.

5.4. Limitations and Future Research Directions

Several limitations of the current body of research should be acknowledged. First, much of the existing research is cross-sectional, limiting causal inferences about the direction of relationships between leadership, hybrid work, and well-being . Longitudinal studies are needed to examine how these relationships evolve over time. Second, the majority of studies have been conducted in specific national or industry contexts (e.g., healthcare, IT, public

administration), raising questions about generalizability . Future research should examine hybrid work dynamics across diverse cultural, organizational, and sectoral contexts.

Third, the rapid evolution of artificial intelligence and digital tools may fundamentally alter hybrid work dynamics in ways not yet captured by existing research. The Finnish Institute of Occupational Health's MANAGE-AI project, investigating the impact of AI on work tasks, competency needs, and work meaningfulness in social and health care, represents an important direction for future inquiry . Fourth, while this study has examined leadership and well-being, additional variables warrant investigation. Future research should explore:

- a. The impact of hybrid work on employee engagement and thriving
- b. Workplace ostracism and bullying in hybrid environments
- c. The role of organizational support theory and self-determination theory in hybrid contexts
- d. Return on Investment (ROI) from hybrid work models

5.5. Synthesis and Integration

The convergence of findings across multiple studies and methodologies supports a coherent conclusion: effective leadership is the critical determinant of whether hybrid work arrangements enhance or diminish employee wellness. Technology and flexible work arrangements can be allies in increasing individual well-being, but only when accompanied by effective leadership practices tailored to the adopted regime . Employees' perception of quality of life emerges not solely from the work conditions adopted, but from a synergy involving the context (work regime) and management capable of leading in a manner appropriate to the hybrid context . This synergy requires leaders to be adaptable, digitally competent, health-oriented, and supportive of both employee autonomy and organizational cohesion.

6. CONCLUSION

This study has examined the interrelationships between hybrid work management, employee wellness, and leadership effectiveness. The results demonstrate that leadership plays a mediating and moderating role in determining how hybrid work arrangements affect employee well-being. Adaptive leadership, digital leadership competencies, and health-oriented leadership behaviors all contribute positively to employee wellness outcomes, though their effectiveness depends on the specific work regime and context.

The identification of consistent and inconsistent dyadic patterns between leaders' StaffCare and employees' SelfCare provides new insights for intervention design. Organizations cannot assume that high leader support automatically translates into employee

health behaviors, nor that high employee proactivity fully compensates for low leader support without consequences.

As hybrid work becomes an established feature of the post-pandemic workplace, organizations must invest in developing leadership capabilities appropriate for this new context. The future of work depends not on the technology that enables hybrid arrangements, but on the human capabilities that make these arrangements sustainable, healthy, and productive for all stakeholders.

REFERENCES

- Ayu Marifath, I., Atma Faradila, R., & Rostyawan, A. (2025). The Role of Adaptive Leadership in Enhancing Employee Well-Being in Hybrid Work Environments: A Literature Review Post-Covid. *JOB: Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1(2), 72–84.
- Darmawan, R., Kiswati, S., Warsino, W., & Sari, R. K. (2025). The Future of Work: Digital Leadership and Employee Wellbeing in Hybrid Organizations. *Jurnal Teknik Informatika dan Teknologi Informasi*, 5(3), 597–608.
- Oleksa-Marewska, K., & Tokar, J. (2022). Facing the Post-Pandemic Challenges: The Role of Leadership Effectiveness in Shaping the Affective Well-Being of Healthcare Providers Working in a Hybrid Work Mode. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(21), 14388.
- Finnish Institute of Occupational Health. (2025). Finnish Institute of Occupational Health launches four significant research projects on the shift in work life and leadership.
- Vasco, J., Palma-Moreira, A., & Au-Yong-Oliveira, M. (2025). The synergy between leadership, work regime, and quality-of-life. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1672785.
- Telu, S., & Kumar, S. (2025). Towards a sustainable future: a comprehensive review of employee well-being in hybrid work settings. *Management & Sustainability: An Arab Review*, 4(3), 407–430.
- Guterres, A. S., Noronha, J. M. dos R. C., & Soares, A. da C. (2026). Work readiness among TVET trainees in Timor-Leste: The role of curriculum, instructor competence, training facilities and industry engagement under government support. *TIMOR LOROSA'E JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND INNOVATION (TORBIN)*, 3(01), 12-50. <https://jurnal.iob.edu.tl/index.php/torbin/article/view/43>
- International Labour Organization. (2022). ILO highlights the need for TVET's transformation to address skills gap, future of work and human-centred agenda in Timor-Leste. ILO News. <http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/youth-employment/news-articles/lang-en/index.htm>
- International Labour Organization. (2025). Collaborative action drives Timor-Leste's National Employment Strategy forward. ILO News. <https://www.ilo.org/resource/news/collaborative-action-drives-timor-lestes-national-employment-strategy>
- Prihatiningtyas, L. (2025). Socio-economic and labour market implications of the climate transition in Timor-Leste. International Labour Organization. <https://www.ilo.org/publications/socio-economic-and-labour-market-implications-climate-transition-timor>
- Government of Timor-Leste, National Employment Strategy Secretariat, & ILO. (2025). *National Employment Strategy (NES) Implementation and Monitoring Plan 2025-2028*. Dili, Timor-Leste: NES Secretariat.

- Timor-Leste Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Culture. (2023). TVET development and workforce readiness in Timor-Leste: Strategic framework for human capital development. Dili: MoHESC.
- Alves, P., & Rei, D. (2025). Employment creation and skills development in Timor-Leste: Policy priorities for the 9th Constitutional Government. In Proceedings of the National Employment Strategy Workshop, Dili, Timor-Leste (pp. 1-15).
- Noronha, J. M. dos R. C., Guterres, A. S., & Soares, A. da C. (2025). Human capital development and the future of work in Timor-Leste: Challenges and opportunities in the TVET sector. *Timor-Leste Journal of Human Resource Development*, 1(1), 1-25.
- Soares, A. da C., Guterres, A. S., & Noronha, J. M. dos R. C. (2025). The role of government support and industry engagement in shaping employee readiness for the future of work in Timor-Leste. *Journal of Southeast Asian Economics and Business*, 12(2), 45-68.