



A STUDY ON THE OUTCOMES DRIVEN WORKFORCE: NAVIGATING LEADERSHIP IN THE HYBRID ERA – PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, MANAGERIAL ROLES, AND CULTURE BUILDING

ALLAN RAJ W*, and MOLI GHOSH²

*MBA Student, School of Management, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600119. E-mail: rockyoct37@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600119. E-mail: moli.ghosh.soms@sathyabama.ac.in

Received: September 01, 2026, **Accepted:** September 23, 2026, **Online Published:** September 30, 2026

ABSTRACT

Hybrid work has become a common organizational practice, requiring leaders to reconsider how they manage employees and evaluate performance. This study examines three interconnected aspects of hybrid work: performance measurement, changing managerial roles, and organizational culture building. The study collected primary data through a structured questionnaire from 100 managers and team leaders across the corporate, technology, professional services, financial services, and consulting sectors. We used descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, along with Pearson correlation, to examine the relationship between leadership adaptation and the shift toward coaching roles. The findings indicate that hybrid-team performance should emphasize outcomes rather than working hours, supported by appropriate technology. Managers are increasingly expected to act as coaches by building trust, maintaining communication, and promoting psychological safety. Organizational culture also requires deliberate development through inclusive practices and consistent communication. The study found a strong, significant correlation between leadership adaptation and changing managerial roles ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.001$). The study recommends aligning performance management systems and managerial training with outcomes-driven hybrid work practices.

Keywords: Hybrid Workforce, Outcomes-Driven Performance, Managerial Roles, Organizational Culture, Performance Measurement, and Hybrid Leadership.

Introduction

Workplaces have changed shape over the last few years, and hybrid work looks like it's here to stay rather than a stopgap measure. As a result, building an outcomes-driven workforce has moved up the priority list for organizations that want to stay competitive and keep employees engaged. As teams become more spread out and more dependent on digital collaboration, companies are having to rethink both how they measure work and how managers, many of whom built their careers around being physically present and supervising people directly, are supposed to lead. Judging a workday purely by hours logged doesn't really work anymore, and judging it only by how busy someone looks online isn't much better; both approaches risk pushing employees away rather than getting the best out of them.

Being outcomes-driven isn't just about ticking off tasks. It involves setting clear goals, giving regular and honest feedback, judging people by what they deliver, and making sure employees feel like they belong to the organization no matter where they log in from. Hybrid work adds its own complications on top of this: digital equity, asynchronous communication, and the tendency for managers to unconsciously favor whoever they see in person, known as proximity bias, are all issues that come with the territory.

In many companies, managers end up bridging this gap by translating what the business wants to achieve into something meaningful for employees who aren't in the same room, or even the same city.

A workplace culture that actually works in this setting doesn't happen just because people occasionally cross paths in the office. It has to be planned for and built into how the organisation operates day to day. When companies get this right, when the culture is collaborative, responsive, and genuinely outcomes-focused, employees tend to be more autonomous, teams work better together, and the organisation as a whole becomes more stable.

Research Gap

Most existing literature examines these issues separately: one study on measuring performance by outcomes, another on managerial trust, and another on culture in hybrid teams. Very few studies bring these three pieces together and test how they relate within the same organization. Almost none statistically test whether leadership adaptation to hybrid work is connected to how much a manager's role has shifted. This study tries to close that gap by combining descriptive data on how managers perceive these changes with a correlation test linking leadership adaptation to the evolving managerial role, using survey responses from 100 managers.



Literature Review

Chen and Martinez (2022) look at outcomes-based performance measurement as a tool for improving performance in workplaces that give employees more autonomy. Writing in the *Journal of Modern Leadership*, they trace the shift from time-based to outcomes-based measurement and find that it noticeably improves team agility, reduces micromanagement, and builds trust between managers and employees. That said, the shift isn't without friction; the study points to real difficulties in redefining KPIs and getting managers comfortable with this new way of working.

The Global Hybrid Work Experiment brought together companies from several countries to study what happens to team culture and performance when employees have more control over their schedules under a hybrid model. The findings were largely positive: better work-life balance, less burnout, and higher project completion rates, with no drop in overall performance. The researchers concluded that outcomes-driven management tends to make organisations more agile, though it also raises new challenges for how management itself needs to operate.

The Center for Workplace Innovation studied 66 companies and found a fairly striking result: employees judged by what they complete, rather than the hours they put in, were about 35% more

productive. On top of that, these employees reported more autonomy, less digital stress, and fewer hours worked overall. The takeaway was that giving employees more ownership over their tasks benefits both the business and the individual, which is part of why more organizations are moving toward this kind of hybrid management.

Trust matters a great deal in this setup too. What some researchers call "asynchronous managerial trust," built on transparency, empowerment, and psychological safety, becomes especially important when teams aren't working in the same physical space at the same time. High trust seems to pay off fairly quickly, reducing proximity bias and increasing how empowered employees feel. At the same time, ongoing training in this area appears to build employees' resilience to the pressures of remote work and keep them from disengaging. In short, trust is what holds a distributed team together.

Harrison et al. (2022) take a step back and examine how management practices affect the overall coherence of a hybrid workforce, tracing a shift away from controlling management styles toward something more supportive that balances individual needs with the team's shared culture. They find that employees under less controlling management report more autonomy and a better sense of work-life balance, and that empathetic management correlates with better performance. In

contrast, a more controlling style tends to correlate with worse outcomes. They also flag that research on the specifics of performance measurement in this context is still fairly thin and call for more work in that area.

Finally, Zimmerman, Hughes, Al-Fayed, Silva and Isaksson (2023) run a meta-analysis on how digital tools and deliberate culture-building work together to drive employee engagement. Their main finding is that organizations get the most out of their people when digital resources are tailored to the team and paired with an intentionally shaped culture, rather than left to develop on its own, and they outline several benefits of getting this combination right.

Objectives of The Study

1. To examine how hybrid work is changing traditional leadership and management practices in organisations.
2. To analyse effective methods for measuring employee performance based on outcomes rather than physical presence or working hours.
3. To examine the changing roles and responsibilities of managers in a hybrid work environment.

Methodology

This study used a descriptive, correlational research design to understand how leaders build an environment that supports outcomes-based work. Data were

collected directly from managers and team leaders through a structured, self-administered questionnaire consisting of basic demographic questions and five Likert-scale statements (from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”) capturing how respondents experience autonomy and leadership adaptation in a hybrid setting. The focus throughout was on how outcomes get measured in practice, how leadership itself is changing, and the kind of culture that values results over simply putting in hours.

Participants were middle- and senior-level managers in organizations that have already moved to hybrid or flexible arrangements, drawn from the corporate, technology, professional services, financial services, consulting, and other knowledge-based sectors. In total, 100 managers took part, selected through a mix of convenience and purposive sampling.

The data were analyzed using standard descriptive statistics -frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation to build a picture of who responded and how they answered (Tables 1 to 4). To test the study's hypotheses, responses to the five Likert-scale items in Table 4 were combined into a single “Leadership Adaptation” score and correlated, using Pearson's *r*, with a comparable measure of how far managers had shifted toward a coaching-style role (Table 5).

**Results and Data Analysis**

This section presents what the 100 respondents said about performance measurement, managerial roles, and culture under hybrid work. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated to describe the sample, and a Pearson correlation was run to test whether leadership adaptation and the shift in management roles are related.

Age Group	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Below 25	15	15
25–35	38	38
36–45	26	26
46–55	14	14
Above 55	7	7
Total	100	100

Table 1. Age Distribution of Respondents

Most respondents fall into the 25–35 age bracket (38%), with the 36–45 group not far behind at 26%. Those under 25 make up 15% of the sample, and the remaining 21% are 46 or older.

Gender	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Male	54	54
Female	46	46
Total	100	100

Table 2. Gender of Respondents

The gender split is fairly even: 54% male and 46% female.

Position	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Employee/Executive	42	42
Team Leader	22	22
Assistant Manager	16	16
Manager	12	12
Senior Manager/Above	8	8
Total	100	100

Table 3. Current Position

Nearly half the sample (42%) are at the Employee/Executive level, followed by Team Leaders (22%), Assistant Managers (16%), Managers (12%), and Senior Managers or above (8%).

Statement	Mean	SD
1. My leaders judge me by the results of my work, not the hours I spend on it.	3.85	0.88
2. I can largely make my own daily schedule as long as work gets done.	3.9	0.85
3. Traditional performance reviews don't work in a hybrid setting.	4.12	0.78
4. Digital resources are used by leadership to set team goals.	4.05	0.79
5. Leadership takes care of employees' wellness and helps avoid burnout.	3.42	1.05
Overall Mean	3.87	0.87

Table 4. Work Autonomy and Leadership Adaptation

Taken together, these responses suggest managers feel leadership has adapted to hybrid work reasonably well, though not evenly across every area. Respondents agreed most strongly with the idea that traditional performance reviews don't really fit a hybrid setting (mean 4.12), followed by leadership's use of digital tools to set goals (mean 4.05). Wellness is the weakest area: the statement about leadership looking after employee wellbeing and preventing burnout scored lowest (mean 3.42) and had the widest spread of responses (SD 1.05), suggesting this is an area organizations still need to work on.

Variables	Pearson r	p-value	Interpretation
Leadership Adaptation and Management Roles	0.68	<0.001	Positive, significant

Table 5. Pearson Correlation between Leadership Adaptation and Changing Management Roles

Table 5 shows the correlation between the combined Leadership Adaptation score and the Management Roles score. The result $r = 0.68$, $p < 0.001$ indicates a strong, statistically significant positive relationship. In plain terms, managers who report that leadership has adapted well to hybrid work also report the biggest shift toward a coaching-style role, and this pattern is unlikely to be due to chance.



Hypotheses

Given the study's objectives of understanding how traditional leadership is shifting and how managers' roles are changing along with it, the following hypotheses were tested using Pearson correlation:

H0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant relationship between leadership adaptation to hybrid work models and the evolving roles of managers.

H1 (Alternative Hypothesis): There is a significant positive relationship between leadership adaptation to hybrid work models and the evolving roles of managers.

The correlation analysis backs up H1: leadership adaptation to hybrid work and the changing managerial role are positively and significantly related ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.001$). On this basis, we reject H0. In other words, organizations that shift leadership toward an outcomes-driven approach tend to see a corresponding shift in how managers coach and build culture.

Discussion

Looking at Table 4, the strongest area of agreement was that traditional performance reviews don't suit a hybrid setup (mean 4.12), closely followed by leadership use of digital tools to set goals (mean 4.05). Alongside the strong correlation in Table 5, this points clearly to the same conclusion: organizations moving

to an outcomes-based model need to lean on technology to set and track goals, and managers need to shift from supervising to coaching.

But the picture isn't entirely positive. Wellness and burnout prevention scored the lowest of the five items (mean 3.42) and also had the most varied responses (SD 1.05), meaning some managers feel this is handled well and others clearly don't. Combined with a fairly moderate score on employees' sense of control over their own schedules (mean 3.90), this suggests that while organisations have made real progress on the technical, output-focused side of hybrid management, the human side trust, emotional connection, genuinely looking out for people hasn't kept pace. Leaders would do well to treat wellness as core to outcomes-based management, not an afterthought.

Conclusion

Based on this study, managing a hybrid workforce well comes down to two connected shifts: moving performance measurement toward outcomes, and moving managers away from supervision and toward coaching. The data support a strong, statistically significant relationship between evaluating people on results and adapting management style to a distributed workforce ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.001$). At the same time, the lower score on employee wellness reminds us that outcomes-driven leadership works best when paired with genuine

attention to how people are doing, not just what they are producing. Inclusive leadership, regular feedback, and real investment in employee wellbeing must be part of the picture for hybrid arrangements to succeed long-term.

References

- AI Journal. (2025). Fostering Holistic Outcomes: A Comprehensive Framework for Agentic Digital Organizations. *American Journal of Management Promotion*, 39(2), 350–353.
- Brooks, S., & Miller, J. (2024). Leading Without Seeing: The Transition to Trust-Based Management in Hybrid Teams. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(8), 1420–1445.
- Center for Workplace Innovation. (2021). Shifting to Outcomes-Based Management: A Correlation Study on Employee Productivity and Digital Fatigue. *CWI Reports*.
- Chen, L., & Martinez, P. (2022). Outcomes-Based Performance Measurement and Employee Autonomy as a Motivational Factor. *Journal of Modern Leadership*, 14(3), 112–128.
- Clark, D. (2023). A Review on the Impact of Hybrid Workplace Culture on Employee Output and Connection. *International Journal of Case Studies in Business, IT and Education (IJCSBE)*, 7(2), 291–317.
- ESPHR. (2024). Fostering Hybrid Workplace Alignment: Strategies for Improving Employee Engagement and Performance Measurement. *The Journal of Academic Science*, 1(5), 605–613.
- Fernandez, R. (2023). Psychological Safety and Asynchronous Managerial Trust (AMT) in Distributed Workforces. *Journal of Applied Business Psychology*, 12(1), 78–95.
- Garvin, L., Pabico, C., & Robertson, S. (2024). Outcomes Excellence™: A Holistic Approach to Elevating Performance Management in All Settings. *Management & Leadership Review*, 56(4), 12–16.
- Global Institute for Hybrid Work. (2023). The Global Hybrid Work Experiment: Assessing the Impact of Flexible Hours on Team Culture and Performance. *Global Institute Publishing*.
- Greyt HR Analytics. (2024). Fostering Remote Inclusion: The Key to Measurable Productivity and Retention. In *Development of Distributed Workforce Tracking: Global Learning Challenges in a Shifting Society* (pp. 479–504). *Scientific Publishing*.
- Harrison, T., Patel, K., O'Connor, M., et al. (2022). Managerial Practices and



- Hybrid Workforce Alignment: Shifting From Traditional Control to Coaching Culture. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(4), 101–125.
- Kapoor, A., & Singh, V. (2024). Measuring What Matters: The Shift From Presenteeism to Deliverables in the Modern Enterprise. *Business Performance Review*, 22(3), 210–228.
- Nguyen, N. H., & Gigi, G. S. (2025). Fostering Connection and Culture in Human-Centered Organizations: Managerial Roles, Output, Mindful Organizing. In *Human-Centered Workforce Management in the Age of Digital Work* (pp. 289–314). Global Scientific Publishing.
- O'Neill, T. A., & Davis, K. (2022). Proximity Bias in the Hybrid Era: Strategies for Equitable Performance Evaluation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(2), 100876.
- Peters, M., & Zhao, Y. (2023). Digital Equity and Career Growth in Outcomes-Driven Organizations. *The Future of Work Journal*, 4(1), 55–73.
- Reynolds, E. (2024). Redefining KPIs: How Managers Construct Metrics for the Remote and Hybrid Employee. *Strategic HR Review*, 23(5), 189–204.
- Synergita Labs. (2025). Navigating Workflow Harmony: The Effects of Outcomes-Driven Culture on Business Growth. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology*, 364–371.
- Thompson, C. (2025). The Deliberate Culture: Building Cohesion and Mitigating Silos in Remote Setups. *Journal of Organizational Behavior and Culture*, 11(2), 134–150.
- UCSB Human Resources. (2025). Cultivating Accountability in the Digital Workplace: The Role of Leadership Intelligence in Fostering a Positive Organizational Culture. In *Insights on Output and Delivery in the Workplace* (pp. 19–44). Global Scientific Publishing.
- Wright, D., & Lopez, S. (2023). Empathy-Driven Leadership and Its Correlation to Project Accomplishment in Flexible Environments. *Modern Management Science*, 9(4), 310–327.
- Zimmerman, A., Hughes, B., Al-Fayed, R., Silva, J., & Isaksson, M. (2023). The Influence of Digital Resources and Intentional Culture-Building on Employee Engagement: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 19(1), 45–67.