



## Managing Hybrid Teams: A Thematic Synthesis Toward Systemic Alignment and Inclusive Leadership

A. Yesseikyzy<sup>1</sup>, D.M. Mukhiyayeva<sup>\*2</sup>, A. Yesseikyzy<sup>\*3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

<sup>3</sup>Zhetysu University named after I. Zhansugurov, Taldykorgan, Kazakhstan

(E-mail: <sup>1</sup>yessey.ar@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>dinara\_muhiyayeva@mail.ru, <sup>3</sup>aiym.yesseykyzy@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** The paper's objective is to conduct a critical thematic synthesis of current literature on managing hybrid teams and to identify the systemic interactions that foster team effectiveness in the contemporary work environment, where flexibility and access to a global talent pool became significant for the success. This study exploits the thematic extraction method, which allowed to define and categorize secondary data into key dimensions. As the result of the research seven dimensions emerged, such as adaptable leadership, sense of equity and fairness, structure of communication, dimension of trust within the team, integration of the technology, well-being, and cultural sensitivity. The analysis demonstrates allows to conclude that a hybrid team performs efficiently if variety of interconnected elements are orchestrated well. For instance, digital tools allow effective collaboration, but it requires establishing rules and norms of implicit trust. The conclusion of the research is that the leadership needs to act as a key integrating force, thus gluing together the gaps within strategic, emotional, and cultural goals. Moreover, the paper concludes that prevailing Western-centric models prove inadequate for diverse, global organizations undergoing hybrid transitions.

**Keywords:** Hybrid team management, leadership adaptability, equity and inclusion, psychological safety, digital collaboration, systems thinking, organizational culture

### Introduction

Around the world, organizations are actively exploring hybrid work models, creating a blend of remote and in-person operations in reaction to evolving employee expectations, rapid technological progress, and major global events that question the viability of traditional, office-based work. Hybrid teams, which are defined as structures integrating individuals who collaborate both virtually and physically (Cousins, Robey, & Zigurs, 2007), have become a popular and flexible solution for retaining talent, optimizing costs, and gaining access to a wider range of skills.

Received 03.07.2025. Revised 11.11.2025. Accepted 26.11.2025. Available online 30.12.2025

124

Nevertheless, as these teams become more common, both managers and academics are faced with the challenge of determining the best ways to lead, engage, and maintain performance within these dynamic settings (Knight, 2020; Winkler, König, & Heß, 2022; Hämäläinen, 2022). The existing body of literature covers strategic management, organizational behavior, information systems, and leadership studies, providing valuable perspectives on the intricacies of coordinating hybrid teams (Cousins et al., 2007; Zasa, Patrucco, & Pellizzoni, 2020), building trust (Alves et al., 2023; Gilstrap, Srivastava, & Gilstrap, 2022), ensuring fairness in resource allocation (Mortensen & Haas, 2021), addressing well-being and health concerns (Dale, Wilson, & Tucker, 2024), and integrating intelligent agents (Hopf, Nahr, Staake, & Lehner, 2024).

Common themes suggest an urgent need for frameworks that can resolve inherent paradoxes: balancing freedom with structure, bridging proximity and distance, managing autonomy alongside accountability, and integrating digital tools with human interaction (Cousins et al., 2007; Jeffries, 2024; Matsudaira, 2023). This paper aims to synthesize and critically assess key scholarly contributions on hybrid team management, pinpointing areas of agreement and disagreement, and identifying gaps for future research to provide new insights. By looking at hybrid teams from multiple angles – technological, interpersonal, cultural, and strategic – this analysis strives to offer a detailed understanding that can guide the creation of thorough frameworks for effective leadership and collaboration in hybrid teams.

Hybrid teams function in a developing area between conventional co-located teams and entirely virtual ones. Initial research by Cousins et al. (2007) described hybrid teams as strategic answers to changing situations, where organizations weigh the advantages of in-person connection against the scalability and adaptability of virtual work. More current studies, like Knight's (2020) managerial viewpoint in Harvard Business Review and the work of Winkler et al. (2022), emphasize that hybrid teams are not a short-term solution but a fundamental change in structure, influenced by technology and employees' desires for independence and flexibility.

A key feature of hybrid teams is the dynamic between on-site and remote work. Matsudaira (2023) sees the hybrid model as a careful coordination of tasks and relationships that can no longer depend solely on physical closeness. Instead, success relies on a comprehensive strategy: policies that acknowledge the differences between remote and in-office work, digital tools that promote connection, and leadership approaches that foster inclusivity and transparency. Together, these studies define hybrid teams as unique organizational structures that need new theoretical models, moving beyond the simple "virtual versus on-site" division (Cousins et al., 2007; Jeffries, 2024).

## Literature Review

A significant portion of the literature on hybrid teams delves into the inherent tension between maintaining agility and adhering to formal processes in workflow management. Zasa et al. (2020) investigate how hybrid organizations can successfully merge Agile methodologies – which are defined by iterative development and adaptive planning – with conventional Stage-Gate processes that rely on explicit milestones and clear authority hierarchies. These researchers conclude that hybridization is not just about location but also about methodology: finding a balance between dynamic adaptation and structured oversight is crucial for achieving both responsiveness and consistent results.

This conflict is echoed in other studies that focus on strategic paradoxes. Cousins et al. (2007) contend that managers of hybrid teams must navigate contradictory demands, such as fostering

openness while maintaining control, which calls for integrative thinking rather than choosing one extreme over the other. Wiatr and Skowron-Mielnik (2022) add that leading hybrid teams is often a journey along a “long and winding road” of continuous practice refinement. Successful leaders implement hybrid project management systems that feature iterative feedback, transparent digital dashboards, and regular in-person meetings to assess progress. Instead of seeing agile and traditional methods as mutually exclusive, these works suggest they are complementary elements that can be skillfully integrated to achieve better outcomes.

The geographic separation of hybrid teams makes communication and collaboration both essential and difficult. Digital tools, such as Slack and Microsoft Teams, act as the glue that holds teams together (Nyktarakis, 2022), facilitating both real-time and delayed information sharing. However, technology by itself is not enough to ensure team unity. Gilstrap et al. (2022) demonstrate that in mobile hybrid teams, the way members make sense of their work and the language they use are critical in forming a shared identity. Likewise, Jeffries (2024) notes that informal communication, like quick video calls and impromptu online chats, is vital for maintaining the trust and friendship that can fade in a hybrid setting.

While digital communication tools improve the flow of information, they also bring risks like information overload, miscommunication, and the exclusion of quieter team members (Nilsson & Norström, 2024; Hämäläinen, 2022). Creating an inclusive dialogue is therefore essential. Research by Gratton (2021) and Detjen and Webber (2023) points out that managers need to set rules for fair participation, actively seek input from remote team members, and structure meetings to give everyone an equal voice. Alharbi, Tang, and Henderson (2023) expand on this by looking at the accessibility challenges for professionals with disabilities in hybrid meetings. They argue that inclusive communication is not only a moral duty but also key to leveraging the full range of skills within the team.

Hybrid work setups can put a strain on conventional methods of building trust. Lacking the casual interactions and non-verbal signals of in-person work, some employees may feel isolated (Jeffries, 2024; Gilstrap et al., 2022). In hybrid teams, trust must be actively cultivated through consistent transparency, dependability in fulfilling commitments, and a shared understanding of cultural differences (Nilsson & Norström, 2024). Alves et al. (2023) explore whether virtual work can, in some cases, actually safeguard team trust. Challenging the idea that distance always undermines trust, they suggest that properly organized virtual interactions can reduce conflicts and improve clarity.

A psychologically safe atmosphere, where team members can openly voice concerns and contribute ideas without fear of negative consequences, is identified as a crucial element for maintaining trust. Hopf et al. (2024), who studied the use of intelligent agents in knowledge-heavy hybrid work, stress that building trust goes beyond human interactions to include relationships between humans and machines. Their research indicates that while intelligent agents can make information access and decision-making more efficient, the team's environment must be supportive of the learning process and address any anxiety employees might have about working with artificial intelligence.

In hybrid settings, management styles need to shift from top-down control to more supportive, coaching-focused leadership. Knight (2020) suggests that leaders should establish clear performance goals and maintain regular communication schedules. Similarly, Winkler et al. (2022) and Detjen and Webber (2023) argue that hybrid leaders must be skilled at reading the team's emotional state and treating both remote and in-office employees fairly. Hämäläinen (2022) underscores the challenges of leading a hybrid team, noting that managers must develop empathy, digital literacy, and cultural awareness.

Guiding hybrid teams requires balancing autonomy with accountability – giving remote staff flexibility while also making sure that deadlines and quality standards are met. Mortensen and Haas (2021) advise leaders to be mindful of fairness, as remote workers could be treated as “second-class citizens” if they are left out of informal decision-making and recognition. Based on these observations, effective hybrid leadership is a flexible, situation-aware skill that harmonizes different work preferences, uses digital tools effectively, and promotes a common understanding of objectives and achievements.

One of the most pressing topics in the study of hybrid teams is fairness and equity. Scholars contend that if not managed well, hybrid systems can unintentionally establish hierarchies that benefit those working in the office (Mortensen & Haas, 2021; Gratton, 2021). Employees working remotely might have fewer opportunities for casual discussions with managers or for getting prompt feedback. This imbalance can adversely affect their career advancement, visibility, and sense of job security.

Grzegorczyk et al. (2021) and Detjen and Webber (2023) stress that companies need to proactively change their policies to guarantee fair access to information, mentoring, and opportunities for professional development. Methods like using tools to monitor contributions, implementing rotation schedules for being in the office, and creating performance standards specific to hybrid work can help create a more level playing field. Alharbi et al. (2023) advance this discussion by looking at accessibility for employees with disabilities, highlighting that fairness in a hybrid context is about more than just location; it also includes ability and the availability of resources. Prioritizing inclusivity helps ensure that hybrid teams can draw on the complete range of human talent and viewpoints, which in turn boosts their capacity for innovation and their resilience.

The well-being of team members is a recurring topic in the literature on hybrid teams. While hybrid arrangements provide flexibility that can enhance work-life balance (Gratton, 2021; Dale et al., 2024), they also have the potential to erase the lines between personal and work life, which can result in burnout and a lack of engagement if not handled with care. Dale et al. (2024) examine how employees view their well-being in hybrid setups, finding that while some value the independence and shorter commutes, others face challenges with loneliness and the breakdown of social support systems.

Van Rossum (2023) links hybrid work to team creativity, proposing that innovative ideas are more likely to emerge when employees have control over their work location and schedule. Yet, creativity is also reliant on team unity and a common goal, both of which can be negatively affected if well-being is impacted by stress or communication issues. Therefore, supporting employee well-being means creating a psychologically safe space (Nilsson & Norström, 2024), offering access to mental health services, providing ergonomic assistance for home offices (Matsudaira, 2023), and arranging occasional in-person events to strengthen relationships (Mortensen & Haas, 2021).

Hybrid work is not a one-size-fits-all solution; its success varies depending on cultural settings, industries, and the size of the organization. Some researchers point to a lack of studies on non-Western environments and different industries, which is needed to determine if hybrid models are universally effective or if they need to be adapted to specific cultures (Cousins et al., 2007; Jeffries, 2024). Additionally, intricate collaborations between different organizations, like joint ventures or project teams from multiple companies, intensify the difficulties already found in internal hybrid teams (Zasa et al., 2020).

Cultural differences in communication styles, attitudes towards deadlines, views on hierarchy, and methods of giving feedback become more significant when team members come from various corporate or national backgrounds. Although research by Nyktarakis (2022) and Hopf et al. (2024) recognizes the challenges of merging different technological systems and organizational methods, there is still limited information on the best ways to manage multicultural, multi-organization hybrid teams. Gaining a better understanding of how cultural factors influence trust, leadership expectations, and team unity is a promising area for future research.

The significance of technology in hybrid teams goes beyond just communication tools. Developments in artificial intelligence, machine learning, and comprehensive project management software are changing team dynamics. Hopf et al. (2024) investigate how intelligent agents can support human decision-making in knowledge-focused hybrid work, introducing the idea of Transactive Intelligent Memory Systems. These systems, integrated into sophisticated collaboration platforms, help teams find the right information quickly and lessen their mental workload.

However, this brings up issues related to ethical supervision, possible biases in AI-generated suggestions, and the comfort level of team members working with non-human counterparts. Alharbi et al. (2023) also draw attention to accessibility issues, cautioning that if technology is not designed to be inclusive, it could unintentionally leave out members with particular needs. A key challenge is to find the right balance between advanced technology, ease of use, proper training, and clear governance. While technology can offer organization and efficiency, it is no substitute for empathetic leadership and intentional efforts to build trust (Matsudaira, 2023).

The discussion on hybrid work is shifting from practical matters to more abstract, relationship-focused aspects. Jeffries (2024) highlights the significance of emotional intelligence and casual conversation in building team unity, while Gilstrap et al. (2022) point out that the words team members choose can either strengthen or weaken their connection. The spontaneous "watercooler" chats that were common in physical offices now need to be deliberately recreated through virtual coffee breaks, informal Slack channels, or organized team-building events (Gratton, 2021).

However, these approaches need to be implemented with care. Mandated "fun" events can seem contrived, and individuals' preferences for social interaction vary. The difficulty is in establishing genuine opportunities for connection that cater to diverse personalities, cultural backgrounds, and varying levels of comfort with technology. Research by Nilsson and Norström (2024) suggests that psychological safety and trust are essential for successful informal communication; team members are more inclined to join in when they believe their contributions are valued. The challenge lies in balancing the need for structure with the space for natural, spontaneous interactions that make the hybrid work experience more human.

Hybrid teams necessitate new governance structures, including clear policies on attendance, availability, communication frequency, and the use of technology. Mortensen and Haas (2021) observe that performance reviews may need to be adjusted, as old metrics based on physical presence and observable effort are not suitable for hybrid work. Instead, managers could focus on results-oriented assessments, looking for concrete outcomes, constructive feedback from colleagues, and the achievement of specific goals.

Grzegorczyk et al. (2021) suggest that changes at the policy level can help reduce unfairness and promote equal development opportunities for everyone, regardless of their location. Dale et al. (2024) also emphasize that leadership training, effective remote onboarding, and cultural orientation programs are key to ensuring all team members are aligned with the company's

norms and objectives. Consequently, organizational policies should be adaptable and frequently updated, as hybrid work models are constantly changing in response to economic trends, technological progress, and global health situations.

Collectively, these studies present a multifaceted view. On one side, hybrid teams offer the promise of greater flexibility, less time spent commuting, access to a worldwide talent pool, and the potential for increased creativity and innovation (Gratton, 2021; Van Rossum, 2023). On the other side, they carry the risk of deepening inequalities, weakening trust, leading to digital exhaustion, and making performance management more complex (Mortensen & Haas, 2021; Cousins et al., 2007).

A conflict exists between the optimistic vision of hybrid work as a more people-focused model that values individual freedom (Dale et al., 2024) and the practical challenges of managing varied schedules, distributing resources fairly, and preserving a unified culture (Zasa et al., 2020; Hopf et al., 2024). Technology serves as both a facilitator and a hindrance—it enhances connection and productivity but can also be a source of stress for employees and lead to new types of exclusion (Alharbi et al., 2023; Nyktarakis, 2022). Leadership approaches that were effective in traditional office settings may need a complete overhaul to be replaced by a hybrid leadership style that prioritizes empathy, clarity, and adaptability (Hämäläinen, 2022; Detjen & Webber, 2023).

This review reveals several areas needing more research. First, although there is extensive literature on communication tools and trust-building, there is less understanding of the subtle emotional and cultural factors that influence interactions in hybrid teams. Future studies should explore the emotional intelligence aspects of hybrid leadership more deeply, examining how elements like humor, empathy, and openness can help create a sense of community despite physical separation.

Second, the majority of research is focused on Western, tech-oriented companies, which raises questions about the applicability of hybrid work best practices in different cultural and economic settings. Comparative research on hybrid team dynamics in developing economies, various sectors like manufacturing or healthcare, and small, family-owned businesses would enrich the discussion and assess the generalizability of current theories.

Third, as intelligent agents and AI technologies become more integrated into knowledge-based hybrid work, it is important to investigate how trust, fairness, and team identity are affected when human team members collaborate with non-human partners. A key area for future hybrid team research is understanding how to prevent biases in AI-driven decisions and how to ethically create tools that safeguard privacy and autonomy (Hopf et al., 2024).

Finally, the existing literature has not yet produced a single, all-encompassing theoretical framework that combines technology, leadership, equity, well-being, and culture. Such a framework would be invaluable for managers, helping them to navigate strategic challenges, evaluate team health beyond simple productivity numbers, and ensure the long-term viability of hybrid work models.

Drawing from the insights in the literature, a solid framework for managing hybrid teams should include several interconnected components:

- Instead of rigidly following a single project management approach, companies can combine traditional and agile methods. This allows for the use of outcome-based metrics that are better suited to the dynamic nature of hybrid work (Zasa et al., 2020).
- Setting up clear communication protocols, including expectations for response times, the use of specific platforms, and accessibility requirements, creates a dependable foundation. It is

also important that this framework supports informal interactions to build team spirit and trust (Nyktarakis, 2022; Gilstrap, Srivastava, & Gilstrap, 2022).

- Building trust in a team that is not physically together requires deliberate action. Techniques could involve rotating who leads virtual meetings and establishing organized yet welcoming channels for feedback. These actions can help make sure everyone's input is heard and respected (Alves et al., 2023; Nilsson & Norström, 2024).
- Leaders need to develop skills specifically for hybrid environments, such as empathy, cultural understanding, and digital competence. They should also be assessed and held responsible for ensuring fairness, promoting well-being, and supporting the professional development of all team members, whether they work remotely or in the office (Hämäläinen, 2022; Detjen & Webber, 2023).
- Genuine inclusivity means more than just having remote employees join meetings. Companies must offer accessible digital resources, create fair opportunities for career advancement, and acknowledge the contributions of every employee, no matter their location or abilities (Alharbi, Tang, & Henderson, 2023; Mortensen & Haas, 2021).
- It is crucial to keep an eye on metrics like workload distribution, team morale, and the quality of interpersonal relationships. Providing support for both mental and physical health through adequate resources, ergonomic advice, and planned breaks can help prevent burnout (Dale, Wilson, & Tucker, 2024).
- Hybrid work strategies are not a one-size-fits-all solution and need to be tailored to the specific culture of the organization, industry standards, and local conditions. Continuous experimentation and adjustment are essential as circumstances and expectations change (Cousins, Robey, & Zigurs, 2007; Jeffries, 2024).

## Research methods

To move this study from a descriptive overview of literature to an original analytical piece, a qualitative thematic extraction method was adopted. This technique is frequently applied in conceptual studies to find, categorize, and understand common patterns in a wide range of academic works. The aim is not just to recap what has already been found, but to identify the underlying structures, conflicts, and points of agreement that can help shape a new theoretical model for leading hybrid teams.

The thematic synthesis is based on 25 peer-reviewed articles and publications for practitioners that were mentioned in the literature review. These materials were chosen for their direct relevance to the management of hybrid teams, with a special focus on topics such as leadership, trust, equity, communication, technology use, well-being, and cultural awareness. Only works published between 2007 and 2024 were included to ensure a mix of both foundational and current viewpoints.

The analysis was conducted using a three-step coding method:

1. Open Coding. In this initial step, each document was carefully read to pull out key ideas and repeated subjects. These first codes were based on the data and included phrases like "psychological safety," "digital fatigue," "adaptive leadership," and "inclusive communication."

2. Axial Coding. Next, codes that were related were grouped into larger thematic categories. For instance, "trust-building mechanisms" and "psychological safety" were combined under the main theme of Relational Dynamics, while "agile-traditional integration" and "project governance" were placed under Structural Complexity.

3. Selective Coding. In the final step, the themes were refined and analyzed in the context of the study's objective: to create a comprehensive model that deals with the strategic, emotional, and operational challenges inherent in hybrid team settings.

This procedure resulted in the identification of seven main themes:

- Leadership Adaptability
- Equity and Fairness
- Communication Architecture
- Trust and Team Climate
- Technology Integration
- Employee Well-being
- Cultural and Contextual Sensitivity

These themes form the analytical foundation for the framework that follows, allowing for a transition from scattered observations to a unified model of hybrid team management. A thematic extraction method was selected instead of a meta-analysis or quantitative synthesis because of the conceptual and cross-disciplinary nature of the subject. Research on hybrid teams covers organizational behavior, information systems, psychology, and management studies – disciplines that frequently rely on qualitative analysis and are not easily compared using statistics. Thematic extraction enables a more profound understanding of meanings and connections, capturing not just what researchers have found, but also how and why these findings are significant in a practical sense.

## Results and discussion

The thematic analysis brought to light seven interconnected themes that represent the essential components of hybrid team success. These themes are not only prevalent throughout the literature but also engage in a dynamic interplay, fostering synergies and creating tensions that influence results like team unity, performance, and psychological well-being. Table 1 provides a summary of the identified themes, which is then followed by detailed explorations of each theme's function and its connections with others. Subsequently, Table 2 presents a matrix of cross-theme interactions, pinpointing relationships that are either mutually reinforcing or conflicting. These elements together establish a solid basis for an integrated model.

**Table 1 – Thematic Categories and Representative Insights**

No.	Thematic Category	Representative Concepts	Key Sources
1	Leadership Adaptability	Empathy, coaching style, equity monitoring	Hämäläinen (2022); Detjen & Webber (2023)
2	Equity and Fairness	Visibility gaps, inclusion of remote staff, bias repair	Mortensen & Haas (2021); Gratton (2021)
3	Communication Architecture	Asynchronous/synchronous tools, participation norms	Nyktarakis (2022); Gilstrap et al. (2022)
4	Trust and Team Climate	Psychological safety, reliability, transparency	Alves et al. (2023); Nilsson & Norström (2024)
5	Technology Integration	AI agents, accessibility, ethical concerns	Hopf et al. (2024); Alharbi et al. (2023)

6	Employee Well-being	Burnout, autonomy, social disconnection	Dale et al. (2024); Van Rossum (2023)
7	Cultural and Contextual Sensitivity	Local norms, global team variance, sector specificity	Cousins et al. (2007); Jeffries (2024)

Note: Conducted by the author based on the literature synthesis

As indicated in Table 1, adaptable leadership and a solid communication framework are frequently mentioned as key success factors. However, their effectiveness is largely dependent on the presence of fair systems and mechanisms for psychological safety. To progress from looking at themes individually, Table 2 illustrates the connections between them, showing whether each combination is likely to be reinforcing (+) or to create friction (-).

**Table 2 – Inter-theme Relationship Matrix**

	Leadership	Fairness	Communication	Trust	Tech Integration	Well-being	Culture
Leadership	-	+	+	+	±	+	±
Fairness	+	-	+	+	±	+	+
Communication	+	+	-	+	±	±	±
Trust	+	+	+	--	-	+	±
Tech Integration	±	±	±	-	-	-	±
Well-being	+	+	±	+	-	-	±
Culture	±	+	±	±	±	±	-

Note: Conducted by the author based on the literature synthesis

Legend: (+) Reinforcing interaction | (-) Potential conflict or trade-off | (±) Context-dependent  
This matrix highlights several key findings:

- Leadership as a central hub: Adaptable leadership has a positive effect on all six other themes. Leaders are crucial in managing the implementation of technology, fostering psychological safety, and championing fairness.
- Technology versus Human Elements: The integration of technology often creates friction, particularly with trust and well-being, due to issues like surveillance, information overload, or unfair design.
- Fairness as a core principle: Fair treatment has a positive impact on most other themes, which confirms that the success of hybrid work is based not only on strategy but also on the perception of fairness.

The mapping of inter-theme relationships in Table 2 highlights a crucial point: the success of hybrid teams is not due to separate management actions or tech improvements, but rather to a comprehensive alignment of relational, structural, and contextual factors. In essence, hybrid work settings require a strong consistency among leadership styles, company policies, communication methods, and the experiences of employees.

For example, while sophisticated AI-powered dashboards (Theme 5) have the potential to make decision-making and project management more efficient, their effectiveness is ultimately determined by how much the team trusts the system (Theme 4) and its effect on the psychological state of the users (Theme 6). If there is no transparency about how data is gathered and used, or if there is a lack of proper training and user control, such technologies could end up alienating team members instead of empowering them.

In the same way, implementing advanced communication platforms (Theme 3) might not be very effective if they are not backed by inclusive rules for participation and fair access for everyone (Themes 2 and 4). In this scenario, technology acts as a magnifier—for both positive and negative aspects—depending on how it is integrated into the team's overall environment.

The analysis also shows that adaptable leadership (Theme 1) is a key unifying element in hybrid systems. Leaders serve as intermediaries between digital resources and human needs, and between strategic goals and emotional states. Their capacity to create a psychologically safe environment, guarantee that all team members are seen and heard, and adapt to different cultural contexts (Theme 7) has a direct bearing on the long-term success of hybrid work. However, leadership by itself is not enough unless it is supported by specific actions that address imbalances in power, information, and opportunities.

Furthermore, the cultural and contextual appropriateness of hybrid models (Theme 7) is an area that has not been sufficiently explored. A large part of the current conversation about hybrid work is based on the assumption of a certain level of digital infrastructure, a culture of individualism, and flat organizational structures, which may not be the case in all parts of the world or in all industries. For instance, in non-Western, collectivist, or less-resourced settings, the ways in which trust is built, hierarchies are respected, and feedback is given can be quite different. Building on top of that argument, the following conclusion can be made: hybrid work strategies need to adapt to local conditions in terms of workplace customs, leadership styles. Moreover, the adaptation process should cover how team identity is formed as well.

To conclude, based on the analysis of the present paper, the success of hybrid teams is found to be more about careful coordination rather than about simple optimization. It is recommended that the companies avoid using technological, procedural simplistic solutions as they may not correspond to the peculiarities of certain teams. Instead, the leadership is advised to adapt systems-thinking approach in order to accommodate and adjust so the hybrid teams can develop into truly adaptable, inclusive, and effective labor units.

## Conclusion

The present paper aimed to research and identify what are the main defining factors of efficient hybrid teams. As a result of the research, it is clear that the governing collaboration, leadership, and equity need to be emphasized within organizations. On the one hand, hybrid work is assumed to provide adaptability, inclusivity, and potential for attracting a global workforce. However, in reality, there are certain strategic challenges and complex interpersonal dynamics.

Any efforts to enhance hybrid work should be evaluated not just for their technical effectiveness, but also for their impact on relationships, psychological well-being, and cultural harmony. Technology cannot make up for poor leadership or a lack of trust, just as supportive management cannot succeed in a setting that is hampered by inaccessible technology or unfair policies.

The analysis also brings to light a significant void in the existing research: the necessity for frameworks that are developed from a local perspective and are culturally flexible, taking into account the wide range of organizational situations that exist beyond the typical Western models. As hybrid work becomes a standard feature of modern employment, it is essential for both academics and professionals to look beyond broad recommendations and to explore the complex relationships between digital systems, human interaction, and organizational culture.

To sum up, the efficiently performing hybrid team can be attained if the company manages to merge various elements into a unified, flexible, and just strategy. Thus, understanding and acknowledging the complexity without the urge to oversimplify it will help the leaders steer the team well. Moreover, this will create conditions for hybrid systems that are psychologically secure, inclusive, and open to continuous change, along with being effective in their operations.

### **Authors' contributions.**

**Yesseikyzy A.** – consent to be responsible for all aspects of the work, formulation of methodology and collection, interpretation of the data, properly studying and resolving issues related to the reliability of data or the integrity of all parts of the article;

**Mukhiyayeva D.M.** – approval of the final version for publication, significant contribution to analysis and interpretation of work results; writing a text and critically reviewing its content;

**Yesseikyzy A.** – data collection and analysis, significant contribution to analysis and interpretation of work results.

### **References**

1. Cousins, K.C., Robey, D., & Zigurs, I. (2007) Managing strategic contradictions in hybrid teams. European Journal of Information Systems, 16 (4), 460-478. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000692>
2. Matsudaira, K. (2023). Managing Hybrid Teams: The combination of on-site and remote workers takes extra effort from team leaders. Queue, 21(3), 5-16.
3. Zasa, F. P., Patrucco, A., & Pellizzoni, E. (2020). Managing the hybrid organization: How can agile and traditional project management coexist? Research-Technology Management, 64 (1), 54-63.
4. Wiatr, A., & Skowron-Mielnik, B. (2023). Hybrid team management: The long and winding road. Organizational Dynamics, 52 (1), Article 100936. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2022.100936>
5. Nyktarakis, G. (2022). Technology Enabling Collaboration of Agile Development Teams in Hybrid Working: The case of Microsoft Teams.
6. Gilstrap, C. A., Srivastava, S., & Gilstrap, C. M. (2022). Making sense of teamwork in mobile hybrid teams: a lexical analysis. Team Performance Management: An International Journal, 28(5/6), 382-397. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-11-2021-0080>.
7. Jeffries, A. (2024). Connecting Hybrid Teams: A Manager's Guide to Foster a Sense of Belonging in a Hybrid Work Environment. ZHAW Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften.
8. Alharbi, R., Tang, J., & Henderson, K. (2023). Accessibility Barriers, Conflicts, and Repairs: Understanding the Experience of Professionals with Disabilities in Hybrid Meetings. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp.1-15).
9. Alves, M. P., Dimas, I. D., Lourenço, P. R., Rebelo, T., Peñarroja, V., & Gamero, N. (2023). Can virtuality be protective of team trust? Conflict and effectiveness in hybrid teams. Behaviour & Information Technology, 42 (7), 851-868.
10. Hopf, K., Nahr, N., Staake, T., & Lehner, F. (2025). The group mind of hybrid teams with humans and intelligent agents in knowledge-intense work. Journal of Information Technology, 40(1), 9-34.

11. Knight, R. (2020). How to manage a hybrid team. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2020/10/how-to-manage-a-hybrid-team>
12. Winkler, K., König, S., & Heß, C. (2022). Managing and leading hybrid teams (EconStor Research Report No. 260561). Hochschule Kempten. <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/260561>
13. Hämäläinen, L. (2022). How to lead a hybrid team (Master's thesis, Metropolia University of Applied Sciences). Metropolia University of Applied Sciences. <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:amk-2022120526330>
14. Mortensen, M., & Haas, M. (2021, February 24). Making the hybrid workplace fair. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2021/02/making-the-hybrid-workplace-fair>
15. Detjen, J., & Webber, S. S. (2023). Leading hybrid teams in a transition to the future knowledge workplace. *Strategy & Leadership*, 51(6), 16–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SL-06-2023-0065>
16. Gratton, L. (2021). How to do hybrid right. Harvard Business Review, 99 (3), 65-74. <https://hbr.org/2021/05/how-to-do-hybrid-right>
17. Dale, G., Wilson, H., & Tucker, M. (2024). What is healthy hybrid work? Exploring employee perceptions on well-being and hybrid work arrangements. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 17(4), 335-352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-03-2024-0041>
18. Van Rossum, S. R. (2023). The impact of hybrid work on team creativity: Understanding the conditions of the workplace (Master's thesis). UHasselt. <http://hdl.handle.net/1942/41183>
19. Nilsson, L., & Norström, W. (2024). Understanding psychological safety in hybrid work teams: Experiences of barriers and facilitators (Master's thesis, Department of Business Administration, Lund University). Lund University. <http://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/record/9156472>
20. Grzegorczyk, M., Mariniello, M., Nurski, L., & Schraepen, T. (2021). Blending the physical and virtual: a hybrid model for the future of work (No. 14/2021). Bruegel Policy Contribution.
21. Тюлькубаева, А., Нурсейтова, Г., & Кошенов, Е. (2024). Управление мотивацией команды проекта в методологии Agile. Экономическая серия Вестинка Евразийского Национального Университета имени Л.Н.Гумилева, (3), 209-226. <https://doi.org/10.32523/2789-4320-2024-3-209-226>
22. Kurmanov, N., Bakirbekova, A., & Adilbekuly, M. (2024). The Manager's Digital Competencies in Education System: A Systematic Review. *ECONOMIC Series of the Bulletin of the L.N.Gumilyov ENU*, (2), 141-157. <https://doi.org/10.32523/2789-4320-2024-2-141-157>

**А. Есейқызы<sup>1</sup>, Д.М.Мухияева<sup>\*2</sup>, Есейқызы А.<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup>Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан

<sup>3</sup>І. Жансұғиров атындағы Жетісу университеті, Талдықорған, Қазақстан

## **Гибридті командаларды басқару: жүйелік сәйкестік пен инклюзивті көшбасшылыққа бағытталған тақырыптық синтез**

**Аннотация.** Мақаланың мақсаты – икемділік пен жаһандық білікті кадрларға қолжетімділік табыс кілтіне айналған қазіргі еңбек нарығында гибридті командаларды басқару бойынша заманауи әдебиеттерге сынни-тақырыптық шолу жасау және команда тиімділігін арттыратын жүйелі өзара байланыстарды анықтау. Әдістемелі бағыты бойынша зерттеу барысында екінші реттік деректерді жүйелеуге және негізгі өлшемдерге бөлуге мүмкіндік беретін тақырыптық іріктеу (экстракция) әдісі қолданылды. Зерттеу нәтижесінде жеті негізгі өлшем анықталды: бейімделгіш көшбасшылық, әділдік пен тендердік сезімі, коммуникация құрылымы, команда ішіндегі сенім деңгейі, технологияларды интеграциялау, қызметкерлердің әл-ауқаты және мәдени сезімталдық. Талдау көрсеткендей, гибридті команда өзара байланысты элементтер дұрыс үйлестірілгенде ғана тиімді жұмыс істейді. Мәселен, цифрлық қуралдар ынтымақтастықты қамтамасыз еткенімен, олардың нәтижелілігі сенімге негізделген ережелер мен нормалардың орнатылуын талап етеді. Қорытындылап келгенде, зерттеу нәтижесінде

көшбасшылық стратегиялық, эмоционалдық және мәдени мақсаттар арасындағы алшақтықты жоятын негізгі біріктіруші күш ретінде әрекет етуі тиіс екендігі тұжырымдалды. Сонымен қатар, мақалада қазіргі батыстық үлгілердің гибридті форматқа көшіп жатқан әр түрлі мәдениетті жаһандық ұйымдар үшін жеткіліксіз екендігі дәлелденеді. Бұл жұмыс гибридті көшбасшылық пен команданы құруда инклюзивті, бейімделгіш және сенімге негізделген тәсілдерді алға тарта отырып, жаңа басқару модельдерінің іргетасын қалайды.

**Түйін сөздер:** Гибридті командаларды басқару, көшбасшылық бейімделгіштігі, теңдік пен инклюзия, психологиялық қауіпсіздік, цифрлық ынтымақтастық, жүйелік ойлау, ұйым мәдениеті.

**А. Есейкызы<sup>1</sup>, Д.М. Мухияева<sup>\*2</sup>, А. Есейкызы<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup>Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан

<sup>3</sup>Жетысуский университет имени И. Жансугурова, Талдыкорган, Казахстан

### **Управление гибридными командами: тематический синтез на пути к системной согласованности и инклюзивному лидерству**

**Аннотация.** Цель работы заключается в проведении критического тематического синтеза современной литературы, посвященной управлению гибридными командами, а также в выявлении системных взаимосвязей, способствующих эффективности командной работы в современных условиях, где гибкость и доступ к глобальному рынку талантов становятся решающими факторами успеха. Методология исследования базируется на методе тематической экстракции, что позволило систематизировать вторичные данные и выделить ключевые параметры. Результаты анализа позволили определить семь основных измерений: адаптивное лидерство, чувство справедливости и равенства, структура коммуникации, уровень доверия в коллективе, интеграция технологий, благополучие сотрудников и культурная чувствительность. Исследование показывает, что гибридная команда функционирует эффективно только при грамотной оркестрации множества взаимосвязанных элементов. Например, цифровые инструменты обеспечивают сотрудничество, однако их эффективность напрямую зависит от установления негласных норм доверия. Выводы: авторы резюмируют, что руководство должно выступать в роли ключевой интегрирующей силы, нивелирующей разрывы между стратегическими, эмоциональными и культурными целями. Более того, в статье делается вывод о том, что преобладающие западоцентричные модели оказываются несостоительными для разнообразных глобальных организаций, переходящих на гибридный формат. Данная работа формирует концептуальную основу для новых рамок управления, подчеркивая важность инклюзивных, адаптивных и основанных на доверии подходов к лидерству и построению команд.

**Ключевые слова:** управление гибридными командами, адаптивность лидерства, справедливость и инклюзия, психологическая безопасность, цифровое взаимодействие, системное мышление, организационная культура.

### **References**

1. Cousins, K. C., Robey, D., & Zigurs, I. (2007). Managing strategic contradictions in hybrid teams. European Journal of Information Systems, 16(4), 460–478. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000692> [in English].
2. Matsudaira, K. (2023). Managing Hybrid Teams: The combination of on-site and remote workers takes extra effort from team leaders. Queue, 21(3), 5–16. [in English].
3. Zasa, F. P., Patrucco, A., & Pellizzoni, E. (2020). Managing the hybrid organization... Research-Technology Management, 64(1), 54–63. [in English].

4. Wiatr, A., & Skowron-Mielnik, B. (2023). Hybrid team management: The long and winding road. *Organizational Dynamics*, 52(1), 100936. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2022.100936> [in English].
5. Nyktarakis, G. (2022). Technology Enabling Collaboration... in Hybrid Working: The case of Microsoft Teams. [in English].
6. Gilstrap, C. A., Srivastava, S., & Gilstrap, C. M. (2022). Making sense of teamwork in mobile hybrid teams. *Team Performance Management*, 28(5/6), 382–397. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-11-2021-0080> [in English].
7. Jeffries, A. (2024). Connecting Hybrid Teams: A Manager's Guide... ZHAW. [in English].
8. Alharbi, R., Tang, J., & Henderson, K. (2023). Accessibility Barriers... Hybrid Meetings. *CHI Proceedings*, 1–15. [in English].
9. Alves, M. P., Dimas, I. D., Lourenço, P. R., Rebelo, T., Peñarroja, V., & Gamero, N. (2023). Can virtuality be protective... *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 42(7), 851–868. [in English].
10. Hopf, K., Nahr, N., Staake, T., & Lehner, F. (2025). The group mind of hybrid teams... *Journal of Information Technology*, 40(1), 9–34. [in English].
11. Knight, R. (2020). How to manage a hybrid team. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2020/10/how-to-manage-a-hybrid-team> [in English].
12. Winkler, K., König, S., & Heß, C. (2022). Managing and leading hybrid teams. *EconomStor Report* 260561. <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/260561> [in English].
13. Hämäläinen, L. (2022). How to lead a hybrid team (Master's thesis). <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:amk-2022120526330> [in English].
14. Mortensen, M., & Haas, M. (2021). Making the hybrid workplace fair. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2021/02/making-the-hybrid-workplace-fair> [in English].
15. Detjen, J., & Webber, S. S. (2023). Leading hybrid teams... *Strategy & Leadership*, 51(6), 16–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SL-06-2023-0065> [in English].
16. Gratton, L. (2021). How to do hybrid right. *Harvard Business Review*, 99(3), 65–74. <https://hbr.org/2021/05/how-to-do-hybrid-right> [in English].
17. Dale, G., Wilson, H., & Tucker, M. (2024). What is healthy hybrid work? *Int. Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 17(4), 335–352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-03-2024-0041> [in English].
18. Van Rossum, S. R. (2023). The impact of hybrid work on team creativity (Master's thesis). <http://hdl.handle.net/1942/41183> [in English].
19. Nilsson, L., & Norström, W. (2024). Understanding psychological safety... (Master's thesis). <http://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/record/9156472> [in English].
20. Grzegorczyk, M., Mariniello, M., Nurski, L., & Schraepen, T. (2021). Blending the physical and virtual... *Bruegel Policy Contribution*, (14/2021). [in English].
21. Tyulkubaeva, A., Nurseitova, G., & Koshenov, E. (2024). Управление мотивацией команды проекта в методологии Agile. *Ekonomicheskaya seriya Vestnika ENU*, (3), 209–226. <https://doi.org/10.32523/2789-4320-2024-3-209-226> [Management of project team motivation in Agile methodology] [in Russian].
22. Kurmanov, N., Bakirbekova, A., & Adilbekuly, M. (2024). The Manager's Digital Competencies in Education System: A Systematic Review. *Economic Series of the Bulletin of ENU*, (2), 141–157. <https://doi.org/10.32523/2789-4320-2024-2-141-157> [in English].

#### Information about authors:

**Yesseikyzy A.** – PhD student, Department of Management, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, K.Satpayev str. 2, 010000, Astana, Kazakhstan.

**Mukhiyayeva D.M.** – corresponding author, PhD, Associate Professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, K.Satpayev str. 2, 010000, Astana, Kazakhstan.

**Yesseikyzy A.** – PhD, Department of Informatics and Digitalization of Education, Zhetsu University named after I. Zhansugurov, I. Zhansugurov str. 187, 040000, Taldykorgan, Kazakhstan.

**Есейқызы А.** – PhD докторанты, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің «менеджмент» кафедрасы, Қ.Сәтбаев көшесі 2, 010000, Астана, Қазақстан.

**Мухияева Д.М.** – хат-хабар авторы, PhD, қауымдастырылған профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Қ.Сәтбаев көшесі 2, 010000, Астана, Қазақстан.

**Есейқызы А.** – PhD, I.Жансүгіров атындағы Жетісіу университетінің информатика және білімді цифрандыру кафедрасы, I.Жансүгіров көшесі 187, 040000, Талдықорған, Қазақстан.

**Есейқызы А.** – докторант PhD, кафедра «Менеджмент», Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, ул. К. Сатпаева, 2, 010000, Астана, Казахстан.

**Мухияева Д.М.** – корреспондент-автор, PhD, ассоциированный профессор, Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, ул. К. Сатпаева, 2, 010000, Астана, Казахстан.

**Есейқызы А.** – PhD, кафедра «Информатика и цифровизация образования», Жетысуский университет имени И.Жансугурова, ул. И.Жансугурова, 187, 040000, Талдыкорган, Казахстан.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4/>).