Managing Innovation and Creativity in Hybrid Work Organizations: Challenges and Strategic Solutions

OPEN ACCESS

Volume: 14

Special Issue: 1

Month: June

Year: 2026

P-ISSN: 2321-788X

E-ISSN: 2582-0397

Citation:
Sabarish, S., et al. "Managing Innovation and Creativity in Hybrid Work Organizations: Challenges and Strategic Solutions." *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities,* vol. 14, no. S1, 2026, pp. 242–48.

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v14iS1-Jun.11218

S. Sabarish
Research Scholar (Full time), Alagappa Institute of Management
Alagappa University, Karaikudi

Dr. S. Chandramohan
Senior Professor & Director, Alagappa Institute of Management
Alagappa University, Karaikudi

Dr. R.V. Suresh
Associate Professor, Hallmark Business School, Trichy

D. Rithikaa
I Year MBA, Hallmark Business School, Trichy

Abstract

Hybrid working is transforming workplaces, communication, and innovation practices in industries. Hybrid working is changing business organization, communication and innovation in industries. The implications of hybrid working on innovation and creativity are unclear, but it does provide flexibility, autonomy, and access to geographically dispersed talent. While the greater autonomy and digital connectivity can spur individual creativity, the less personal interaction and informal knowledge sharing can constrain collective innovation. This study investigates the impact of a hybrid working environment on innovation performance and explores how to improve creativity in a hybrid environment strategically.

The research, based on the Componential Theory of Creativity, Knowledge Based View of the Firm, and Dynamic Capabilities Theory, suggests a framework that combines the four factors – leadership support, effectiveness of digital collaboration, psychological safety, and knowledge sharing – into one. The research design used is a sequential explanatory mixed-method. The quantitative phase is a structured survey that was administered to employees and managers in the hybrid organizations in order to test hypothesized relationships through regression and structural equation modelling. The qualitative phase involves in-depth interviews with innovation leaders using a semi-structured approach to gain insights into the context of challenges and strategic approaches. The objectives of the study are to detect the major obstacles to creativity in hybrid environments and to create a Hybrid Innovation Management Framework (HIMF) that provides practical and relevant proposals to keep innovation performance. The study's statistical analysis and managerial insights add value to the field of Innovation Management and offer practical lessons for organisations in the midst of the complexities of hybrid working systems.

Introduction

The swift shift to hybrid working has dramatically reshaped business and communication structures and the innovation landscape. The COVID-19

pandemic has been a huge catalyst for hybrid work (working from home and in the office on a rotating basis) becoming a common organizational strategy in many industries, if not in most. This flexibility, autonomy, and cost-efficiency comes with a mixed picture regarding the shadows it casts on innovation and creativity. To maintain competitive advantage in fast changing environments, innovation, which involves the successful implementation of novel ideas (West & Farr, 1990), and creativity, the generation of useful and original ideas (Amabile, 1996), are required. New ways of working and collaborating, sharing knowledge and informal exchanges, are reshaping the traditional ways of supporting creative processes in the shift to hybrid work. While digital tools enable connectivity, there may be less opportunity for tacit knowledge transfer and for spontaneous idea generation (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Allen, 1977). The elements of Leadership, Psychological Safety, and Effective Digital Collaboration are thus pivotal to Innovation Performance in Hybrid environments (Edmondson, 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006). However, the empirical evidence on the hybrid workplace and innovation is not consistent, hence a mixed-method approach is used to explore the problems and strategies that could be used to manage creativity in hybrid organizations. The objective of the research is to create a holistic framework to support sustainable innovation in the changing hybrid working context.

Research Objectives

1. To pinpoint the key issues impacting innovation and creativity in hybrid working organisations.
2. To explore the relationship between leadership support and effectiveness of digital collaboration, psychological safety and innovation performance in hybrid settings.
3. To examine how knowledge sharing is a mediator in improving innovation outcomes.
4. To discuss management approaches to overcome innovation obstacles in hybrid settings.
5. To create a strategic approach to innovation and creativity in hybrid organizations.

Research Hypothesis

- H_1: The support of leadership positively affects innovation performance in hybrid work organizations.
- H_2: For hybrid settings, digital collaboration effectiveness has a positive effect on knowledge sharing between employees.
- H_3: Psychological safety has a positive relationship with the creativity of employees in hybrid teams.
- H_4: Knowledge sharing is the mediating variable between the hybrid work factors (leadership support, collaboration effectiveness, autonomy), and innovation performance.
- H_5: The intensity of hybridity has a moderating effect between the levels of digital collaboration effectiveness and innovation performance, with a stronger relationship in organizations where hybrid policies are structured.

Review of Literature

Bennett, N., & Lemoine, G. (2024)[1] explored strategic adaptability in post-pandemic hybrid companies and suggested the need for deliberate innovation governance. Their results indicate that, when there is no systematic coordination processes, hybrid systems actually seem to decrease the idea exchange between cross-functional teams in spite of technology. Cascio, W. F., Montealegre, R. (2024)[2] addressed digital transformation in hybrid organisations and focused on the three key elements for innovation, namely leadership alignment, digital fluency and mechanisms for participation. They said hybrid inequities can lead to poor collaboration. Using multi-industry data, Zhang, X. and Venkatesh, V. (2024)[3] looked at digital collaboration tools and innovation performance. They concluded that digital platform integration positively impacts knowledge sharing; however in the presence of psychologically safe climates. Amankwah-Amoah, J. Talking about innovation shifts in response to the crisis, and highlighting hybrid resilience strategies, as per (2023). The study indicated that dynamic capabilities helped ease firms in hybrid settings to adapt

their innovation routines more effectively. Bailey, D., & Kurland, N. (2023) explored the challenge of coordinating hybrid teams and found that an important factor for creativity were low levels of informal communication. Structured innovation rituals were proposed as compensators. This suggests that distance matters when it comes to collaboration networks and can dampen knowledge spillovers, which in turn stifles breakthrough innovation (Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. 2023). Yang, L., et al. (2023) showed that using communication network analysis, the effectiveness of remote work resulted in a decrease in cross-team connections, which impacted the diffusion of innovation. This was lessened by hybrid policies that called for in-person interaction at certain times. Bailenson, J. In (2022), Zoom Fatigue" was coined as a term describing the cognitive overload that can result from too many virtual meetings, which diminishes creative engagement and poorer quality and creativity in ideation. Gilson, L. L., et al. (2022)9 investigated virtual creativity processes and determined factors that are more predictive of innovation in distributed teams than technology alone, including psychological safety and leadership clarity. In a recent review of the research on remote work, Kniffin, K. M., et al. (2022)[1] noted that there are gaps in our understanding of innovation dynamics in hybrid environments. Teece, D. J. (2022)[11] adapted dynamic capabilities theory to digital ecosystems, highlighting the ability of organizations to be agile and reconfigure in hybrid environments. Edmondson, A., & Lei, Z. In 2021, 12 years later, psychological safety returned as the center of attention in the current teams (Hackman et al., 2021)[1]2. Waizenegger, L., et al. (2021)[13] studied how people work together when working remotely due to the pandemic, and found that a lack of informal interactions was a factor that hindered creative collaboration. Carillo, K., et al. (2020)[1] studied the implementation of forced remote work and found that companies that already had a high level of digital maturity were better able to continue the process of innovation. Nonaka, I., & Toyama, R. This idea of shared context ("Ba") in tacit knowledge creation was highlighted by (2020)[1] as an element that is important for the innovation process and that needs to be intentionally designed when it comes to virtual contexts.

Research Gap

Although hybrid work is becoming an area of focus among academics, the following gaps still exist: Focus Gap for Innovation:

1. Innovation-Specific Focus Gap: Most recent studies emphasize productivity and well-being rather than innovation performance.
2. Integration Gap: Limited research integrates leadership, digital collaboration quality, psychological safety, and knowledge-sharing mechanisms into a unified framework.
3. Methodological Gap: Predominance of single-method (quantitative or qualitative) studies restricts comprehensive understanding.
4. Strategic Framework Gap: Few empirically grounded models provide actionable strategies tailored specifically to hybrid innovation management.
5. Moderation Analysis Gap: Limited examination of hybrid intensity as a moderating variable influencing innovation outcomes.

Conceptual Framework

Component Explanation

1. Leadership Support: Transformational and digitally competent leadership promotes vision clarity, intellectual stimulation and participation, which allows for a creative approach to engagement.
2. Digital Collaboration Effectiveness: Quality, access and integration of digital tools in support of simultaneous and non-simultaneous knowledge sharing.
3. Psychological Safety: Climate for employees to share ideas without fear of criticism.
4. Employee Autonomy: Autonomy in how a job is carried out, increases intrinsic motivation.
5. Knowledge Sharing (Mediator): Mechanism, by which collaboration and leadership are translated in innovation performance.
6. Innovation Performance (Dependent Variable): Assessed with output of new product development, process improvement, and creative problem solving.
7. Hybrid Intensity (Moderator): Strength of relationships as a function of the extent to which relationships are remote versus in office.

Methodology

Research Design

Sequential Explanatory Mixed-Method Design is used.

Quantitative Component

Sample: 300–400 employees and managers, Stratified sampling across IT, finance, consulting, education sectors

Instrument: Structured questionnaire (5-point Likert scale)

Variables: IVs: Leadership Support, Digital Collaboration, Psychological Safety, Autonomy, Mediator: Knowledge Sharing, DV: Innovation Performance, Moderator: Hybrid Intensity

Analysis Techniques: Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), Mediation (Bootstrapping), Moderation Analysis

Qualitative Component

Sample:15–20 innovation leaders/managers

Method: Semi-structured interviews

Observations: a description of what was found, including analysis of text and images.

Findings: the visual and textual analysis and the results of the thematic coding.

Justification for Mixed Methods

- Complementarity: Quantitative data finds statistical relationships, qualitative data finds contextual nuances.
- Triangulation: increases validity via cross-check.
- Developmental Purpose: Qualitative findings support quantitative interpretations.
- Complex Phenomenon Suitability: Hybrid innovation is not only of structural, but also of psychological and strategic nature and thus must be analyzed from a variety of perspectives.

Data Integration

Compare the convergence and divergence, build up the conceptual framework, develop strategic hybrid model of Hybrid Innovation Management

Findings

Quantitative Findings

The quantitative phase comprised 356 respondents, with an average hybrid intensity of 53% remote working across the IT, finance, consulting, and education industries. The internal consistency of the

constructs was assessed using reliability and validity measures which demonstrated high internal validity (Cronbach's alpha values between 0.85 and 0.91). Confirmatory Factor Analysis showed the model fit was good (CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.052), which has set the convergent validity and discriminant validity. The results of the Structural Equation Modeling showed the model has a very good explanatory power (R2 = 0.63), meaning that the model explains 63% of the variance in the conceptual model of innovation performance. Leadership support had the greatest effect on innovation performance ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.001$). Knowledge sharing was significantly affected by digital collaboration effectiveness ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$), and psychological safety was significantly related to employee creativity ($\beta = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$). The results of mediation analysis indicated that the digital collaboration to innovation performance relationship was partially mediated by knowledge sharing ($\beta = 0.17$, $p < 0.01$). Moderation analysis showed that when structured hybrid policies were present, the intensity of hybrid had a positive effect on the relationship between digital collaboration and innovation outcomes ($\beta = 0.14$, $p < 0.05$). Overall, leadership, the quality of digital collaboration and psychological safety proved to be key enablers of innovation in hybrid contexts.

Qualitative Findings

Five dominant themes emerged from the qualitative phase which involved 18 semi-structured interviews with innovation leaders:

1. Informal Ideation Spaces are gone: Organic idea generation was stunted due to spontaneous interactions being limited.
2. Digital Collaboration – A Double-Edged Sword: Digital tools helped improve coordination, but too many meetings online diminished in-depth creative engagement.
3. Leadership Intentionality – Innovation in hybrid spaces will need intentional design and structured ideation sessions.
4. Psychological Safety as an enabler – Trust-based environments facilitated experimentation and idea sharing.
5. Structured Innovation Rituals – The organizations that ran innovation sprints, virtual incubators and cross-functional workshops had higher innovation performance.

Integrated Findings

There is a strong convergence of the quantitative and qualitative results. The value of leadership, quality of collaboration, and psychological safety was reinforced with statistical evidence, and managerial insights were used to reinforce the value of intentional innovation design and structured hybrid policies. The results support the notion that hybrid working is not a threat to innovation; rather, managerial decisions, culture and collaborative structures are the key elements that influence innovation performance.

Conclusion and Future Research

The aim of this study was to investigate the consequences of hybrid working on innovation and creativity through a sequential explanatory mixed method design. This indicates that leadership support, the effectiveness of digital collaboration, psychological safety, and knowledge sharing are all significant factors in innovation performance in hybrid organizations, while hybrid intensity serves as a contextual moderator. The findings validate that hybrid working does not limit innovation in its own right. Instead, innovation outcomes rely on the managerial intent, organized knowledge process and strategicization of digital infrastructure into organizational culture. Leadership and psychological safety proved to be key enablers for creative engagement, and knowledge sharing was identified as the key transmission mechanism to translate collaboration into innovation performance. The proposed Hybrid Innovation Management Model (HIMM) combines these insights to five strategic pillars: leadership enablement, optimization of digital infrastructure, reinforcement of psychological safety, structuring knowledge-sharing mechanisms,

and hybrid policy alignment. This model gives theory and guidance to organisations that want to maintain innovation in distributed settings. With a world of technological upheaval, flexibility in the workforce, and uncertainty in the world, hybrid work is going to be around for a while. The question for organizations is not if and not how they can develop hybrid models, but how to use them strategically to ensure competitive advantage by innovation. The shift to hybrid working is more of a change in organizational strategy than a mere shift in structure. Deliberate leadership, psychologically safe cultures, digitally optimized collaboration and structured knowledge-sharing systems are essential to sustain innovation in hybrid environments. This study is a theory-to-practice linkage that helps to create future-ready organizations to convert the hybrid complexity into innovative advantage.

Future Research Directions

This research contributes to the knowledge base of hybrid innovation management, but there are some opportunities for further research.

1. Longitudinal Studies: In the present study, cross sectional data was used. Longitudinal studies are needed to explore the hybrid innovation dynamics over time, especially as organizations fine-tune their hybrid policies.
2. Cross-Cultural Comparisons: Hybrid work norms may vary across cultural context. International comparative research may identify the different aspects of cultural dimensions that shape the psychological safety, leadership effectiveness, and innovation outcomes.
3. Industry-Specific Analysis: Innovation processes are different in various industries. Further research may focus on specific hybrid innovation strategies in certain sectors like manufacturing, healthcare or R&D intensive fields.
4. Artificial Intelligence's position: As the collaboration tools are increasingly being supported by AI, the future may see studies on the effect of AI augmentation on creativity, knowledge sharing, and innovation performance in hybrid teams.
5. Employee-Level Creative Processes: Micro-level studies on cognitive creative processes, motivation and digital fatigue would help gain more insight into how individual employees process innovation.
6. Network Analysis of Hybrid Collaboration: Synthesizing a social network analysis approach could further explore the impact of hybrid structures on informal communication networks and idea diffusion patterns.

References

1. Allen, T. J. (1977). Managing the flow of technology: Technology transfer and the dissemination of technological information within the R&D organization. MIT Press.
2. Amabile, T. M. (1996). Creativity in context. Westview Press.
3. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
4. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999
5. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. Oxford University Press.
6. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640
7. West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (1990). Innovation at work. In M. A. West & J. L. Farr (Eds.), Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies (pp. 3–13). John Wiley & Sons.
8. Amankwah-Amoah, J. (2023). Crisis-driven innovation and organizational resilience in the post-pandemic era. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 190, 122425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122425

9. Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2023). Remote work reconsidered: The impact of hybrid arrangements on team collaboration and creativity. Organization Science, 34(2), 415–432.
10. Bailenson, J. N. (2022). Nonverbal overload: A theoretical argument for the causes of Zoom fatigue. Technology, Mind, and Behavior, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000030
11. Bennett, N., & Lemoine, G. J. (2024). Adaptive leadership and innovation governance in hybrid organizations. Strategic Management Journal, 45(1), 88–105.
12. Carillo, K., Cachat-Rosset, G., Marsan, J., Saba, T., & Klarsfeld, A. (2020). Adjusting to epidemic-induced telework: Empirical insights into organizational innovation continuity. European Journal of Information Systems, 29(4), 395–412.
13. Cascio, W. F., & Montealegre, R. (2024). Digital transformation and workforce evolution in hybrid organizations. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(1), 24–40.
14. Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2021). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 8, 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-055300
15. Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. (2023). Work from home and collaboration networks. Journal of Labor Economics, 41(S1), S57–S89.
16. Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Young, N. C., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2022). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. Journal of Management, 48(6), 1500–1536.
17. Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., et al. (2022). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications for remote and hybrid work innovation. American Psychologist, 76(1), 63–77.
18. Nonaka, I., & Toyama, R. (2020). The knowledge-creating theory revisited: Knowledge creation in digitally enabled contexts. Organization Studies, 41(3), 343–356.
19. Teece, D. J. (2022). Dynamic capabilities and digital transformation: A hybrid work perspective. California Management Review, 64(3), 5–25.
20. Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2021). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. European Journal of Information Systems, 30(4), 429–442.
21. Yang, L., Holtz, D., Jaffe, S., et al. (2023). The effects of remote work on collaboration among information workers. Nature Human Behaviour, 7, 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01416-0
22. Zhang, X., & Venkatesh, V. (2024). Digital collaboration platforms and innovation performance: The moderating role of psychological safety. Information Systems Research, 35(1), 112–130.