INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH STUDIES (IJAMRS)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: 3107-9695 ISSN Print: 3139-1761



Leadership Styles and Employee Engagement in Remote Work Environments: A Post-Pandemic Analysis

Remya Krishna

Assistant Professor, School of commerce and professional studies, Marian college Kuttikkanam (Autonomous), India.

Article information
Received:16th October 2025
Received in revised form:19th November 2025
Accepted:24th December 2025
Available online:26th January 2026

Volume:2
Issue:1
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63090/IJAMRS/3107.9695.0021

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic fundamentally altered workplace dynamics, with remote work becoming a permanent fixture for many organizations. This research examines the relationship between different leadership styles and employee engagement levels in remote work environments through a mixed-methods approach involving 320 employees and their managers across various industries. The study reveals that transformational leadership demonstrates the strongest correlation with employee engagement ($r = .78$, $p < .001$), with teams led by transformational leaders showing 111% higher engagement scores compared to those with laissez-faire leaders. The findings provide crucial insights for leaders navigating the new paradigm of distributed work, with 47% of transformational leadership's effect operating through mediating mechanisms including team cohesion, work-life balance, and remote work adaptation.

Keywords: - Leadership styles, employee engagement, remote work, transformational leadership, authentic leadership, virtual teams

I. INTRODUCTION

The global shift to remote work, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, has created unprecedented challenges for organizational leaders (Kniffin et al., 2021). Traditional leadership approaches, developed for face-to-face interactions, require significant adaptation to remain effective in virtual environments (Antonakis & Day, 2018). Employee engagement, already a critical concern for organizations, has become even more complex to maintain when physical presence and informal interactions are limited (Galanti et al., 2021).

Employee engagement, defined as the emotional commitment and involvement employees have toward their organization and its goals, directly impacts productivity, retention, and organizational performance (Kahn, 1990). Research consistently demonstrates that engaged employees are more productive, creative, and loyal to their organizations (Gallup, 2020). However, maintaining engagement in remote work environments presents unique challenges including isolation, communication barriers, and reduced social connection (Oakman et al., 2020).

This study investigates how different leadership styles impact employee engagement in remote work environments, providing evidence-based recommendations for leaders managing distributed teams in the post-pandemic era.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership in virtual environments requires adaptation of traditional leadership theories and practices (Malhotra et al., 2007). The absence of physical presence, reduced non-verbal communication, and reliance on technology-mediated interactions fundamentally change the leader-follower dynamic (Zigurs, 2003).

Transformational leadership, characterized by inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence, has shown particular effectiveness in virtual settings (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leaders' ability to inspire and motivate through vision and personal connection translates well to remote environments where employees need additional motivation and clarity (Avolio et al., 2014).

Authentic leadership, emphasizing self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and moral perspective, has gained prominence in remote work contexts where trust and authenticity become paramount (Walumbwa et al., 2008). The challenges of virtual communication make authentic leadership behaviors particularly valuable for building trust and maintaining relationships (Gardner et al., 2021).

Employee engagement in remote work environments faces unique challenges including technological barriers, work-life balance issues, and reduced social interaction (Bailey & Kurland, 2002). Research by (Wang et al.,2020) suggests that leadership behaviors must be adapted to address these specific challenges while maintaining the core elements that drive engagement.

III. METHODOLOGY

This research employed a mixed-methods design combining quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews. The quantitative phase involved 320 employees working remotely for at least 18 months, along with their 64 direct supervisors, across technology, financial services, and consulting industries.

Data collection instruments included the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) to assess transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles, the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) to measure authentic leadership behaviors, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-17) to evaluate employee engagement levels, and a custom remote work adaptation questionnaire measuring virtual leadership effectiveness.

The qualitative phase consisted of semi-structured interviews with 30 employees and 15 managers to provide deeper insights into leadership experiences in remote environments. Statistical analysis included correlation analysis, multiple regression, and multilevel modeling to account for the nested nature of employees within teams. Qualitative data was analyzed using thematic analysis to identify key themes and patterns.

IV. RESULTS

4.1. Sample Characteristics and Descriptive Statistics

The final sample consisted of 320 employees and 64 managers across three industry sectors. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics and descriptive statistics for all study variables.

Table 1. Sample Demographics and Descriptive Statistics (N = 320)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Employee Demographics					
Gender	Male	178	55.6%		
	Female	142	44.4%		
Age	25-35 years	124	38.8%		
	36-45 years	132	41.3%		
	46-55 years	64	20.0%		
Education	Bachelor's	189	59.1%		
	Master's	114	35.6%		
	Doctoral	17	5.3%		
Industry	Technology	128	40.0%		
	Financial Services	98	30.6%		
	Consulting	94	29.4%		
Remote Work Experience	12-18 months	89	27.8%		
	19-24 months	142	44.4%		
	25+ months	89	27.8%		

Note: Leadership and engagement variables measured on 7-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

4.2 Leadership Style Distribution and Engagement Levels

Table 2 demonstrates the distribution of leadership styles across teams and corresponding engagement levels, revealing significant variations in employee outcomes.

Table 2. Leadership Style Distribution and Employee Engagement by Team

Leadership Style Dominant	Number of Teams	Avg Team Size	Employee Engagement	Job Satisfaction	Turnover Intention
	n	M	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Transformational	23	5.2	5.84 (0.87)	5.72 (0.91)	1.98 (0.76)
Authentic	18	4.8	5.51 (0.92)	5.34 (0.95)	2.15 (0.82)

Transactional	15	5.1	3.89 (1.12)	3.67 (1.08)	3.45 (0.98)
Laissez-faire	8	4.6	2.76 (1.34)	2.91 (1.28)	4.21 (1.15)
F-statistic			87.23***	78.91***	64.52***
η^2			.45	.42	.38

Note: ***p < .001. Post-hoc analyses revealed significant differences between all leadership style groups.

4.3. Correlation Matrix and Reliability Analysis

Table 3 presents the correlation matrix for all study variables, including reliability coefficients and control variables.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix and Reliability Statistics

Variable	**α**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
1. Transformational Leadership	.92	-									
2. Authentic Leadership	.89	.76***	-								
3. Transactional Leadership	.85	.34***	.29***	-							
4. Employee Engagement	.94	.78***	.71***	.42***	-						
5. Job Satisfaction	.91	.74***	.69***	.38***	.81***	-					
6. Turnover Intention	.88	-.69***	-.63***	-.34***	-.73***	-.79***	-				
7. Remote Work Adaptation	.86	.52***	.48***	.31***	.61***	.58***	-.51***	-			
8. Team Cohesion	.89	.68***	.64***	.35***	.72***	.67***	-.58***	.56***	-		
9. Work-Life Balance	.83	.41***	.45***	.18**	.49***	.52***	-.44***	.48***	.43***	-	
10. Technology Proficiency	.79	.28***	.24***	.22**	.33***	.31***	-.26***	.67***	.29***	.19**	-

Note: N = 320. **p < .01, ***p < .001. Scale reliability (Cronbach's α) shown on diagonal.

4.4. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 4 shows the hierarchical regression analysis examining predictors of employee engagement in remote work environments.

Table 4. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Employee Engagement

Predictor Variables	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
	β	B	β	B
Step 1: Control Variables				
Gender (1=Female)	.08	.06	.04	.04
Age	.12*	.09*	.06	.05
Education Level	.15**	.11*	.08	.07
Industry (Technology)	.19**	.13*	.09	.08
Industry (Financial)	.14*	.10	.07	.06
Remote Work Experience	.23***	.16**	.12*	.11*
Step 2: Leadership Styles				
Transformational Leadership		.54***	.41***	.38***
Authentic Leadership		.28***	.22***	.19**
Transactional Leadership		.15**	.12*	.11*
Step 3: Mediating Variables				
Team Cohesion			.31***	.28***
Work-Life Balance			.18***	.16**

Remote Work Adaptation			.22***	.20***
Step 4: Interaction Terms				
Transformational × Experience				.14**
Authentic × Team Cohesion				.12*
Transformational × Industry				.09*
R^2	.142	.687	.743	.762
ΔR^2	.142***	.545***	.056***	.019**
F	8.94***	41.23***	35.67***	31.89***

Note: N = 320. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. β = standardized regression coefficient.

4.5. Leadership Effectiveness by Remote Work Context

Table 5 examines how leadership effectiveness varies based on remote work experience and team characteristics.

Table 5: Leadership Effectiveness by Remote Work Context

Context Variable	Transformational Leadership	Authentic Leadership	Transactional Leadership
	r with Engagement	r with Engagement	r with Engagement
Remote Work Experience			
Less experienced (12-18 months, n=89)	.72***	.67***	.38***
Moderately experienced (19-24 months, n= 142)	.81***	.74***	.41***
Highly experienced (25+ months, n=89)	.76***	.71***	.45***
Team Size			
Small teams (3-4 members, n=134)	.84***	.76***	.39***
Medium teams (5-6 members, n=128)	.75***	.68***	.43***
Large teams (7+ members, n=58)	.69***	.65***	.46***
Industry Sector			
Technology (n=128)	.82***	.75***	.41***
Financial Services (n=98)	.76***	.69***	.39***
Consulting (n=94)	.74***	.67***	.44***
Communication Frequency			
Daily check-ins (n=156)	.79***	.73***	.42***
2-3 times per week (n=112)	.75***	.68***	.40***
Weekly or less (n=52)	.61***	.56***	.35**

Note: **p < .01, ***p < .001.

4.6. Mediation Analysis Results

Table 6 presents comprehensive mediation analysis examining the pathways through which leadership styles influence employee engagement.

Table 6. Mediation Analysis - Leadership Styles → Mediators → Employee Engagement

Independent Variable	**Mediator**	**Direct Effect (c')**	**Indirect Effect (a×b)**	**Total Effect (c)**	**95% CI Indirect**	**% Mediated**
Transformational Leadership						
	Team Cohesion	.52***	.26***	.78***	[.19, .33]	33.3%
	Work-Life Balance	.67***	.11***	.78***	[.06, .16]	14.1%

	Remote Adaptation	.61***	.17***	.78***	[.12, .23]	21.8%
	Total Mediation	.41***	.37***	.78***	[.31, .44]	47.4%
Authentic Leadership						
	Team Cohesion	.49***	.22***	.71***	[.16, .28]	31.0%
	Work-Life Balance	.58***	.13***	.71***	[.08, .19]	18.3%
	Remote Adaptation	.56***	.15***	.71***	[.10, .21]	21.1%
	Total Mediation	.38***	.33***	.71***	[.26, .40]	46.5%
Transactional Leadership						
	Team Cohesion	.32***	.10**	.42***	[.04, .16]	23.8%
	Work-Life Balance	.38***	.04	.42***	[-.02, .10]	9.5%
	Remote Adaptation	.36***	.06*	.42***	[.01, .12]	14.3%
	Total Mediation	.28***	.14***	.42***	[.08, .21]	33.3%

Note: N = 320. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. Bootstrap samples = 5,000. CI = confidence interval.

4.7. Multi-level Analysis Results

Given the nested nature of employees within teams, Table 7 presents multilevel modeling results accounting for team-level variance.

Table 7. Multilevel Analysis of Leadership and Employee Engagement

Fixed Effects	**Model 1 (Null)**	**Model 2 (Individual)**	**Model 3 (Team)**	**Model 4 (Full)**
	Coef (SE)	Coef (SE)	Coef (SE)	Coef (SE)
Individual Level				
Age		.012 (.008)	.011 (.007)	.009 (.007)
Gender		.089 (.067)	.084 (.064)	.078 (.062)
Education		.156* (.074)	.142* (.071)	.134* (.069)
Remote Experience		.187** (.058)	.169** (.056)	.153** (.054)
Team Level				
Transformational Leadership			.623*** (.089)	.578*** (.086)
Authentic Leadership			.298*** (.076)	.267** (.074)
Team Size			-.045 (.034)	-.039 (.033)
Cross-level Interactions				
Transformational × Experience				.124* (.052)
Authentic × Team Size				-.089* (.041)
Random Effects				
Individual Level Variance	1.234***	0.789***	0.456***	0.423***
Team Level Variance	0.456***	0.398***	0.167**	0.143**
ICC	.270	.335	.268	.253
Model Fit				
-2 Log Likelihood	1456.7	1398.4	1267.8	1251.3
AIC	1462.7	1410.4	1281.8	1269.3

Note: N = 320 employees, 64 teams. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. ICC = Intraclass correlation coefficient.

4.8. Data Interpretation

The comprehensive statistical analysis reveals several critical insights about leadership effectiveness in remote work environments:

- Transformational Leadership Superiority**:** Teams with transformational leaders showed engagement levels 2.11 times higher than those with laissez-faire leaders (5.84 vs. 2.76, Cohen's d = 2.83), representing an extremely large effect size.
- Mediation Mechanisms**:** Nearly half (47.4%) of transformational leadership's effect on engagement operates through mediating variables, with team cohesion being the strongest mediator (33.3% of total effect).
- Cross-level Interactions**:** The significant interaction between transformational leadership and remote work experience ($\beta = .14$, $p < .01$) suggests that experienced remote workers benefit even more from transformational leadership approaches.
- Industry Variations**:** Technology sector employees showed the strongest response to transformational leadership ($r = .82$), possibly due to the creative and collaborative nature of technology work.
- Communication Frequency Moderator**:** Daily communication significantly enhanced leadership effectiveness, with transformational leaders showing stronger engagement correlations ($r = .79$) compared to those with weekly communication ($r = .61$).
- Multilevel Effects**:** The ICC of .253 in the full model indicates that 25.3% of engagement variance occurs at the team level, justifying the multilevel approach and highlighting the importance of team-level leadership interventions.

V. DISCUSSION

The findings confirm that leadership style significantly impacts employee engagement in remote work environments, with transformational and authentic leadership styles proving most effective. These results extend previous research by demonstrating how traditional leadership theories apply in virtual contexts while highlighting necessary adaptations.

The strong correlation between transformational leadership and engagement aligns with research by (Bass & Avolio, 2019), who emphasized the importance of inspirational motivation in challenging circumstances. The virtual work environment, with its inherent challenges, provides a context where transformational leadership behaviors become particularly valuable.

Authentic leadership's strong impact on engagement reflects the increased importance of trust and transparency in remote work settings where traditional oversight mechanisms are reduced (Choudhury et al., 2020). The qualitative findings support this, with employees emphasizing the value of leaders who are genuine, transparent, and understanding of remote work challenges.

The mediation analysis reveals that leadership effectiveness in remote environments operates through multiple pathways, with team cohesion emerging as the most critical mediator. This finding suggests that leaders must invest deliberate effort in building and maintaining team connections in virtual settings.

Practical implications include the need for leadership development programs that specifically address virtual leadership competencies. Organizations should invest in training leaders to adapt their styles for remote environments while maintaining the core behaviors that drive engagement.

VI. CONCLUSION

This research provides empirical evidence that leadership style significantly influences employee engagement in remote work environments. Transformational and authentic leadership styles emerge as most effective for maintaining high engagement levels in virtual settings, with the relationship mediated through team cohesion, work-life balance, and remote work adaptation mechanisms.

The study contributes to the growing literature on virtual leadership while offering practical guidance for organizations navigating the permanent shift to remote and hybrid work models. The multilevel analysis demonstrates that both individual and team-level factors contribute to engagement outcomes, emphasizing the need for comprehensive leadership strategies that address multiple organizational levels.

Future research should explore the long-term effects of virtual leadership on organizational culture and performance, as well as investigate how emerging technologies might further enhance or challenge leadership effectiveness in distributed work environments.

REFERENCES

Antonakis, J., & Day, D. V. (2018). *The nature of leadership* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Avolio, B. J., Sosik, J. J., Kahai, S. S., & Baker, B. (2014). E-leadership: Re-examining transformations in leadership source and transmission. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 105–131.

Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(4), 383–400.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2019). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. (2020). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal, 42*(4), 655–683.

Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappalà, S., & Toscano, F. (2021). Work from home during the COVID-19 outbreak: The impact on employees' remote work productivity, engagement, and stress. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 63*(7), e426–e432.

Gallup. (2020). *State of the global workplace*. Gallup Press.

Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2021). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly, 32*(6), 101459.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 692–724.

Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., ... & van Vugt, M. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist, 76*(1), 63–77.

Malhotra, A., Majchrzak, A., & Rosen, B. (2007). Leading virtual teams. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*(1), 60–70.

Oakman, J., Kinsman, N., Stuckey, R., Graham, M., & Weale, V. (2020). A rapid review of mental and physical health effects of working at home: How do we optimise health? *BMC Public Health, 20*, Article 1825.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34*(1), 89–126.

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2020). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology, 70*(1), 16–59.

Zigurs, I. (2003). Leadership in virtual teams: Oxymoron or opportunity? *Organizational Dynamics, 31*(4), 339–351.