

IS ENGAGED ONBOARDING IMPORTANT FOR ENGAGED WORK? THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STRUCTURED ONBOARDING AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Received: 28. 3. 2024.

Accepted: 10. 10. 2024.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi.29.2.5>

Original scientific paper

ABSTRACT

The paper explores the relationship between the structured onboarding process and the resulting employee engagement, as most onboarding studies focus on other onboarding outcomes. The proposed hypothesis was: “A structured onboarding process is positively related to employee engagement.”, while the research question was: ‘Is a structured onboarding process more relevant for some employee engagement dimensions than others?’ To assess the onboarding process, the ‘Onboarding Assessment Survey’ developed by Baker and DiPiro (2019) was used, and to assess employee engagement the ‘Utrecht Work Engagement Scale’, more specifically UWES-17, developed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004b) was used. Using a sample of 622 respondents and applying correlation and multiple regression analyses, we revealed that a structured onboarding process is statistically significantly positively related to employee engagement in total and by dimensions. In terms of employee engagement dimensions, we also found that a structured onboarding process is more strongly related to employee dedication and less related to employee absorption in their work.

KEYWORDS: *employee onboarding; structured onboarding; employee engagement; vigour; dedication; absorption*

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the dominant characteristics of the contemporary business environment is fierce competition for talents of all sorts of profiles. Many organizations are planning for this situation by focusing on the first step – recruiting the needed talent. In doing so, they fail to recognize that efficient and effective onboarding is key to turning new hires into productive employees and retaining them for longer (Booz Allen Hamilton, 2008).

Onboarding as “the process by which one is taught and learns ‘the ropes’ of a particular organizational role” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 211), is considered a critical human resource management function as it has implications for individuals and organizations (Saks & Gruman, 2018). It helps individuals experience less tension in adapting to the new work environment due to being unfamiliar with the organizational culture, procedures and systems (Jahya et al., 2019). For organizations, it is a cost-effective way to accelerate the time it takes for a new hire to become

* Nina Pološki Vokić, PhD, full professor with tenure, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Economics & Business, Department of organisation and management, Trg J. F. Kennedyja 6, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia, Phone: +385 1 238 3262, E-mail: npoloski@efzg.hr
** Vedra Regul Erent Ondrušek, MA spec, Procter & Gamble d.o.o. za trgovinu, Bani 110, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia, Phone: +385 95 922 9547, E-mail: vedra.re.ondrusek@gmail.com

productive, enhance employee engagement, improve employee retention, and be a critical determinant of an employee's long-term success within an organization (Booz Allen Hamilton, 2008; Nigah et al., 2012).

However, although the impact of quality onboarding has been documented in both practice and scientific research, there is still one area that requires attention – its relationship with employee engagement. Not only that “very little is known about the effects of onboarding on newcomers’ work engagement” (Saks & Gruman, 2018, p.12), but there is a lack of empirical research proving the relationship between the concepts. Namely, most studies on onboarding focus on the outcomes of onboarding such as job satisfaction, increased performance, and turnover intentions (e.g., Bauer, 2010; Bauer et al., 2007). Furthermore, studies on onboarding and employee engagement usually focus on specific aspects of the concept, such as institutionalized onboarding tactics (e.g., Nguyen et al., 2020) or satisfaction with buddying (e.g., Nigah & al., 2012). As well, some studies in this area failed to find a direct relationship between onboarding and newcomer engagement (Saks & Gruman, 2011). Finally, it is impossible not to onboard a new employee – the real issue is the quality of the onboarding (SHRM, 2012). Consequently, it is relevant to explore whether a structured onboarding process is vital for onboarding success as measured by the later engagement of employees at work.

As approaches to onboarding range from quite systematic, comprehensive and formal to the ‘sink or swim’ strategy, where new employees often struggle to figure out what is expected and understand the norms of their new workplace (Bauer, 2010), our research is embedded in the interactionist perspective (see Griffin, 2012), a sociological approach which discloses that what happens in work settings is the outcome of the interaction between the organization and the individual (Nguyen et al., 2020).

In the theoretical part of our paper, we briefly define the concepts of onboarding and employee engagement through their definitions, dimensions and benefits for organizations, and present general reflections and insights on the relationship between the characteristics of onboarding and employee engagement. In the empirical part of our paper, we explore the aforementioned relationship through quantitative field research on a sample of 622 employees.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND, HYPOTHESIS AND RESEARCH QUESTION

2.1. The concept of onboarding new employees

Onboarding defined. Onboarding is the process of integrating and assimilating new hires to performance and social aspects of their new jobs quickly and easily, by enabling them to acquire knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviours, as well as tools and other resources necessary to function effectively and efficiently within an organization (using Bauer, 2010; Lavigna, 2009; SHRM, 2012). Two distinct but interrelated areas of onboarding are orientation (operational integration) and socialization (cultural integration) (e.g., Bauer, 2010; Laurano, 2013), with the former referring to understanding the role demands, job tasks, and other ‘hard’ characteristics of a job, while the latter refers to integrating within an organization in terms of understanding the organizational values and norms, interpersonal integration and other ‘soft’ characteristics of a job. Orientation programs provide information about the job itself and the immediate work environment (Klein & Weaver, 2000), while the socialization process focuses on enculturating new employees so that they develop pride in their new organization and internalize its values (Cable, Gino & Staats, 2013).

Benefits of onboarding. The benefits of onboarding for employees and companies are manifold. For individuals, onboarding reduces uncertainty and ambiguity, which facilitates entering the role more quickly, accelerates time-to-productivity, enables social adjustment and provides a sense of belonging in the short term, while in the longer term, by supporting learning, it increases job satisfaction and employee engagement, improves employee performance, and increases employee emotional attachment and commitment to the organization (e.g., Bauer et al., 2007; Gallup, 2016; Jahya et al., 2019; Laurano, 2013; Lavigna, 2009; Nguyen et al., 2020; Saks & Gruman, 2018; SHRM, 2012; Yang, 2008). Consequently, on the organizational level, successful onboarding leads to higher work quality, greater customer satisfaction, higher productivity levels, and better employee retention rates (e.g., Bauer, 2010; Cable, Gino & Staats, 2013; Laurano, 2013; Lavigna, 2009; SHRM, 2012).

Onboarding activities. Various departments and key stakeholders are typically involved in the creation, implementation, and measurement of onboarding efforts (Laurano, 2013), such as HR department (e.g., onboarding specialist), managers (e.g., senior leaders as process champions, immediate superiors), colleagues (e.g., mentors, buddies), support functions (e.g., IT department), and the newly employed themselves. To achieve the best onboarding results, multiple stake-

holders need to collaborate, and there should be no primary owner of this process (e.g., Booz Allen Hamilton, 2008; Laurano, 2013). Typical onboarding components include (in order of frequency of occurrence): paperwork, preparation of a workstation, orientation package, information about the organization (e.g., vision, mission, goals, values, culture, policies, benefits package), introduction to team members and other relevant members of the organization (especially go-to people), tour of the facility, assignment of a buddy/mentor, establishment of job duties and responsibilities (including information about work standards and performance expectations), arrangement of formal and informal social interactions, training (from learning about products/services and mentoring to specific training for the job), constant support and progress feedback (including communicating career development opportunities), and measuring and evaluating the onboarding process. All these activities are used to provide newcomers with two types of resources – work-related and social capital resources (Saks & Gruman, 2018). Additionally, it is worth mentioning that organizations disagree on the appropriate length of onboarding initiatives – some accept that a few hours or a single day/week is sufficient (e.g., Bauer, 2010; Laurano, 2013; Lavigna, 2009), the majority considers it to be a comprehensive process involving a series of activities spanning one or many months (e.g., SHRM, 2012), while some view it as an ongoing process that takes place throughout the employee's tenure (e.g., Jahya et al., 2019).

Structured onboarding process. As organizations increasingly realize the value of a thorough onboarding process and are looking for ways to strengthen onboarding by making it a process and rather than an event (SHRM, 2012), a more structured onboarding process is becoming a norm. Organizations vary in the formality, comprehensiveness and complexity of onboarding activities they apply. Some apply *informal onboarding* – the process by which an employee learns about their new job without an explicit organizational plan, while others believe in *formal onboarding* – a written set of coordinated policies and procedures that assist an employee in adjusting to their new job in terms of both task and social aspects (e.g., Bauer, 2010; Bauer et al., 2007). In this paper, we define the structured onboarding process as a well thought through, step-by-step implemented and carefully timed programme for integrating new employees.

2.2. Employee engagement

Employee engagement defined. One of the first widely accepted definitions of employee engagement was

offered by Kahn (1990, p. 694), in which personal engagement is defined as the “harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles: in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, emotionally, and mentally during role performances”. According to Schaufeli et al. (2002, p. 74), who popularized the engagement concept, it is “a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption”, where the three employee engagement dimensions refer to the following: “vigour refers to high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one’s work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties; dedication refers to being strongly involved in one’s work, and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge; and absorption refers to being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one’s work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work” (Schaufeli, 2013, p. 21.). Colloquially, employee engagement is the enthusiasm someone feels towards their job (Guy & Newman, 2013), because of which they are willing to go the extra mile (Bakker & Hakanen, 2013) and ready to invest not only hands and head, but also their heart (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995).

Benefits of employee engagement. Many employee- and employer-level benefits of an engaged workforce are documented in the literature. Engaged employees are more satisfied with their jobs, more creative, innovative and proactive, have higher job performance, feel lower burnout, and are more satisfied with their careers and life in general (e.g., Agarwal, 2014; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Chughtai & Buckley, 2011; Gruman & Saks, 2011; Kyoung Park et al., 2014; Timms & Brough, 2013; Wefald & Downey, 2009). On the employer level, employee engagement is associated with higher employee commitment and loyalty, greater organizational citizenship behaviour, reduced absenteeism and turnover, and ultimately better business outcomes (e.g., Biswas & Bhatnagar, 2013; Brunetto et al., 2012; Harter & Schmidt, 2002; Høigaard et al., 2012; Ibrahim & Al Falasi, 2014; Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004a).

2.3. The relationship between employee onboarding and employee engagement

There is a general agreement that solid onboarding strategy helps with engaging new employees, as well as engagement issues throughout an employee's tenure (e.g., Lavigna, 2009; SHRM, 2012; Stein & Christiansen, 2010). As plastically explained by Gallup (2016), if new employees are not welcomed like rock stars, their experiential disappointment could lead to

low engagement and seeking out a new opportunity. However, according to Saks and Gruman (2018), as already highlighted, not enough attention has been given to this relationship.

Moreover, existing studies exploring the relationship between onboarding and employee engagement are often limited in their scope. For instance, Nigah et al. (2012) explored the impact of a buddy. They found that employees who reported more satisfaction with buddying reported greater levels of work engagement. Saks and Gruman (2018) accentuate the supervisor's support. They explain that supervisor's support is especially important for newcomers' work engagement because supervisors can provide a variety of resources that are important for engagement, such as challenging work assignments, opportunities for growth and development, and positive feedback and recognition. Related to the length of onboarding process, SHRM (2012) reports that studies demonstrate that the new employee's treatment and orientation during the first 30 to 90 days of employment is the most relevant period for their later engagement. Nguyen et al.'s (2020) study on the relevance of institutionalized onboarding tactics showed that institutionalized approach can increase employees' engagement to work.

All the above implies that the assumption that more structured onboarding programs, which enable better integration of new employees into their jobs and the organizational culture, result in more engaged employees (e.g., Booz Allen Hamilton, 2008; Gomes & Sousa, 2023; Stein & Christiansen, 2010), has to be thoroughly explored. This relationship should be verified empirically, as scientific agreement could not be achieved by using only general impressions of practitioners. Moreover, previous research has predominantly explored the relationship between specific onboarding aspects (such as the role of various onboarding stakeholders) and employees' engagement levels, but not the significance of the onboarding as a comprehensive process that includes both orientation and socialization elements, in other words, the role of a structured onboarding process. Accordingly, we pose the following hypothesis: H = A structured onboarding process is positively related to employee engagement. However, since previous research has not problematized the role of onboarding for various dimension of employee engagement, we also pose the following research question: RQ = Is a structured onboarding process more relevant for dimensions of some employee engagement than for others?

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Instruments

The questionnaire for collecting data, which was anonymous, consisted of three parts. For assessing the structuredness of the onboarding process, we used the 'Onboarding Assessment Survey' developed by Baker and DiPiro (2019), which assesses the respondents' onboarding experience with the necessary components of the onboarding process identified by the authors. The instrument covers four areas that the authors believe constitute a structured onboarding: consistent communication of expectations, a timely onboarding schedule, provision of onboarding resources and the establishment of a mentor relationship. It is a 10-item one-factor self-report scale, and the respondents evaluate their agreement with the items on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), which indicates the level of perceived structuredness of the onboarding process. The sample items are "I received an itinerary outlining my first day, which included parking and the name of my departmental point-person." and "I was provided a mentor who was available to assist me when needed." A higher mean value of 10 evaluations represents a perception of a higher level of structured onboarding process being present (independent variable).

To assess employee engagement, we used the 'Utrecht Work Engagement Scale – UWES', which was developed by Schaufeli et al. in 2002, specifically a UWES-17 version (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004b). This is a 17-item three-factor self-report scale which measures both the total engagement and three engagement dimensions: (1) vigour (6 items; e.g., "I can continue working for very long periods at a time."), (2) dedication (5 items; e.g., "I am proud on the work that I do.") and (3) absorption (6 items; e.g., "I get carried away when I'm working."). Respondents evaluate how they feel at work on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always/every day). A higher mean value of respondent's evaluations represents a higher level of four self-reported employee engagement indicators – three engagement dimensions indicators and total engagement indicator (dependent variables).

Finally, to control the role of socio-demographic variables, the questionnaire collected six demographic and background information – gender, age, educational level, length of service, hierarchical level, and sector (control variables).

3.2. Data collection and sample

A snowball sampling was used to identify and reach respondents, starting with the authors' busi-

TABLE 1 Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and Pearson correlation coefficients for the relation between structured onboarding and engagement indicators

Constructs	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1 Structured onboarding	3.61	0.95	(.912)				
2 Vigour	5.00	1.19	.360***	(.883)			
3 Dedication	5.23	1.41	.371***	.783***	(.919)		
4 Absorption	5.21	1.06	.199***	.718***	.664***	(.828)	
5 Total engagement	5.14	1.09	.347***	.928***	.908***	.871***	(.942)

NOTE: Cronbach’s a shown in brackets; *** $p < .001$

ness contacts. The only requirement was that respondents worked for the current employer for at least 6 months, as we assumed that both onboarding experience and employee engagement take time to happen/develop. The data were collected from Croatian employees in March 2021.

The sample consists of 622 respondents of both genders (80.4 female; 19.6 male), from various age groups ($M = 36.92$; $\text{min} = 23$; $\text{max} = 65$) and educational levels (secondary school degree = 19%; undergraduate degree = 12.6%; graduate degree = 52.3%; postgraduate degree = 16.1%), with different length of service*** ($M = 12.35$ years; $\text{min} = 6$ months; $\text{max} = 45$ years) and coming from various hierarchical levels (non-managerial position = 70.1%; lower managerial position = 16.9%; higher managerial position 13%) and sectors (private = 56.4%, public = 37.6%, non-profit = 3.9%, mixed = 2.1%).

3.3. Data analysis

We first explored the relationship between the concepts using correlation analysis. Since the dependent variables were significantly correlated with each other and with the independent variable, we then performed a linear multiple regression analysis. To test the effect of control variables on dependent variables, we used Pearson correlation coefficient calculations and non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney U-tests or Kruskal-Wallis H-tests). The Kruskal-Wallis H-tests showed that the sector was unrelated to all dependent variables and were therefore excluded from regression analyses. Other socio-demographic variables implied statistically significant differences between the groups (gender, educational level and

hierarchical level) or were statistically significantly correlated (age and length of service) with some dependent variables, and were therefore retained in corresponding regression analyses. The statistical software package IBM SPSS Statistics 23 was used for the data analysis.

4. RESULTS

Table 1 shows that respondents rated their employer’s onboarding practices as moderately to well structured ($M = 3.61$ on a scale from 1 to 5), that they are more engaged ($5.00 < M < 5.23$ on a scale from 1 to 7) and that data are suitable for regression analysis as all explored variables are statistically significantly interrelated ($p < .001$).

Table 2 depicts the results of four regression analyses performed, with selected socio-demographic variables (those detected significantly correlated/related with specific engagement indicators) and structured onboarding as independent variables, engagement dimensions and total engagement as dependent variables. As can be seen from the table, all regression models are significant ($p < .001$) and 12.5 to 18.7% of the variance in respondents’ engagement when measured by engagement dimensions and 17.3% of the variance in respondents’ total engagement are explained by the perceived level of structured onboarding. Next, the results indicate that the perceived level of the structured onboarding process is statistically significantly positively related with all three engagement dimensions and total engagement. Finally, regression results indicate that gender and hierarchical level are statistically significantly related with the intensity of all explored engagement indicators, while educational level and length of service are statistically significantly related with the intensity of absorption as an engagement dimension. However, beta coefficients ($.226 < \beta < .373$) reveal that struc-

*** Various lengths of service were accepted as previous research revealed that employee engagement is related to the onboarding experienced during the first one to three months of employment (SHRM, 2012).

TABLE 2 Multiple linear regression analyses for structured onboarding predicting engagement dimensions and total engagement

	Vigor		Dedication		Absorption		Total engagement	
	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t
(Constant)		5.382***		6.847***		7.719***		6.768***
Gender	.089	2.424*	.087	2.358*	.180	4.715***	.131	3.529***
Age	-.025	-.259	/	/	-.200	-1.909	-.057	-.576
Educational level	/	/	/	/	.147	3.665***	/	/
Length of service	.173	1.771	/	/	.345	3.283**	.177	1.800
Hierarchical level	.167	4.565***	.124	3.365**	.100	2.618**	.147	4.002***
Structured onboarding	.370	9.998***	.373	10.114***	.226	5.812***	.354	9.492***
F-test value	28.163***		39.049***		14.515***		25.631***	
R ²	.187		.159		.125		.173	

NOTE: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

tured onboarding is more relevant for employee engagement in total and by dimensions than socio-demographic variables explored ($.087 < \beta < .189$, with the exception of $\beta = .345$ of the length of service).

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Theoretical implications

Considering the relevance of the topic, studies on the relationship between onboarding and employee engagement are insufficient. Our research therefore adds to the body of knowledge in the area by empirically proving the hypothesized relationship. Precisely, both the correlation and regression analysis show the statistically significant proportional relationship ($p < .001$) between the structured onboarding process and employee engagement overall and in the individual, thus supporting the proposed hypothesis. This finding is in line with Booz Allen Hamilton's (2008) recommendation that organizations should use the onboarding process strategically, as well as with Gallup's (2016) conclusion that throwing new hires into work immediately without proper onboarding puts an early strain on the employee-employer relationship (which includes employee engagement).

Next, as there were no previous studies investigating the relationship between the structured onboarding process and various dimensions of employee engagement, our study opens the discussion in this area. Our research provides a positive answer to the research question of whether the structured

onboarding is more relevant for some employee engagement dimensions than for others. Namely, when looking at correlation and beta coefficient values, the structured onboarding was revealed to be more relevant for employee's dedication to their work ($r = .371$; $\beta = .373$). At the same time, correlation and beta coefficient values indicate that the structured onboarding is less relevant for employee onboarding ($r = .199$; $\beta = .226$). The results presented are interesting considering that vigour presents a physical-energetic, dedication, an emotional absorption and a cognitive component of engagement, or put differently, vigour corresponds to an employee energy, dedication to an employee persistence and absorption to an employee focus (Schaufelli, 2013). This explicitly implies that a structured onboarding is more relevant for an employee's emotional involvement and persistence at work than their cognitive involvement and focus during work.

Finally, our research underscores the need for an interactionist perspective in the organizational setting, as employee engagement (individual behaviour) was found to be a function of a structured onboarding process (organizational practice). As Nguyen et al. (2020) explain, what happens in work settings is not the result of the organization's practice or the individual efforts, but the outcome of their interaction, which our findings support as well.

5.2. Implications for practice

The theoretical part of our paper underlines that onboarding, as the process of "integrating new em-

ployees into an organization and equipping them to succeed" (Lavigna, 2009, p. 65) is important for employee and organizational performance in general, and employee engagement in particular. In general, as Bauer (2010) advises, the sooner new hires feel welcome and prepared for their jobs, the sooner they will be able to successfully contribute to the organization's mission. Organizations and HR practitioners should be particularly aware of the importance of a well-structured onboarding process for the engagement of employees afterwards. The fact that onboarding is one of the most challenging areas of talent management when it comes to discerning the ROI should not discourage organizations from adopting a new approach to onboarding — one that both engages new hires and drives business results (Laurano, 2013).

The empirical part of our paper implies that the priority of HR professionals should be to convince upper management of the strategic importance of proper onboarding (SHRM, 2012). By proper onboarding, we mean a well-structured onboarding process that is the consequence of attentive reflection and comprehensive integration of all relevant onboarding elements.

5.3. Limitation and future research

A common limitation of field research, including ours, stems from the operationalization of the concepts explored. While the employee engagement concept was operationalized through "UWES-17", a validated and widely used construct (Bakker et al., 2008) in more than 20 languages (De Bruin et al., 2013), the "Onboarding Assessment Survey" which was used to operationalize the structuredness of the onboarding process, is a less used but most readily available correlate construct of the concept (Regul Erent Ondrušek, 2021). Further limitations related to the operationalization of the concepts are: the usage of self-reports, which raises the issue of socially desirable responses (self-reports used to assess both the independent and the dependent variables) and a common source bias (structured onboarding and employee engagement were measured from the same source). However, the subjective nature of both concepts, the anonymity of the respondents and the high reliability of both scales used, mitigate concerns over these issues. Another limitation of our study is that the respondents evaluated the onboarding processes they had gone through in the past, while reporting on their engagement in the present. This is a legitimate research design from a theoretical perspective, but excludes the potential impact of other organizational, group, or individual variables on employee engagement.

Based on the above, it is recommended that future research consider developing a more appropriate instrument to measure the structuredness of the onboarding process. Next, although the socialization part of onboarding is a matter of employee experience, future research could use only objective indicators of onboarding, such as onboarding components, length of onboarding, stakeholders involved, etc., to avoid a common method variance. Finally, the longitudinal or experimental research design should be recognized to investigate whether employees respond to a structured onboarding with more engagement, in other words, to determine the causality between the structured onboarding process and employee engagement.

6. CONCLUSION

Our research contributes to the discussion on the relationship between the quality of the onboarding process and the resulting engagement of new employees. Our empirical findings suggest that the perceived level of the structured onboarding process is proportional to employee engagement and that the dimensions of employee engagement are more important for employee engagement and less important for employee absorption.

References

1. Agarwal, U. A. (2014). Linking justice, trust and innovative work behaviour to work engagement. *Personnel Review*, 43(1), 41-73. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2012-0019>
2. Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the Workplace: A Reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48(2), 97-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679504800201>
3. Baker, B., & DiPiro, J. (2019). Evaluation of a Structured Onboarding Process and Tool for Faculty Members in a School of Pharmacy. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 83(6), 1233-1238. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7100>
4. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476>
5. Bakker, A. B., & Hakanen, J. J. (2013). Work engagement among public and private sector dentists. In: R. J. Burke, A. J. Noblet & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Human Resource Management in the Public Sector* (pp. 109-131), Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
6. Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649>
7. Bauer, T. N. (2010). *Onboarding New Employees: Maximizing Success*, Society for Human Resource Management [EPub]. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org/foundation/ourwork/initiatives/resources-from-past-initiatives/Documents/Onboarding%20New%20Employees.pdf>
8. Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: A meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes, and methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 707-721. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.707>
9. Biswas, S., & Bhatnagar, J. (2013). Mediator Analysis of Employee Engagement: Role of Perceived Organisational Support, P-O Fit, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, 38(1), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0256090920130103>
10. Booz Allen Hamilton (2008), *Getting On Board: A Model for Integrating and Engaging New Employees* [EPub]. Retrieved from [https://www.opm.gov/wiki/uploads/docs/Wiki/OPM/training/Getting_On_Board__A_Model_for_Integrating_and_Engaging_New_Employees-\[2008.05.12\].pdf](https://www.opm.gov/wiki/uploads/docs/Wiki/OPM/training/Getting_On_Board__A_Model_for_Integrating_and_Engaging_New_Employees-[2008.05.12].pdf)
11. Brunetto, Y., Teo, S. T. T., Shacklock, K., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement: explaining organisational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(4), 428-441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2012.00198.x>
12. Cable, D. M., Gino, F., & Staats, B. R. (2013). Breaking Them In or Eliciting Their Best? Reframing Socialization around Newcomers' Authentic Self-Expression. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(1), 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839213477098>
13. Chughtai, A. A., & Buckley, F. (2011). Work Engagement: Antecedents, the Mediating Role of Learning Goal Orientation and Job Performance. *Career Development International*, 16(7), 684-705. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431111187290>
14. De Bruin, G., P., Hill, C., Henn, C., M., & Muller, K. (2013). Dimensionality of the UWES-17: An item response modeling analysis. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(2), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i2.1148>
15. Gallup (2016). Why the Onboarding Experience is Key for Retention. Retrieved January 23, 2023, from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/235121/why-onboarding-experience-key-retention.aspx#:~:text=Gallup%20finds%20that%20only%2012,can%20make%20or%20break%20retention>
16. Gomes, R., & Sousa, D. (2023). The relevance of structured onboarding in the assimilation of organizational culture. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 18(1), 690-697. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.1.0659>
17. Griffin, E. (2012). *A First Look at Communication Theory* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
18. Gruman, J., & Saks, A. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 123-136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmmr.2010.09.004>
19. Guy, M. E., & Newman, M. A. (2013). Emotional labor, job satisfaction and burnout: how each affects the other. In: R. J. Burke, A. J. Noblet & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Human Resource Management in the Public Sector* (pp. 132-150), Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
20. Harter, J. K., & Schmidt, F. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>
21. Høigaard, R., Giske, R., & Sundslø, K. (2012). Newly qualified teachers' work engagement and teacher efficacy influences on job satisfaction, burnout, and the intention to quit. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(3), 347-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649>

- /10.1080/02619768.2011.633993
22. Ibrahim, M., & Al Falasi, S. (2014). Employee loyalty and engagement in UAE public sector. *Employee Relations*, 36(5), 562-582. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-07-2013-0098>
 23. Jahya, A., Alias, N. E., Othman, R., & Romaiha, N. R. (2019). A Three-Factor Model of Organizational Socialization Tactics: Impact on Job Satisfaction among Engineers in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(9), 663-675. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v9-ig/6342>
 24. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256287>
 25. Klein, H. J., & Weaver, N. A. (2000). The Effectiveness of an Organizational-Level Orientation Training Program in the Socialization of New Hires. *Personnel Psychology*, 53(1), 47-66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb00193.x>
 26. Kyoung Park, Y., Hoon Song, J., Won Yoon, S., & Kim, J. (2014). Learning organization and innovative behaviour: The mediating effect of work engagement. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 38(1/2), 75-94. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-04-2013-0040>
 27. Laurano, M. (2013). *Onboarding 2013: A New Look at New Hires*, Aberdeen Group [Epub]. Retrieved from <https://deliberatepractice.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Onboarding-2013.pdf>
 28. Lavigna, B. (2009). Getting Onboard: Integrating and Engaging New Employees. *Government Finance Review*, 25(3), 65-70.
 29. Nguyen, T. N. T., Bui, T. H. T., & Nguyen, T. H. H. (2020). Improving employees' proactive behaviors at work: The role of organizational socialization tactics and work engagement. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 31(6), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2020.1803172>
 30. Nigah, N., Davis, A. J., & Hurrell, S. A. (2012). The Impact of Buddying on Psychological Capital and Work Engagement: An Empirical Study of Socialization in the Professional Services Sector. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 54(6), 891-905. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.21510>
 31. Regul Erent Ondrušek, V. (2021). *Povezanost programa uvođenja u posao s random angažiranošću zaposlenika [The relationship between onboarding programs and employee work engagement]* (Specialist postgraduate thesis). Faculty of Economics & Business – Zagreb, Zagreb.
 32. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
 33. Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2011). Getting newcomers engaged: the role of socialization tactics. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(5), 383-402. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111139001>
 34. Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2018). Socialization resources theory and newcomers' work engagement: A new pathway to newcomer socialization. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 12-32. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-12-2016-0214>
 35. Schaufeli, W. (2013). What is engagement? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice* (pp. 15-35). London: Routledge.
 36. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004a). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
 37. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. (2004b). *UWES – Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Preliminary Manual* [Epub]. Retrieved from https://www.willemarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/Test%20Manuals/Test_manual_UWES_English.pdf
 38. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
 39. SHRM (2012). *Managing the Employee Onboarding and Assimilation Process*, Society of Human Resources Management, Retrieved January 23, 2023, from <http://mgt2210.pbworks.com/w/file/57726478/Managing%20the%20Employee%20Onboarding%20and%20Assimilation%20Process.pdf>
 40. Stein, M. A., & Christiansen, L. (2010). *Successful onboarding: A Strategy to Unlock Hidden Value Within Your Organization*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
 41. Timms, C., & Brough, P. (2013). "I like being a teacher": Career satisfaction, the work environment and work engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(6), 768-789. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-06-2012-0072>
 42. Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
 43. Wefald, A. J., & Downey, R. G. (2009). Construct dimensionality of engagement and its relation with satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(1), 91-111. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.143.1.91-112>

44. Yang, J.-T. (2008). Effect of newcomer socialisation on organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in the hotel industry. *The Service Industries Journal*, 28(4), 429-443, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060801917430>

JE LI ANGAŽIRAN ONBOARDING VAŽAN ZA ANGAŽIRANI RAD?

ODNOS IZMEĐU STRUKTURIRANOG ONBOARDINGA I ANGAŽIRANOSTI ZAPOSLENIKA

SAŽETAK

Rad istražuje odnos između strukturiranog onboarding procesa i rezultirajuće angažiranosti zaposlenika, s obzirom na to da se većina istraživanja onboarding procesa usredotočuje na druge ishode. Predložena hipoteza glasila je: „Strukturirani onboarding proces pozitivno je povezan s angažiranošću zaposlenika“, dok je istraživačko pitanje bilo: „Je li strukturirani onboarding proces relevantniji za neke dimenzije angažiranosti zaposlenika nego za druge?“

Za procjenu onboarding procesa korištena je anketa „Onboarding Assessment Survey“, koju su razvili Baker i DiPiro (2019.), dok je za procjenu angažiranosti zaposlenika korištena „Utrecht Work Engagement Scale“ (UWES-17), koju su razvili Schaufeli i Bakker (2004b).

Na temelju uzorka od 622 ispitanika i primjenom korelacijske i višestruke regresijske analize otkriveno je da je strukturirani onboarding proces statistički značajno pozitivno povezan s ukupnom angažiranošću zaposlenika te s pojedinačnim dimenzijama angažiranosti. Što se tiče dimenzija angažiranosti zaposlenika, također je utvrđeno da je strukturirani onboarding proces snažnije povezan s posvećenošću zaposlenika, dok je slabije povezan s njihovom apsorpcijom u rad.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: *onboarding zaposlenika; strukturirani onboarding; angažiranost zaposlenika; energija; posvećenost; apsorpcija*

