

**Digital onboarding and employee outcomes: empirical evidence from the UK**

SANI, Kareem, ADISA, Toyin, ADEKOYA, Olatunji <<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4785-4129>> and ORUH, Emeka

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/30719/>

---

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

**Published version**

SANI, Kareem, ADISA, Toyin, ADEKOYA, Olatunji and ORUH, Emeka (2022). Digital onboarding and employee outcomes: empirical evidence from the UK. *Management Decision*.

---

**Copyright and re-use policy**

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>



**Digital Onboarding and Employee Outcomes: Empirical Evidence from the UK**

Journal:	<i>Management Decision</i>
Manuscript ID	MD-11-2021-1528.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Digital onboarding, New hires, Covid-19, Organisational socialisation

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 ABSTRACT:  
4

5 Given the sharp rise in the adoption of digital onboarding in employment relations and human  
6 resource management practices, largely caused by the continuing COVID-19 pandemic, this study  
7 explores the impact of digital onboarding on employees' wellbeing, engagement level,  
8 performance, and overall outcomes.  
9

10 This study uses an interpretive qualitative research methodology, undertaking semi-structured  
11 interviews with 28 participants working in the UK services industry.  
12

13 The study finds that digital onboarding has a significant impact on employee outcomes, following the  
14 perceptions of 'dwindling social connectedness and personal wellbeing', 'meaningful and  
15 meaningless work', and 'poor employee relations' among employees and their employers  
16 in the workplace.  
17  
18

19 CUST\_RESEARCH\_LIMITATIONS/IMPLICATIONS\_\_(LIMIT\_100\_WORDS) :No data available.  
20

21 Due to the increased adoption of digital onboarding, human resource teams must focus on having  
22 considerable human interaction with new hires, even if it means adopting a hybrid approach to  
23 onboarding. Human resource teams must ensure that they work together with line managers to  
24 promote a welcoming culture for new hires and facilitate organisation-driven socialisation tactics  
25 and 'quality' information necessary for supporting new employees. For new employees,  
26 besides acquiring the essential digital skills for the workplace, they must accept the changing digital  
27 landscape in order to practice effective communication and align with their organisation's goals  
28 and values.  
29  
30

31 CUST\_SOCIAL\_IMPLICATIONS\_\_(LIMIT\_100\_WORDS) :No data available.  
32

33 Qualitative research on the influence of digital onboarding on employee outcomes is limited, with  
34 much of the research yet to substantially consider the impact of digitalisation on the human  
35 resource function of onboarding employees as full members of an organisation.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Digital onboarding and employee outcomes: Empirical evidence from the UK

### Abstract

**Purpose** – Given the sharp rise in the adoption of digital onboarding in employment relations and human resource management practices, largely caused by the continuing COVID-19 pandemic, this study explores the impact of digital onboarding on employees' wellbeing, engagement level, performance, and overall outcomes.

**Design/methodology/approach** – This study uses an interpretive qualitative research methodology, undertaking semi-structured interviews with 28 participants working in the UK services industry.

**Findings** – The study finds that digital onboarding has a significant impact on employee outcomes, following the perceptions of 'dwindling social connectedness and personal wellbeing', 'meaningful and meaningless work', and 'poor employee relations' among employees and their employers in the workplace.

**Practical implications** – Due to the increased adoption of digital onboarding, human resources teams must focus on having considerable human interaction with new hires, even if this means adopting a hybrid approach to onboarding. Human resources teams must ensure that they work together with line managers to promote a welcoming culture for new hires and facilitate organisation-driven socialisation tactics and the 'quality' information necessary for supporting new employees. For new employees, besides acquiring the digital skills that are essential in the workplace, they must accept the changing digital landscape in order to practice effective communication and align their goals and values with those of their organisation.

**Originality/value** – Qualitative research on the influence of digital onboarding on employee outcomes is limited, with much of the research yet to substantially consider the impact of digitalisation on the human resources function of onboarding employees as full members of an organisation.

**Keywords:** COVID-19, digital onboarding, new hires, organisational socialisation

## Introduction

The discourse on employee outcomes has always generated contentious debate among stakeholders, specifically scholars and practitioners. This contentiousness has only intensified during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which has triggered an unprecedented rise (among organisations) in digital onboarding (among other technological adaptations) (Lund et al., 2021). Broadly speaking, digital onboarding entails the digitalisation of the human resources management (HRM) practice of onboarding by leveraging digital technology to help new hires to adjust and integrate into an organisation (Maurer, 2020). It is therefore important to establish the possible implications of this rise in digital onboarding on employee wellbeing, engagement, performance, and overall outcomes.

Consequently, the rise in digital onboarding is considered to have significant implications for new job starters and those changing jobs (Lund et al., 2021). This is due to the digitalisation of HRM practices, which allows organisations to use digital technology to recruit and onboard new employees into organisations. Thus, using digital technologies, organisations can effectively integrate new employees and familiarise them with their organisational culture, processes, and job roles (Chillakuri, 2020). Digital onboarding is not an entirely new human resources (HR) practice that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic – organisations have previously exploited the approach to manage new hires, especially geographically dispersed ones. However, its adoption has increased significantly during the pandemic (Goodermote, 2020).

It is against this backdrop that this article explores the impact of the increased adoption of digital onboarding on employee outcomes in the UK. This increase is due to the changing structures perceived to have been built to onboard new hires and bolster positive employee experiences for most employees who undergo digital onboarding. Furthermore, we focus on employees in the UK services industry, since the rising adoption of digital communication

1  
2  
3 technologies not only increase client engagement but also foster quicker work processes within  
4 organisations in this industry. The study aims to address a fundamental question: How has the  
5 increased adoption of digital onboarding affected employee outcomes in the UK? This study  
6 therefore contributes to the field by providing qualitative evidence (the participants' lived  
7 experiences) that advances knowledge on whether digital onboarding affects employee  
8 outcomes (positively or negatively).  
9

10  
11 Furthermore, it is important to note that because this study was carried out during the COVID-  
12 19 pandemic, the study findings account for the experiences of the study participants who, as  
13 a result of the social-distancing rules during the pandemic, were largely subjected to a virtual  
14 (digital) onboarding experience. Therefore, it is not the aim of this study to focus on the effects  
15 of the COVID-19 pandemic on digital onboarding in depth. Rather, its aim is to observe the  
16 pandemic as a reagent leading to the increased adoption of digital onboarding. As a result, it  
17 also has research-related implications on the adoption of digital onboarding in the case of the  
18 increasing regularity of remote working post-COVID-19.  
19

20  
21 The article is structured as follows. The first section presents a review of the extant literature  
22 and is followed by a description of the interpretivist research methodology used herein.  
23 Thereafter, the findings and a discussion thereof are presented. The study concludes by  
24 outlining the research implications and acknowledging its limitations, including some  
25 suggestions for future research.  
26

### 27 **Digital onboarding, organisational socialisation, and employee outcomes**

28  
29 Onboarding is an HR routine of introducing new employees into their job roles and  
30 familiarising them with an organisation's culture, goals, values, rules, and processes (Cable et  
31 al., 2013). Digital onboarding is inspired by digital transformation in the workplace, which  
32 reinforces the need for digital organisations by using technology to gain a competitive  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 advantage, transforming business processes, and creating value that increases business revenue  
4 (Bajer, 2017). The goal of digital onboarding is to create a virtual experience for employees to  
5 quickly become absorbed into the organisation in order to make a contribution to the overall  
6 business objectives. Moreover, using digital technologies for onboarding facilitates different  
7 forms of dynamic capabilities that are suitable for difficult situations (Bharadwaj et al., 2013),  
8 such as the COVID-19 pandemic. For instance, digital onboarding during the COVID-19  
9 pandemic has affected organisational dynamics – a continuous process of enhancing resources  
10 and employee performance through organisational learning, particularly with regard to how  
11 employees and employers react and behave towards each other (Turner, 2019; Lund et al.,  
12 2021). Moreover, the rapidly increasing adoption of digital onboarding due to social-distancing  
13 measures (e.g. remote working) means that digital onboarding appears to be the most viable  
14 option for organisations to continue operating and for employees to continue working.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 The terms ‘organisational socialisation’ and ‘onboarding’ have been used interchangeably in  
32 many studies (Chao, 2012; Klein and Polin, 2012). However, Chao (2012) argues that the  
33 unclear distinction between the two terms diminishes the uniqueness of the conceptualisations  
34 of each term: socialisation is more individualised and requires individual effort, whereas  
35 onboarding is an organisational effort to facilitate employee socialisation. Therefore, Chao  
36 (2012) defines socialisation as the learning and adjustment process that enables an individual  
37 to assume an organisational role that fits both organisational and individual needs’ Eberl et al.  
38 (2012) emphasises that the learning process is ‘social’, enabling the acquisition of the social  
39 knowledge and skills needed to understand an organisation’s cultural values and norms; to  
40 undertake a particular job role; and to be accepted as a member of the organisation. In this vein,  
41 the digital onboarding process can help the socialisation of new employees when there are  
42 adequate amounts of organisational, social, and personal resources to help them learn the  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 attitudes, skills, and behaviours required to function effectively in their new work environment  
4  
5 with the aid of digital technologies (Kowtha, 2018).  
6  
7

8  
9 Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) typology of socialisation tactics remains one of the most  
10  
11 widely used socialisation models, and it is divided into six socialisation tactics. Jones (1986)  
12  
13 further categorised these socialisation tactics into two clusters. First, institutionalised  
14  
15 socialisation, bordering on the formalised and structured socialisation process, involves  
16  
17 collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and investiture tactics. Second, individualised  
18  
19 socialisation, which lacks structure, means that new hires experience neglect and are left to  
20  
21 determine their success or failure at adjusting to the organisation on their own. This approach  
22  
23 involves individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive, and divestiture tactics.  
24  
25 Consequently, Ashforth et al. (2007) argue that the neglect arising from individualised  
26  
27 socialisation may motivate innovativeness among new employees but may also engender a  
28  
29 feeling of abandonment and role ambiguity, leading to adjustment difficulties. Moreover,  
30  
31 organisational socialisation often produces anxiety for new hires, who are likely to experience  
32  
33 a 'reality shock', especially those who find the socialisation process challenging (Kodama,  
34  
35 2017). Within the present context, we envisage significant implications for new employees  
36  
37 who have had experience with digital onboarding and may find it difficult to establish a  
38  
39 'normal' social interaction with organisational members since onboarding takes place virtually,  
40  
41 especially within a difficult situation like the COVID-19 pandemic.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Organisational socialisation has several implications for employee experience and outcomes,  
50  
51 particularly with regard to the automated onboarding process (Snell, 2006). In terms of the  
52  
53 transformation from a traditional to digital onboarding experience, new hires are expected to  
54  
55 encounter a timely and consistent socialisation experience. The extant research has revealed  
56  
57 that socialisation yields positive employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction, motivation,  
58  
59 reduced turnover intentions, organisational commitment, and improved job performance (Eberl  
60



1  
2  
3 et al., 2012; Phillips et al., 2015). In contrast, employee characteristics (e.g. personality and  
4 self-identity) may generate negative experiences for new hires. For instance, an introverted  
5 individual may find it overwhelming and uncomfortable communicating with a group during  
6 the socialisation process. Likewise, new hires may feel that some organisational members do  
7 not approve of their self-identity or values, thereby undermining adjustment (Phillips et al.,  
8 2015). Therefore, Gruman and Saks (2018) proposed a hybrid approach to onboarding for  
9 effective organisational socialisation, requiring a proportionate mixture of in-person and virtual  
10 onboarding activities. Moreover, within the present context, we envisage that digital  
11 onboarding may trigger several outcomes for new employees. Against this backdrop, it is  
12 important to explore the employee outcomes of the digital onboarding experience of new  
13 employees.

## 29 **Methodology**

### 32 ***Research approach and data collection***

34 This study adopts a qualitative method in order to explore the participants' lived experiences  
35 and provide rich insights into the researched phenomenon (Saunders et al., 2019). Using the  
36 qualitative method allows us to explore the subjective knowledge and choices related to the  
37 participants' lived experiences in depth by asking the participants to give detailed accounts of  
38 their digital onboarding experiences and the impacts thereof. Moreover, the qualitative method  
39 complements prior research on digital onboarding, most of which has adopted quantitative  
40 methods, which lack the ability to investigate the participants' responses in depth. Furthermore,  
41 the study is guided by interpretivism, allowing us to discover rich narratives from individuals'  
42 lived experiences (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). Although some studies have used the  
43 qualitative method and interpretive approach to explore onboarding (e.g. Chillakuri et al.,  
44 2020), there are not many studies that have explored digital onboarding using the interpretive  
45 research approach. Although qualitative and interpretive research lacks generalisability  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Saunders et al., 2019), this study's goal is not to clarify reality or a particular truth; instead,  
4  
5 the methods help us gather in-depth descriptions and subjective views of the participants with  
6  
7 the intention of understanding the impact of digital onboarding on employee outcomes.  
8  
9

10 Data collection from employees in the UK services industry occurred between April and July  
11  
12 2021 through cloud-based video conferencing applications (e.g. Zoom and Microsoft Teams).  
13  
14 This communication medium was deemed appropriate due to the social-distancing measures in  
15  
16 place across the country due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The study used semi-structured  
17  
18 interviews to obtain information from the participants. This method allowed us to ask some  
19  
20 pre-set open-ended questions, allowing the participants to express their views on the subject in  
21  
22 a detailed manner (Given, 2008). We applied the snowballing sampling technique to recruit  
23  
24 even more participants based on the referrals of the initial participants whom we contacted  
25  
26 (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). The snowballing method was deemed fit for recruiting the  
27  
28 participants due to the difficulty of reaching them (specifically, due to the inclusion and  
29  
30 exclusion selection criteria). Supported by Saunders et al. (2019), we depended on the initial  
31  
32 research participants to nominate some of their acquaintances that would fit this study's line of  
33  
34 inquiry.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 The inclusion and exclusion criteria were based on two characteristics. First, the participants  
42  
43 were required to be new hires, including those who have recently moved jobs within the last  
44  
45 year. Second, the participants were required to have recently gone through or be going through  
46  
47 a digital onboarding process. This screening process helped us improve the validity and  
48  
49 reliability of the research by recruiting participants with first-hand knowledge about the studied  
50  
51 phenomenon (Gioia et al., 2013). On average, the participants started their new jobs seven  
52  
53 months prior to being interviewed for this research, and on average, their onboarding  
54  
55 programmes took 12 weeks to complete. It should be noted that the scope of this study does  
56  
57 not include an assessment of the technology used, such as the specific ICT artefact/system that  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sustains the virtual onboarding process. Instead, the study investigates the employee outcomes  
4 based on the managerial practice of onboarding new hires virtually without the requirement to  
5 be physically present at the company's premises. Furthermore, we have obtained, through the  
6 data, a 'snapshot' of the impacts of digital onboarding on employees' wellbeing, engagement  
7 levels, performance, and overall outcomes. It is therefore important to note that generalisability  
8 is not a relevant criterion for qualitative research. According to Carminati (2018), the purpose  
9 of qualitative research is to provide in-depth explanations and meaning rather than to generalise  
10 findings. Future research may consider using a quantitative research method that has the  
11 capacity to cover the wider services industry.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 **Insert Table 1 about here**

26  
27 The semi-structured interviews lasted an average of 45 minutes, and pseudonyms have been  
28 used to conceal the participants' real identities (Saunders et al., 2019), as we assured the  
29 participants in the consent/participation form. The interviewing continued until data saturation  
30 was achieved – the point at which no new information, themes, or experiences were being  
31 discovered (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). A total of twenty-eight semi-structured interviews  
32 (17 males, 11 females) aged between 20 and 45 years old were conducted (see Table 1 for  
33 detailed demographic information). The interviews began with open-ended questions. For  
34 instance, the participants were asked: How did you feel going through a digital onboarding  
35 process? Considering your digital onboarding experience, how quickly were you able to adjust  
36 to and understand the new work environment and organisational culture? Then, the interviews  
37 progressed into more specific questions relating to the participants' experiences of digital  
38 onboarding. Some of the specific questions included: What were the outcomes of your digital  
39 onboarding experience on your learning and development? How do you think your virtual  
40 interaction experiences helped in developing a social understanding of your organisation? What  
41 are the effects (positive and negative) of socialising online compared to in-person interaction?  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 These questions enabled us to investigate, interpret, and understand the participants' digital  
4 onboarding experiences. Ultimately, this approach provided insights regarding the employee  
5  
6 outcomes associated with digital onboarding experiences.  
7  
8  
9

### 10 ***Data analysis***

11  
12 Following the data collection, the interviews were transcribed and analysed using the thematic  
13 analysis procedure (TAP), a qualitative analysis tool used for identifying, analysing, and  
14 reporting patterns or themes within datasets (Braun et al., 2014). We adopted the three stages  
15 of TAP used by Pratt et al. (2006). In the first stage, all the information that was transcribed  
16 was compiled into one set. Next, the initial concepts were highlighted, using the language that  
17 was initially used by the participants. Then, in deriving first-order codes, we used an open-  
18 coding system by separating and fragmenting the data into meaningful expressions by creating  
19 two-letter words or simple descriptive phrases that captured the interview extracts, all of which  
20 related to the key research objective. For instance, there are provisional descriptions from the  
21 data excerpts (such as individual personality; isolation; first impression; comfort and wellness;  
22 workplace hostility; and intimidation and bullying). The process continued to the second stage  
23 of the analysis (see Table 2).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 After consolidating the first-order codes that emerged from the datasets, we began the process  
42 of creating theoretical categories (see Table 2), which is the second stage of the TAP (Pratt et  
43 al., 2006). Then, we combined the related patterns and concepts to ensure they were truly  
44 representative of the participants' viewpoints by repeatedly reviewing the data. In the final  
45 stage, all the conceptual categories were combined to generate theoretical explanations of the  
46 studied phenomenon. Then, all the authors' results were compared for the purpose of  
47 investigator triangulation (Saunders et al., 2019). We then developed the themes by jointly  
48 reviewing and merging the overlapping themes. The themes were re-confirmed, and existing  
49 themes were modified; thus, the final themes were established (see Table 2).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We followed the validity procedure suggested by Hayashi et al. (2019) during the data analysis  
4 process. First, descriptive validity was ascertained by avoiding any distortion to the data that  
5 was collected and by ensuring that data was transcribed verbatim. Second, interpretive validity  
6 took place by conducting member checks. For instance, we contacted the participants to clarify  
7 any discrepancies in the interpretations of their responses and to enable the participants to  
8 determine the extent to which they felt that the interpretations reflected their lived experiences.  
9  
10 The feedback revealed that all the participants were satisfied with the interpretations. Lastly,  
11 in order to ensure theoretical validity, the authors iteratively moved back and forth across data  
12 and theory. This allowed us to provide a theoretical explanation that would be consistent with  
13 the data that was obtained (Hayashi et al., 2019).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

**Insert Table 2 about here**

## **Findings and discussion**

30  
31  
32 As shown in Table 2, the findings of the study are based on three key themes: dwindling social  
33 connectedness and personal wellbeing; meaningful and meaningless work; and poor employee  
34 relations, as demonstrated in the following sections.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### ***Dwindling social connections and personal wellbeing***

40  
41  
42 When discussing the digital onboarding experiences of the participants concerning their  
43 adjustment to and understanding of the new work environment, a dominant theme was the level  
44 of social connectedness within the organisation. Many new hires often have an understandably  
45 nerve-racking experience in their first few weeks of starting a new job. Since the COVID-19  
46 pandemic has resulted in an increase in the adoption of digital onboarding in most  
47 organisations, new hires are likely to experience increased anxiety and stress while trying to  
48 acclimatise to their new working environment, especially those who attempt to 'shoehorn' their  
49 existing experience into the virtual work setting (Faragher, 2020). Since in-person interaction  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 during the onboarding process has been replaced by digital onboarding, social connectedness  
4 remains a profound concern for most participants in this study. Social connectedness refers to  
5  
6  
7  
8 ‘the ways in which one can connect to others physically, behaviourally, cognitively, and  
9  
10 emotionally’ (Holt-Lunstad, 2018, p. 1308). Our data shows that the participants demonstrated  
11  
12 mixed emotions regarding their digital onboarding experiences and the associated level of  
13  
14 social connectedness. For example, as one participant mentioned:

15  
16  
17 I found it quite easy to adjust to the new work environment and new culture despite  
18 the pandemic, because I felt the organisation suited my personality. We had an  
19 online social activity in my second week on the job, and it was pretty good, because  
20 I found it interactive, and it was just one way of showing people’s characters and  
21 personalities. For instance, we had a painting activity, and from there, I could see  
22 people’s competitive sides coming out...so, I learned a bit about my colleagues’  
23 personalities (Participant 1, project manager).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 In contrast, most participants commented on the negative impacts of digital onboarding on  
31 achieving social connectedness. The quote below is typical of their shared experiences:  
32  
33

34  
35 I had mixed feelings about my digital onboarding experience during COVID-19. I  
36 didn’t feel like it allowed me to have a social understanding of my new workplace,  
37 because the whole experience felt like an interaction with a computer – with  
38 minimal human connection. In fact, I felt isolated in the first few weeks, and it was  
39 mainly my line manager who really kept checking in with me, so I wouldn’t say it  
40 was a pleasant experience for the first few weeks, but having spent six months there  
41 now, I think there’s been much improvement in social interaction (Participant 4,  
42 administrative officer).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Most participants believe that digital onboarding engenders social disconnection compared to  
51 traditional in-person onboarding. Employees often want to feel supported by their employers,  
52 managers, and colleagues, and their perceived level of support often determines their  
53 performance and other employee outcomes (Philips et al., 2015). This is especially true for new  
54 hires, particularly in their first few weeks on the job. For example, an understanding of ‘how  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 things are done around here' and 'what to do and what not to do' are common concerns about  
4  
5 the effects of social disconnections due to the digitalised process of onboarding, as expressed  
6  
7 by most participants.  
8  
9

10  
11 However, due to the restrictions on close contact (social distancing) with people outside one's  
12  
13 household, many organisations were left with no choice but to facilitate digital onboarding  
14  
15 while working remotely. Most participants felt that given the restrictions they faced due to the  
16  
17 pandemic, face-to-face social interactions would have been more helpful to facilitate  
18  
19 organisational integration and enable them to clearly understand the organisation's culture.  
20  
21 Their shared experience reveals that digital onboarding engenders weak relationships and  
22  
23 results in language loss due to the absence of body language, facial expressions, and hand  
24  
25 gestures over emails and text messages or the misinterpretation of these elements over video  
26  
27 calls. For instance, Participant 16, a data analyst, remarked that 'The first impression matters...  
28  
29 People like me, whose love language is physical touch, prefer in-person interaction, with  
30  
31 handshaking and hugs being part of the welcoming process'.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Moreover, this finding aligns with those studies that suggest that employees' personality traits  
38  
39 (especially proactive personalities) influence how quickly they adjust to a new organisation  
40  
41 (Gruman et al., 2006; Philips et al., 2015), facilitated by effective socialisation. Like these  
42  
43 studies, the present study finds that personality types (such as introversion and extroversion)  
44  
45 are determinants of the effectiveness of socialisation. For example, some participants who  
46  
47 appear to be introverts (e.g. Participants 6, 10, 14, and 18) reported a preference for digital  
48  
49 onboarding, as they were able to avoid pressures of group social interactions, while the  
50  
51 extraverted participants (e.g. Participants 2, 8, 15, 19, 22, and 28) preferred social interactions.  
52  
53  
54  
55 Consequently, for most participants, digital onboarding felt more transactional than social, and  
56  
57 efficiency, standardisation, and continuity seemed more important to their organisations than  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 social connectedness. Faragher (2020) suggests that technology is helpful for HR to automate  
4 and facilitate the transactional parts of employees' onboarding experiences (e.g. processing  
5 final documentation), but organisations owe it to their employees to be creative in replicating  
6 the human aspects of the experience. Therefore, organisational socialisation remains crucial  
7 for considering how employees feel socially connected to each other and how these interactions  
8 affect their engagement, commitment, and performance even when the process is digitalised.  
9  
10 Prior studies have advocated the importance of encouraging social connections in the  
11 workplace, such that employees can interact freely with each other (Holt-Lunstad, 2018;  
12 Moldavanova and Goerdel, 2018), and as a result, the digitalised process of onboarding new  
13 employees should be made to foster stronger social relationships rather than weaken them.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 In addition, when discussing the impact of digital onboarding on their socialisation  
28 experiences, the participants had mixed perspectives about the influence of digital onboarding  
29 on their personal wellbeing. Overall, the consensus strongly upheld by the participants is that  
30 social connectedness is also linked to personal wellbeing, thus corroborating previous studies  
31 that find that social connectedness in the workplace is critical to employees' psychological  
32 wellbeing, physical health (including reducing premature mortality), and cognitive functioning  
33 (Holt-Lunstad, 2018). The following quotes exemplify the participants' experiences:  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 I feel that digital onboarding has its positives and its negatives... In my experience  
45 of both in-person and digital onboarding, digital onboarding reduces workplace  
46 intimidation and bullying. For example, when I started my current job, being  
47 behind the camera, you don't really know what people are like, especially in terms  
48 of their height. I remember thinking that my line manager would be taller than me  
49 [laughs]... The currently discussed return to the office is a no for me, and I'm not  
50 bothered about the in-person interaction because it [virtual interaction] preserves  
51 my personal wellness (Participant 1, project manager).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 I am not really convinced by the need for in-person onboarding, because when  
59 everyone is in their own space or house, they feel a lot more comfortable and  
60



1  
2  
3 relaxed than when they are all 'suited and booted' in the office... I feel a lot freer  
4 at home and can speak my mind because I don't need to be too mindful of who's  
5 listening or of being judged by someone who has not had the time to meet me and  
6 understand my personality, because that can affect my emotional stability.  
7 Moreover, observing the onboarding remotely means that I can be free of the stress  
8 of commuting (Participant 12, social worker).  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Like Participant 1, three other participants (Participants 15, 19, and 27) raised concerns  
15 regarding the negative impacts of in-person onboarding due to the risk of workplace  
16 intimidation and bullying. This finding aligns with that of Holt-Lunstad (2018): workplace  
17 relationships can be rife with hostility, such as interpersonal mistreatment; a disregard for other  
18 people's feelings, or rude or condescending comments, all of which are indicators of a toxic  
19 workplace or hostile working environment. These participants raised issues concerning how  
20 colleagues' physical appearance (e.g. their manner of dress, body/facial features, and stature)  
21 affects their personal wellbeing and expectations, especially when meeting them for the first  
22 time. Interestingly, the aforementioned participants were all females. This finding corroborates  
23 existing research findings that women (more so than men) are targets of workplace bullying  
24 and are particularly vulnerable to workplace intimidation (McCormack et al., 2018). However,  
25 their affirmation that with digital onboarding, these challenging experiences have been lowered  
26 (but not necessarily eliminated) aligns with the findings of previous studies that suggest that  
27 bullying, harassment, and intimidation have extended into the digital work environment (see  
28 Sobieraj, 2018).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 On the other hand, for those who are against or who had an unpleasant digital onboarding  
50 experience, the socialisation aspect of onboarding is a grave concern. These participants felt  
51 that a simple check-up on new employees by their colleagues (not only line managers) was  
52 critical for their social connectedness. Some participants opined, 'It is easier to check up on  
53 people in the physical office and ask after their wellbeing than to call them on the phone or  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 connect virtually' (Participant 2, social worker). These concerns are perceived to be triggered  
4  
5 by the perception that while modern digital communication technology (e.g. video  
6  
7 conferencing) saves time and costs, it also leads to a phenomenon known as 'video call fatigue'  
8  
9 (Ames, 2020), especially for workers in the services industry, who require such technologies  
10  
11 to connect to geographically dispersed clients.  
12  
13  
14

15 In sum, our findings suggest that organisational support through direct physical interactions  
16  
17 during the onboarding process is important for effective socialisation. It enhances positive  
18  
19 employee outcomes, such as increased self-efficacy; job motivation and satisfaction; reduced  
20  
21 turnover intentions; and improved personal wellbeing.  
22  
23  
24

### 25 *Perceptions of meaningful and meaningless work*

26  
27 The discourse typically used by the participants regarding the impact of their digital onboarding  
28  
29 experiences on their learning and development was related to the extent to which they found  
30  
31 meaning and purpose in their new roles and new work environment. Employees want to know  
32  
33 if their work is meaningful and exciting from the beginning, and they often get a snapshot of  
34  
35 their work during the onboarding process. Despite the relevant roles, duties, and responsibilities  
36  
37 being detailed in the job description, the onboarding process is expected to provide a much  
38  
39 clearer understanding of the job. Therefore, when employees perceive their job as boring,  
40  
41 mundane, and repetitive, they often become demotivated and find it challenging to understand  
42  
43 how their work is significant in their organisation's success (Chillakuri et al., 2020). In  
44  
45 addition, organisational socialisation through effective onboarding is facilitated by meaningful  
46  
47 interactions with managers, co-workers, and customers, thereby enhancing innovativeness and  
48  
49 creativity among new hires (Cesário and Chambel, 2019). Our findings show how the  
50  
51 participants perceive meaningful work during their digital onboarding process:  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 When I started my new job – in the heat of the pandemic – I watched some videos  
58  
59 provided by my company of what they expect and how my role fills the gap and  
60

1  
2  
3 would add value to the organisation... I liked the experience because I can play the  
4 videos repeatedly to boost my morale and remind me of how important my job is  
5 to the company (Participant 19, client service officer).  
6  
7

8  
9 Adjusting to the new work environment during the COVID-19 pandemic was fine  
10 for me, especially because I'm an advocate of working from home... For me, it  
11 was the excitement of something new that helped me, as I was very keen and eager  
12 to fully understand what my job role is and how I can help my team and the  
13 organisation. For instance, during the first few weeks, I would happily jump up  
14 when receiving new office emails to see what would be next and what else they  
15 had in store for me (Participant 5, accountant).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Most participants, at the start of their new job, felt very excited and eager to know their  
22 organisation and what their job entails, sometimes leading to positive tension; for example,  
23 Participant 5 expressed his eagerness to check new official emails and new tasks. Although  
24 others may perceive this as one of the dangers of digital onboarding for employees, as Bailey  
25 and Madden (2016) suggest, meaningful work is often based on individuals' subjective  
26 experiences and could mean different things to different people. In contrast, Michaelson's  
27 (2021) normative perspective argues that meaningful work should be meaningful to the  
28 individual and others (e.g. organisations) as well as be independent of them. It is generally  
29 agreed that meaningful work leads to job satisfaction and increased employee wellbeing (Smids  
30 et al., 2019). Therefore, it is important for managers to ensure that (new) employees, through  
31 institutionalised socialisation (Jones, 1986), find meaning in their work, such that their work is  
32 worthwhile for themselves and their organisation.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 However, after several days and weeks into their digital onboarding experience, only a few  
51 participants acknowledged sustained excitement – as they progressed through the onboarding  
52 activities, the lack of adequate social interaction extinguished their excitement. Thus, for many,  
53 the human-digital interaction reduced their responsiveness and connectivity to their job roles  
54 and often resulted in negative tension. The following quotes exemplify their experiences:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Despite the adverse effects of COVID-19, I started my new job in high spirits  
4 because I felt this was something new. I was ‘on cloud nine’, and my friends saw  
5 my excitement as a ‘fizzy soda’. But the whole digital process killed that spirit  
6 because it took me a long time to figure out my role. I hated that feeling because I  
7 lost that satisfaction, thirst, and enthusiasm for work... Imagine just interacting  
8 with a computer with lots of information, yet it doesn’t answer all your questions  
9 (Participant 28, content producer).

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Three weeks into my new job was a ‘hell of tension’ because the pressure was  
17 enormous, especially with the pandemic causing increased work demands...  
18 Because I started teaching from week two after joining the university, I couldn’t  
19 complete the online induction and onboarding activities, and HR kept sending me  
20 emails to ensure their completion. I needed to convince myself to find meaning in  
21 what I was doing, so I took some nights to do the tasks and watch videos that were  
22 sometimes so boring that I skipped many [laughing]. I wouldn’t have had to do this  
23 online thing [in usual circumstances], but in the ‘new normal’, everything is online  
24 (Participant 8, lecturer).

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 A significant number of the participants indicated that digital onboarding increases negative  
33 tension due to work-related factors (e.g. role overload and work pressure), especially with the  
34 pandemic exacerbating this pressure. Although most participants acknowledged receiving  
35 adequate remote work facilities and equipment (e.g. a computer, work chairs, and desks), there  
36 were several reports of a lack of role clarity due to the limited social interaction with their  
37 managers and team members. While certain organisation-related factors (e.g. firm size and the  
38 nature of the business) could necessitate the use of digital onboarding to quicken the  
39 onboarding process, creating a positive onboarding experience is crucial to enable new  
40 employees to adapt to the existing dynamics in the new work environment. Moreover, the  
41 majority of the participants seemed to have experienced individualised socialisation due to  
42 perceived organisational neglect, such as being made to figure out how to solve problems on  
43 their own and adjust to the organisation themselves. For example, as Participants 4, 11, and 22  
44 reported, they were mainly able to view frequently asked questions but often failed to get quick

1  
2  
3 responses to specific questions that would facilitate an understanding of their roles. This  
4  
5 situation was particularly dominant among the inexperienced younger participants and those  
6  
7 without prior work experience who unfortunately found themselves working in the unusual  
8  
9 environment engendered by the pandemic.  
10  
11

12  
13 This study's findings support the arguments of prior studies that workplace digitalisation (e.g.,  
14  
15 digital onboarding) could potentially lead to a decline in meaningful work (Smids et al., 2019;  
16  
17 Symon and Whiting, 2019). From a socialisation perspective, it may be assumed that digital  
18  
19 onboarding significantly changes the social dynamics at work and affects work meaningfulness  
20  
21 due to limited social interaction, fewer human consultations, less dependency on others, and a  
22  
23 diminished sense of purpose. Thus, as our findings suggest, employees who feel isolated may  
24  
25 find work meaningless, which in turn leads to underperformance, job dissatisfaction, poor  
26  
27 engagement, and demotivation. The tension (positive or negative) experienced during the  
28  
29 digital onboarding process also influence employee outcomes (positive or negative) and work  
30  
31 meaningfulness depending on the content of the work and the design of the digital technologies  
32  
33 used to facilitate the work (Symon and Whiting, 2019). However, Bailey and Madden (2016)  
34  
35 argue that the greatest meaningfulness may sometimes be experienced through negative  
36  
37 experiences and struggles. Conversely, if individuals can bear this tension, they may accept  
38  
39 negative work conditions (stress, over-working, long working hours) as temporary or inevitable  
40  
41 outcomes of undertaking meaningful work (Symon and Whiting, 2019) at the expense of their  
42  
43 wellbeing.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

### 49 ***Poor employee relations***

50  
51 When discussing the impact of the virtual interaction experiences (through digital onboarding)  
52  
53 in developing a social understanding of the organisation, poor employee relations was another  
54  
55 dominant theme that emerged from our discussions with the participants. The most pronounced  
56  
57 concern was the lack of transparency and trust in the workplace engendered by digital  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 onboarding. Transparency and trust in the workplace are part of the organisational culture and  
4 identity that define the employee-employer relationship (Pirson and Malhotra, 2011).  
5  
6 Schnackenberg and Tomlinson (2016, p.1788) define transparency as ‘the perceived quality of  
7  
8 intentionally shared information from a sender’. This conception of transparency denotes the  
9  
10 significance of sharing ‘quality information’ or knowledge in a ‘timely’ manner to promote  
11  
12 trust, awareness, and coherence. Our findings reveal that digital onboarding, especially during  
13  
14 the pandemic, leads to lower transparency among some organisations, as some participants  
15  
16 raised significant concerns regarding the trustworthiness of their organisations:  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 I have moved jobs twice during the pandemic, and with my first job, it looked like  
24 digital onboarding helped the organisation sweep some relevant information under  
25 the carpet, which to me showed a lack of transparency. For instance, my contract  
26 states I would have a four-month probation period, but that was extended by  
27 another three months... Due to the limited physical interaction in the first few  
28 months, understanding my new role was like having a ‘mountain to climb’, leading  
29 to some lapses in performance. It was demoralising because it felt like I had no job  
30 security, and my trust in the organisation diminished, so I resigned (Participant 23,  
31 customer representation officer).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Although three participants reported having to undergo an extended probation period due to  
39 poor performance, which they blamed on lack of managerial and co-worker support as well as  
40 social disconnection, only one (Participant 23) resigned from work. Nevertheless, all three  
41 participants had something in common: They felt that their organisations were not transparent  
42 with them. Even though the pandemic might have made a typically bad experience much worse,  
43 the participants still expected a transparent relationship with their employers. Like Participant  
44 3, a social worker, remarked, ‘We all understand the circumstances of COVID-19, but  
45 managers cannot keep throwing us under the bus for every little mistake if we do not have the  
46 means of connecting to them to clarify work issues and share our feelings’. Therefore,  
47 providing employees (especially new hires) with quality information about organisational  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 conduct and culture helps facilitate the effective adjustment of new recruits to their new  
4 environment (Bennett and McWhorter, 2021). Moreover, although some researchers feel  
5 transparency is a perception of received information (Zhou et al., 2018), employees often prefer  
6 that their employers endeavour to ‘intentionally’ divulge or share ‘relevant’ information to  
7 boost their trust and organisational commitment (Schnackenberg and Tomlinson, 2016). Our  
8 finding supports the assertion of Jiang and Luo (2018) that transparent communication from an  
9 organisation impacts employee trust, engagement, performance, and intention to remain. It also  
10 aligns with Schnackenberg et al.’s (2020) three-dimensional construct of transparency:  
11 perceived information disclosure, clarity, and accuracy. Therefore, when employers fail to  
12 disclose relevant, quality, clear, and accurate information to their employees, mistrust results,  
13 leading to adverse employee outcomes. This is even more true when considering the limitations  
14 of digital onboarding concerning social interactions (especially during the COVID-19  
15 pandemic). Employees may find it difficult to raise issues that are both personal and relevant  
16 to their work. For most participants, digital onboarding resulted in individualised socialisation  
17 tactics, resulting from an ambiguous sequence in the order of the activities or experiences that  
18 employees undergo during onboarding (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979; Jones, 1986), leading  
19 to adjustment difficulties.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 In addition, most participants raised significant concerns regarding how being micromanaged  
44 and unable to bring their whole self to work affected them in developing a social understanding  
45 of their organisation. The COVID-19 pandemic seems to have increased the level of managerial  
46 control and monitoring, which is a problem relating to organisational trust (Hodder, 2020).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

In addition, most participants raised significant concerns regarding how being micromanaged and unable to bring their whole self to work affected them in developing a social understanding of their organisation. The COVID-19 pandemic seems to have increased the level of managerial control and monitoring, which is a problem relating to organisational trust (Hodder, 2020). With managers’ jobs on the line, particularly during the pandemic, ensuring productivity became even more of a priority to them than it was before the outbreak of the pandemic, as they want to keep their jobs; hence, they increased their control and surveillance of employees



1  
2  
3 – even while they were all working from home (Hodder, 2020). The following quotes  
4  
5 exemplify the participants' experiences:  
6  
7

8  
9 I think the virtual environment exposed me to the feeling that my manager bullies  
10 me... I consider being micromanaged as a form of bullying and a lack of trust  
11 because my manager is overly involved in my work even while I am working  
12 remotely... I understand that as a new employee, I would need more supervision  
13 than experienced employees, but when it becomes a case of controlling my whole  
14 work structure and undermining my performance, I had to draw the line and express  
15 how I felt at the time, because he [manager] was choking me as a result of his  
16 insecurities (Participant 12, social worker).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 In my experience, interacting online with colleagues during the pandemic has not  
24 allowed me to bring out the best parts of myself, because, unlike the physical office,  
25 I'm not driven to talk about myself. If I was face to face with people in the physical  
26 office, I would have been able to bring my whole self to work, and you'd see a bit  
27 more of my personality, because that's where people ask you about what kind of  
28 music you listen to, or the food you like, or what you did at the weekend... That  
29 kind of talk hardly happens online (Participant 25, marketing executive).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The participants extended their perceptions of micromanagement to mean workplace  
37 intimidation and bullying, evidencing poor employee relations. Some participants (Participants  
38 2, 7, 13, and 26) used descriptions such as, 'discouraging independent thinking and decision  
39 making', 'requesting overly detailed reports', 'wanting to be cc'ed into every email', 'excessive  
40 supervision', and 'wanting perfection' as evidence of micromanagement by their managers.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Consequently, the participants perceived that their managers have been undermining their  
48 performance and controlling their work processes, resulting in workplace intimidation, anxiety,  
49 bullying, distrust, demotivation, and a hesitation to make independent decisions due to a fear  
50 of making mistakes. In addition, besides organisational transparency, the participants felt that  
51 working remotely and socialising virtually restricts them from being transparent about  
52 themselves (e.g. bringing the 'whole self' to work), making it difficult for others to understand  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 their personalities. This finding aligns with that of a Deloitte (2016) study: 61% of employees  
4 hide their identities at work to a certain extent. They trivialise parts of themselves to avoid  
5 being discriminated against or considered as not taking work seriously. Thus, employers need  
6 to rethink how employees are valued (socially and financially) to ensure that they bring out  
7 employees' best performance and enhance employee wellbeing (Hodder, 2020).  
8  
9

10  
11 Overall, this study suggests that digital onboarding significantly impacts employee outcomes  
12 (positively and negatively). This is shown in the above discussions of how digital onboarding  
13 is perceived to lead to dwindling social connectedness and personal wellbeing, such that many  
14 new hires find it challenging to build effective social connections and relations with their  
15 employers, managers, and colleagues, and all this inadvertently affects their wellbeing.  
16 Additionally, digital onboarding can lead to both meaningful and meaningless work, depending  
17 on the subjective experiences of new hires and how they find meaning in their work while  
18 undergoing digital onboarding. Finally, a lack of trust and transparency, excessive managerial  
19 control, intimidation, and bullying all result in poor employee relations among employees and  
20 employers in the workplace.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 **Conclusion and implications**

40 This study set out to explore the impacts of the increased adoption of digital onboarding on  
41 employee outcomes in the UK. There has been limited qualitative research on the influence of  
42 digital onboarding on employee outcomes, with much of the research yet to substantially  
43 consider the impact of digitalisation on the HR function of onboarding employees to become  
44 full members of an organisation. In addition, most of these studies were conducted before the  
45 COVID-19 pandemic. The current study presented empirical evidence of employees' digital  
46 onboarding experiences during the pandemic, even though, as was previously stated, its aim  
47 was not to focus on the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on digital onboarding in depth.  
48 Rather, it aimed to observe the pandemic as a reagent leading to the increased adoption of  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 digital onboarding. Thus, our findings corroborate those of previous studies undertaken before  
4 the outbreak of the pandemic and further contribute to the existing literature on digital  
5 onboarding.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 In particular, as an empirical contribution, this study reveals three key themes: dwindling social  
11 connectedness and personal wellbeing; perceptions of meaningful and meaningless work; and  
12 poor employee relations. Therefore, this is a case study of how digital onboarding, even during  
13 a turbulent time (in this case, the COVID-19 pandemic), changes the social dynamics at work  
14 and affects employee outcomes. Most importantly, our findings suggest that employees are  
15 exposed to both the positive and negative impacts of digital onboarding. On a positive note,  
16 our findings also show that digital onboarding relatively reduces hostility in the workplace,  
17 including bullying, harassment, and intimidation, particularly in the views of employees who  
18 perceive that digital onboarding accommodates introverted personalities – the ‘lone-wolf’  
19 employees – more than extraverted ones. In terms of the negative impacts of digital onboarding,  
20 our study found that digital onboarding results in social disconnection at work, diminishes  
21 meaningful work, decreases transparency, and increases mistrust issues at work.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Furthermore, this study contributes to the scarce literature that reveals the importance of  
40 digitalisation within the theoretical concept of socialisation. Given that the future of work  
41 requires digital transformation to ensure value creation and strengthen competitiveness (Bajer,  
42 2017), our study emphasises the influence of digital onboarding on providing new hires with a  
43 social understanding of the workplace. It confirms that for effective socialisation to take place,  
44 organisations must depend primarily on institutionalised socialisation tactics, whereby  
45 socialisation is driven by the organisation rather than individual employees (Jones, 1986; Eberl  
46 et al., 2012). The study demonstrates that although successful socialisation is a function of  
47 employees’ individual differences (Gruman et al., 2006), employees cannot be left isolated to  
48 adjust to their organisations solely by means of individual tactics. Such a situation can result  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in significant negative experiences that may lead to negative employee outcomes. As this study  
4 shows, employees who feel abandoned in the socialisation process may face the challenges of  
5 role ambiguity, trust issues, and meaningless work due to social disconnection from the  
6 workplace. Therefore, redesigning the onboarding process to ensure that it is 'fit for purpose'  
7 can result in more positive employee outcomes, such as increased engagement and commitment  
8 as well as reduced turnover intentions (Cable et al., 2013).  
9

10  
11 This study has two important practical implications. First, there are implications for HR  
12 professionals regarding onboarding new hires and socialising them to align with the relevant  
13 organisational culture, values, and processes. HR must focus on strengthening the onboarding  
14 process, especially by recognising the importance of first (and lasting) impressions as crucial  
15 factors in the long-term performance and retention of new employees. Therefore, HR must  
16 ensure that it works together with line managers to promote a welcoming culture for new hires,  
17 facilitate organisation-driven socialisation tactics, and provide 'quality' information necessary  
18 for supporting new employees rather than leaving them to figure out things on their own.  
19 Furthermore, with the increased adoption of digital onboarding, HR must foster considerable  
20 human interactions with new hires, even if it means adopting a hybrid approach to onboarding  
21 by mixing in-person and virtual onboarding activities (Gruman and Saks, 2018).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Second, there are implications for new hires regarding their digital onboarding experiences and  
45 socialisation. Despite the importance of individual differences in successful socialisation, new  
46 employees need to recognise the growing trends in workplace digitalisation and prepare  
47 themselves, by acquiring digital skills, for increased digital social interactions – now during  
48 the pandemic more than ever before. Therefore, new employees are encouraged to brace  
49 themselves for the changing digital landscape in order to foster effective communication and  
50 align themselves with organisational goals and values.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Limitations and suggestions for future research

One limitation of the study is that it used an interpretive and qualitative research approach, making statistical generalisation difficult or impossible. Instead, it provides in-depth meanings and interpretations of the studied phenomenon. Furthermore, given the subjective nature of the views of the participants and the researchers, this study may be subject to potential bias. The study is also limited to a single country and a single industry context, which may not necessarily be generalisable to other countries. Future research therefore may consider a cross-cultural study that extends the findings of this research to other contexts. Studies undertaken on this topic in the future could also consider using quantitative research instruments to perform a large-scale study that further probes the phenomenon under study. In addition, given the limited scope of this study, such that we did not assess the technology used, including the specific ICT artefact/system that sustains the virtual onboarding process, future research could explore this area, as the different digital onboarding technologies used may result in different outcomes for employees. For instance, the workplace is rapidly changing due to technological advancement and the role of artificial intelligence and augmented reality, as organisations are beginning to shift to using these advanced digital systems and platforms in the workplace to boost employee experiences and develop soft skills, even during onboarding (Fowler, 2019; Meister, 2021). Therefore, future research could investigate the similarities and differences among the ICT artefacts/systems used for digital onboarding and the common role these technologies play as well as the outcomes thereof.

## References

- Ames, H. (2020). What is a video call fatigue. Retrieved from [medicalnewstoday.com/articles/video-call-fatigue](https://medicalnewstoday.com/articles/video-call-fatigue)
- Ashforth, B.E., Sluss, D.M. and Saks, A.M. (2007), “Socialization tactics, proactive behavior, and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 70, pp. 447–462.
- Bailey, C. and Madden, A. (2016), “What makes work meaningful—or meaningless”. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 57, No. 4, pp. 53–61.
- Bajer, J. (2017), “Editorial: Digital transformation of HR”. *Strategic HR Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 53–54.
- Bauer, T.N. (2010), “Onboarding new employees: Maximizing success”. The SHRM Foundation’s Effective Practice Guideline Series, Alexandria, VA. Retrieved from [www.shrm.org/about/foundation/products/Pages/OnboardingEPG.aspx](http://www.shrm.org/about/foundation/products/Pages/OnboardingEPG.aspx)
- Bennett, E.E. and McWhorter, R.R. (2021), “Virtual HRD’s role in crisis and the post Covid-19 professional lifeworld: Accelerating skills for digital transformation”. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 5–25.
- Bharadwaj, A., El Sawy, O., Pavlou, P., Ventrakaman, N., (2013). Digital business strategy: Toward a next generation of insights. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 471-482.
- Braun, V., Clarke, V. and Terry, G. (2014), “Thematic analysis”. In Rohleder, P. and Lyons, A.C. (eds.). *Qualitative research in clinical and health psychology* (pp. 95–114). London: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Cable, D.M, Gino, F. and Staats, B.R. (2013), “Reinventing employee onboarding”. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 54, No. 3, pp. 23-28.
- Caldwell, C. and Peters, R. (2018), “New employee onboarding – Psychological contracts and ethical perspectives”. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 27-39.
- Cesário, F. and Chambel, M.J. (2019), “On-boarding new employees: A three-component perspective of welcoming”. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 27, No. 5, pp. 1465-1479.
- Chao, G.T. (2012), “Organizational socialization: Background, basics, and a blueprint for adjustment at work”, In: Kozlowski, S.W.J. (ed). *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 579-614.
- Chillakuri, B. (2020), “Understanding Generation Z expectations for effective onboarding”. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 33, No. 7, pp. 1277-1296.
- Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018), “Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches”. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Deloitte (2016), “Uncovering talent: A new mode of inclusion”. Retrieved from <https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/about-deloitte/us-about-deloitte-uncovering-talent-a-new-model-of-inclusion.pdf>
- Donthu, N. and Gustafsson, A. (2020), “Effects of COVID-19 on business and research”. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 117, pp. 284-289.

- 1  
2  
3 Eberl, P., Clement, U. and Möller, H. (2012), "Socialising employees' trust in the  
4 organisation". *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 343-359.
- 5  
6 Eldor, L. and Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2017), "The nature of employee engagement: rethinking the  
7 employee-organization relationship". *The International Journal of Human Resource*  
8 *Management*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 526-552.
- 9  
10 Faragher, J. (2020), "Why virtual onboarding can still be a warm welcome". Retrieved from  
11 [https://www.personneltoday.com/hr/why-virtual-onboarding-can-still-be-a-warm-](https://www.personneltoday.com/hr/why-virtual-onboarding-can-still-be-a-warm-welcome/)  
12 [welcome/](https://www.personneltoday.com/hr/why-virtual-onboarding-can-still-be-a-warm-welcome/)
- 13  
14 Fowler, G (2019), "The impact of VR, AI and AR in the workplace". Retrieved from  
15 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinessdevelopmentcouncil/2019/11/27/the-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinessdevelopmentcouncil/2019/11/27/the-impact-of-vr-ai-and-ar-in-the-workplace/?sh=30bafb2c132e)  
16 [impact-of-vr-ai-and-ar-in-the-workplace/?sh=30bafb2c132e](https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinessdevelopmentcouncil/2019/11/27/the-impact-of-vr-ai-and-ar-in-the-workplace/?sh=30bafb2c132e)
- 17  
18 Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G. and Hamilton, A.L. (2013), "Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive  
19 research". *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 15-31.
- 20  
21 Given, L.M. (2008), "The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods", (Vols. 1-0).  
22 Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- 23  
24 Goodermote, C. (2020), "Remote onboarding and training of new program coordinators into  
25 the medical education office during Covid-19 social distance quarantine: Process and  
26 recommendations", *Journal of Community Hospital Internal Medicine Perspectives*,  
27 10(5), 399-401.
- 28  
29 Gruman, J.A., Saks, A.M. and Zweig, D.I. (2006), "Organizational socialization tactics and  
30 newcomer proactive behaviors: An integrative study". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,  
31 Vol. 69, pp. 90-104.
- 32  
33 Gursoy, D. and Chi, C.G. (2020), "Effects of COVID-19 pandemic on hospitality industry:  
34 review of the current situations and a research agenda". *Journal of Hospitality*  
35 *Marketing & Management*, Vol. 29, No. 5, pp. 527-529.
- 36  
37 Hodder, A. (2020), "New technology, work and employment in the era of COVID-19:  
38 Reflecting on legacies of research". *New Technology, Work and Employment*, Vol. 35,  
39 No. pp. 262-275.
- 40  
41 Holt-Lunstad, J. (2018), "Fostering social connection in the workplace". *American Journal of*  
42 *Health Promotion*, Vol. 32, No. 5, pp. 1307-1312.
- 43  
44 International Labour Organization (2020), "Teleworking during the COVID-19 pandemic and  
45 beyond: A Practical Guide". Available at: [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/-](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/-ed_protect/---protrav/---travail/documents/publication/wcms_751232.pdf)  
46 [--ed\\_protect/---protrav/---travail/documents/publication/wcms\\_751232.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/-ed_protect/---protrav/---travail/documents/publication/wcms_751232.pdf)
- 47  
48 Jiang, H. and Luo, Y. (2018), "Crafting employee trust: From authenticity, transparency to  
49 engagement". *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 138-160.
- 50  
51 Jones, G.R. (1986), "Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to  
52 organizations". *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 262-279.
- 53  
54 Kodama, M. (2017), "Functions of career resilience against reality shock, focusing on full-time  
55 employees during their first year of work", *Japanese Psychological Research*, Vol. 59,  
56 pp. 255-265.
- 57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Kowtha, N.R. (2018), “Organizational socialization of newcomers: The role of professional  
4 socialization”, *International Journal of Training and Development*, 22, 87-106.  
5
- 6 Lu, S.C. and Tjosvold, D. (2013), “Socialization tactics: Antecedents for goal interdependence  
7 and newcomer adjustment and retention”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 83, pp.  
8 245-254.  
9
- 10 Lund, S., Madgavkar, A., Manyika, J., Smit, S., Ellingrud, K., Meaney, M. and Robinson, O.  
11 (2021), “The future of work after COVID-19”, Available at:  
12 [https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/featured%20insights/future%20of%20](https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/featured%20insights/future%20of%20organizations/the%20future%20of%20work%20after%20covid%2019/the-future-of-work-after-covid-19-report-vf.pdf?shouldIndex=false)  
13 [organizations/the%20future%20of%20work%20after%20covid%2019/the-future-of-](https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/featured%20insights/future%20of%20organizations/the%20future%20of%20work%20after%20covid%2019/the-future-of-work-after-covid-19-report-vf.pdf?shouldIndex=false)  
14 [work-after-covid-19-report-vf.pdf?shouldIndex=false](https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/featured%20insights/future%20of%20organizations/the%20future%20of%20work%20after%20covid%2019/the-future-of-work-after-covid-19-report-vf.pdf?shouldIndex=false)  
15
- 16 Maurer, R. (2020), Virtual onboarding of remote workers more important than ever. Retrieved  
17 from [https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-](https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/virtual-onboarding-remote-workers.aspx)  
18 [acquisition/pages/virtual-onboarding-remote-workers.aspx](https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/virtual-onboarding-remote-workers.aspx)  
19
- 20 Meister, J.C. (2021), “How companies are using VR to develop employees’ soft skills”.  
21 Retrieved from [https://hbr.org/2021/01/how-companies-are-using-vr-to-develop-](https://hbr.org/2021/01/how-companies-are-using-vr-to-develop-employees-soft-skills)  
22 [employees-soft-skills](https://hbr.org/2021/01/how-companies-are-using-vr-to-develop-employees-soft-skills)  
23
- 24 Michaelson, C.A. (2021), “Normative meaning of meaningful work”. *Journal of Business*  
25 *Ethics*, Vol. 170, pp. 413–428.  
26
- 27 Moldavanova, A. and Goerdel, H.T. (2018), “Understanding the puzzle of organizational  
28 sustainability: Toward a conceptual framework of organizational social connectedness  
29 and sustainability”. *Public Management Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 55-81.  
30
- 31 Phillips, C., Esterman, A. and Kenny, A. (2015), “The theory of organisational socialisation  
32 and its potential for improving transition experiences for new graduate nurses”. *Nurse*  
33 *Education Today*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 118–124.  
34
- 35 Pirson, M. and Malhotra, D. (2011), “Foundations of organizational trust: What matters to  
36 different stakeholders?” *Organization Science*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 1087-1104.  
37
- 38 Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2019), “Research methods for business students”.  
39 Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.  
40
- 41 Schnackenberg, A. K., Tomlinson, E. and Coen, C. (2020), “The dimensional structure of  
42 transparency: A construct validation of transparency as disclosure, clarity, and accuracy  
43 in organizations”. *Human Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720933317>  
44
- 45 Schnackenberg, A.K. and Tomlinson, E.C. (2016), “Organizational transparency: A new  
46 perspective on managing trust in organization-stakeholder relationships”. *Journal of*  
47 *Management*, Vol. 42, No. 7, pp. 1784–1810.  
48
- 49 Smids, J., Nyholm, S. and Berkers, H. (2019), “Robots in the workplace: A threat to—or  
50 opportunity for—meaningful work?” *Philosophy & Technology*, Vol. 33, pp. 503-522.  
51
- 52 Snell, A. (2006), “Researching onboarding best practice: using research to connect onboarding  
53 processes with employee satisfaction”. *Strategic HR Review*, Vol. 5 No. 6, pp. 32-35.  
54
- 55 Sobieraj, S. (2018), “Bitch, slut, skank, cunt: Patterned resistance to women’s visibility in  
56 digital publics”. *Information, Communication & Society*, Vol. 21, No. 11, pp. 1700-  
57 1714.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Song, L. and Zhou, Y. (2020), “The COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on the global  
4 economy: What does it take to turn crisis into opportunity?”. *China & World Economy*,  
5 Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 1-25.  
6  
7 Symon, G. and Whiting, R. (2019), “The sociomaterial negotiation of social entrepreneurs’  
8 meaningful work”. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp. 655-684.  
9  
10 Turner P. (2019), “Understanding organisational dynamics”, In: *Leadership in Healthcare* (pp.  
11 203-231), Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## Appendix

### Interview Questionnaire

#### General Questions

1. How did you feel going through a digital onboarding process?
2. Considering your digital onboarding experience, how quickly were you able to adjust to and understand the new work environment and organisational culture?

#### Specific Questions

1. What were the outcomes of your digital onboarding experience on your learning and development?
2. Did you feel that you had the necessary support from your organisation (e.g. managers and colleagues) during your onboarding?
3. How do you think your virtual interaction experiences helped in developing a social understanding of your organisation?
4. What are the effects (positive and negative) of socialising online against in-person interaction?
5. Was there any impact of the digital onboarding experience on your wellbeing?



**Table 1: Participants' Demographic Information**

Characteristics	Range/Categories	Frequencies
Age	18 – 25	5
	26 – 35	14
	36 – 45	9
Gender	Male	17
	Female	11
Occupation	IT	4
	Transport	2
	Health and Social Services	7
	Education	4
	Banking and Finance	5
	Hospitality	4
	Communication, Media and Entertainment	2
Type of business	Sole Proprietorship	3
	Partnership	2
	Corporation/Limited Liability company	5
	Not-for-profit	6
Company revenue (Turnover)	Less than EUR 2 million	2
	Less than EUR 10 million	2
	Less than EUR 50 million	5
	More than EUR 50 million	3
New job duration	0 – 5 months	7
	6 – 10 months	18
	11 – 15 months	3
Duration of digital onboarding program	0 – 5 weeks	5
	6 – 10 weeks	8
	11 – 15 weeks	13
	16 – 20 weeks	2

Table 2: Emerging Themes with Indicative Quotations

Research inquiry	Illustrative quotes	First-order codes	Consolidation of codes and conceptual categories	Main themes
Digital onboarding and impact on its employee outcomes	<p>Working from home feels good and suits my personality because I don't really like being around many people...so, I enjoyed my online onboarding experience – despite the reduced social interaction (Participant 10, Cybersecurity analyst).</p> <p>The social connection is gone...I miss the physical office, because talking to people and sharing one's daily experience is good for mental wellbeing because it's therapeutic... (Participant 17, Sales executive).</p>	<p>Individual personality, isolation, first impression, comfort and wellness, social disconnection, workplace hostility, intimidation and bullying</p>	<p>Social interaction, physical, psychological and cognitive wellbeing</p>	<p><b>Dwindling social connections and personal wellbeing</b></p>
	<p>There was excitement and less pressure when I started my job. I feel that I have a purpose in the organisation, and I can contribute my quota (Participant 13, Social worker).</p> <p>There's too much to assimilate in one go, and it's difficult to understand what the job entails when all that you have is a computer in front of you at all time (Participant 15, Marketing executive).</p>	<p>New job excitement, positive and negative tensions, role clarity, information overload, work pressure</p>	<p>Workplace responsiveness and connectivity, work-induced stress, organisational learning and development</p>	<p><b>Perceptions of meaningful and meaningless work</b></p>
	<p>...because getting the right information is important for me so that I can trust my employer, and if that is missing from the start due to limited face-to-face interactions, then it will affect my commitment and performance (Participant 18, Project development officer).</p> <p>I want to be able to show my real self and not hide behind the camera. When people see you physically, they can assess you better than when you're online... I also don't like it when my work is undermined, as if it's my fault that I don't get the needed help on time (Participant 2, Social worker).</p>	<p>Information sharing, disclosure, awareness/ambiguity, trustworthiness, bringing one's whole self, micromanagement</p>	<p>Lack of transparency and trust, managerial control, self-identity</p>	<p><b>Poor employee relations</b></p>