The Impact of Onboarding Levels on Perceived Utility, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Support, and Job Satisfaction

Amanda M. Meyer
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Lynn K. Bartels
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

This study examined the outcomes and assumptions of Bauer's (2010) model of onboarding levels (Compliance, Clarification, Culture, and Connection). Specifically, we examined the impact of onboarding levels on subsequent work attitudes (i.e., perceived utility of onboarding, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction). Participants who were onboarded at the highest level, Connection, had higher perceptions of onboarding utility, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction. Bauer's hierarchical assumption was supported, however our data suggests the frequency of occurrence of these levels is quite different. Organizations should design onboarding programs that provide all four levels of onboarding experiences.

INTRODUCTION

Onboarding is a relatively new term and has been defined as "the process of helping new hires adjust to social and performance aspects of their new jobs," (Bauer, 2010, p.1). Although little research has been conducted on onboarding specifically as it is called now, research has examined aspects of onboarding and its positive relationship to employee orientation and socialization in the workplace (Bielski, 2007; Cable, Gino & Staats, 2013; Graybill, Carpenter, Offord, Piorum, & Shaffer, 2013; Gundry & Rousseau, 1994; Kammeyer-Mueller, Wanberg, Rubenstein, & Song, 2013; Klein & Weaver, 2000; Lavigna, 2009; Saks, 1997; Singh, 2003; Snell, 2006;, 2009). Onboarding supports employee socialization which is the transition of the employee from organizational stranger to integrated member. Through onboarding, employees gain an understanding of the goals, responsibilities and legal implications of their roles within the greater structure of the organization. Because organizations frequently invest significant time in recruiting and acquiring talent, onboarding is a crucial piece in ensuring retention and preparedness of their employees (Graybill et al., 2013). Effective onboarding is positively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, engagement, performance and inversely related to turnover (Cable, Gino, & Staats, 2013; Klein & Weaver, 2000; Lavigna, 2009; Snell, 2006).

Much of the research supporting onboarding and socialization of newcomers to organizations focuses on orientation. Orientation, as defined by Wanous (1992), consists of short term programs that introduce the new employee to basic employment information (compliance procedures, new hire paperwork, and

job skills training) with the purpose of reducing the stress of starting a new job. Employee socialization has been primarily conceptualized as the enculturation of new employees to the organization's values, norms, mission, and vision (Holton, 1996). Because there has not been considerable research in onboarding specifically, research on orientation and new employee socialization will be used, in large part, to develop the current study. Based on these constructs it is reasonable to use this research because, as conceptualized, orientation describes activities within the first and second levels of Bauer's theory, Compliance and Clarification, and socialization describes activities within Bauer's third and fourth levels, Culture and Connection (Bauer, 2010). Bauer's (2010) levels of onboarding are described next.

Bauer's Levels of Onboarding

Bauer (2010) identified four levels that acclimate to the organization's legal, performance, cultural, and relational dimensions. These levels are Compliance, Clarification, Culture and Connection. Compliance is, at the most basic level of onboarding, educating employees on the legal policies and regulations in place at the organization. Examples of this include reading an employee handbook that outlines specific organizational practices such as an attendance or dress code policy. The next level of onboarding, Clarification, educates employees on the performance expectations in their role. For example, this may involve training the employee in different systems, processes or reporting formats that he or she will use on the job.

The third level of effective onboarding, Culture, introduces the employee to the organization's history, traditions, values, philosophy and norms. To facilitate the transfer of information about the organization's culture new hire learning experiences may focus on the company's core philosophies and values (Everson, 2015). The final and most integrative level in the onboarding process is Connection. This is the level at which the employee has the opportunity to forge relationships formally and informally within the organization. Ways that organizations might achieve this include describing the organizational hierarchy, introducing employees to senior leadership, or having their line managers and colleagues take them out to lunch to learn more about them. Effective onboarding consists of all four levels which, if all are included and reached in the program, best orient the employee into the organization (Bauer, 2010).

Bauer's theory posits that almost all organizations naturally cover the first level of onboarding, Compliance, in their new employee socialization process (Bauer, 2010). The second and third levels of onboarding, Clarification and Culture, are reached and practiced by approximately 50% of organizations, (Bauer, 2010). The final level, Connection, is achieved by approximately 20% of organizations, who proactively onboard their employees and often employ a strategic human resources management approach in this process (Bauer, 2010). The frequency of occurrence of each level and the hierarchical order will be examined to see if these assumptions are matched by our data. The current study examined the impact of onboarding level (Compliance, Clarification, Culture and Connection), on level of perceived utility and attitudinal outcomes of perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction.

Perceived Utility of Onboarding

One variable necessary to examine in the current study is perceived value of onboarding by participants. Utility, for the purpose of this study, was defined as an employee's perceived value of onboarding, and its usefulness for the job (Ruona, Leimback, Holton & Bates, 2002). Ruona, et al. (2002) found significant relationships between perceived utility of *training* and transfer factors, which will be expanded to assume relevance to onboarding, such that utility of knowledge gained during onboarding may be related to levels of onboarding. These relationships found by Ruona et al. (2002) include positive correlations between utility and training design, motivation to transfer learning, perceived content validity, outcomes expectations, and opportunity to use learning. Research on knowledge transfer regarding onboarding specifically, has shown that transfer is successful when the employee has access to multiple knowledge sources, an opportunity to observe procedures, and a description of their core job duties (Viana, Conte & de Souza, 2014). This research points to the importance of onboarding utility.

Higher levels of onboarding provide more information from more sources to help the employee succeed on the job and in the organization. Ruona, et al., (2002) suggested that employees who receive more job training would feel more prepared, and that perceived helpfulness of the training would lead to transfer from training to on-the-job performance. New employee attitudes and beliefs toward their organization are established early on and can persist through their tenure, emphasizing the importance of imparting positive experiences and attitudes during organizational entry (Bauer & Green, 1994). It is likely that as an organization invests more effort in onboarding, employees will in turn perceive their onboarding as more useful. Therefore, it is hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1: Employees onboarded at the highest level, Connection, will have higher levels of perceived utility of onboarding than those at the other three levels (Compliance, Clarification, and Culture).

Organizational Commitment

An important attitude resulting from onboarding is organizational commitment (OC) which is an attachment to the organization, "characterized by shared values, a desire to remain in the organization, and a willingness to exert effort on its behalf" (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). A number of onboarding tactics are positively related to organizational commitment after six months (Bauer, Bodnar, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007). Onboarding experiences that newcomers go through in groups have a higher relationship with OC than experiences newcomers go through individually (Bauer et al., 2007). Newcomers who go through an onboarding process with a fixed timetable and sequential progression of each level in onboarding also report higher levels of OC, than those who go through a variable, random process (Bauer et al., 2007). Finally, those who receive positive feedback from coworkers and are socialized into the organization through the presence of role models display higher levels of OC than those who are socialized alone and do not receive feedback affirming their identity as a member of the organization (Bauer et al., 2007). Additional research has shown a significant positive relationship exists between socialization tactics and OC (Bauer, et al., 2007; Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1991). In other words, newcomer socialization tactics are highly influential in an employee's development of OC and other important behaviors that contribute to OC overall.

In situations with high person-organization fit, or where employees are well-matched to the culture of the organization and their role, high levels of OC are more likely. In a study conducted by Solinger, van Olffen, Roe, and Hofmans (2013), significantly higher levels of commitment were observed in newcomers who were socialized into their organizations with high person-organization fit, and additionally these newcomers experienced an internalization and increased understanding of organizational knowledge, values, and norms. In organizations with effective onboarding, employees may perceive higher person-organization fit and organizational commitment than those without effective onboarding.

A longitudinal study on newcomer socialization tactics and organizational commitment showed that after 6 months and 12 months, employees who experienced onboarding which reinforced social support reported higher levels of organizational commitment than those who did not (Meyer & Allen, 1990). These findings point to the importance of social support during organizational entry, which may be achieved through interactions with coworkers, and presumably reinforced if the highest level of onboarding, Connection, is achieved (Bauer, 2010). Research conducted by Allen and Shanock (2013) states that early socialization experiences enabling relationship building may be particularly important in gaining organizational commitment. If employees are able to identify and connect to the organization's culture and relationships as a newcomer during the onboarding process, it is likely that their OC will be positively related to their onboarding experience. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 2: Individuals who were onboarded at the fourth level (Connection) will have greater organizational commitment than those who were onboarded at the other three levels (Compliance, Clarification, Culture).

Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived organizational support (POS) is the employee's perception that the "organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being" (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 1). Employees who experience POS interpret it two-fold: as the organization showing value and investment in its employees, and the organization's concern for their well-being. Some antecedents to POS include perceptions of fairness, supervisor support, rewards, and job conditions (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Though not all of these may be present in order for an employee to perceive organizational support, to some extent they all positively contribute to a person's perception of the organization.

Perrot, Bauer, Abonneau, Campoy, Erdogan, and Liden (2014) examined perceived organizational support and its relationship to new employee socialization outcomes. The results of their research indicated that POS was significantly related to learning the job, learning work-group norms, and role innovation, or, the flexibility one has in defining their job role and ways to perform (Perrot et al., 2014). This research points to the impact that POS has on the success of new employees in learning when joining a new organization.

Research conducted by Allen and Shanock (2013) examined three dimensions of organizational socialization; content (framework of activities and expectations); context (setting where socialization takes place); and social. The social dimension, or the nature of interactions with organizational members during organizational entry, (positive or negative, formal or informal) was positively correlated with POS. These researchers purported that given these results, early socialization experiences that enable relationship building may be crucial in the development of POS (Allen & Shanock, 2013). These opportunities are best achieved at the highest level of onboarding, Connection. For this reason, we hypothesized:

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who were onboarded at the fourth level (Connection) will have higher levels of perceived organizational support than those who were onboarded at the other three levels (Compliance, Clarification, Culture).

Job Satisfaction

Weiss (2002) has defined job satisfaction (JS) as an attitude as "a positive (or negative) evaluative judgment one makes about one's job or job situation," (p. 175). JS is one of the most widely researched topics in organizational research, especially regarding work attitudes. Its antecedents include job and task variables such as task variety, task significance, skill variety, autonomy, and feedback, (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). It is positively correlated with organizational commitment (Saks, 1996), and negatively with absenteeism and turnover, (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Scott & Taylor, 1985), anxiety, (Saks, 1996) and job searching (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). JS has additionally shown empirical relationships with onboarding, as discussed below.

Job satisfaction has been shown to be moderately correlated with socialization dimensions including information seeking, role clarity, and social acceptance. In other words, job satisfaction shows positive relationships to newcomer socialization, of which onboarding plays a key role (Bauer et al., 2007). Employees who perceived onboarding training to be helpful are also more likely to be satisfied in their jobs (Saks, 1996). Saks' (1996) research has also identified a relationship between amount of training received and overall job satisfaction. Also, information and support provided during organizational entry by the employer is positively related to new employee satisfaction (Louis, Posner & Powell, 1985). It is also very likely that helpful onboarding training would lead to higher levels of satisfaction with one's job. Research conducted by Ashford and Black (1996) has shown a relationship between coworker and supervisor relationship building during socialization and higher job satisfaction. Because the fourth level of onboarding provides the opportunity to foster these relationships in the beginning stages of their employment within the organization, we hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 4: Individuals who were onboarded at the fourth level (Connection) will have higher levels of job satisfaction than those who were onboarded at the other three levels (Compliance, Clarification, and Culture).

METHOD

Overview

Survey Monkey, an online survey participation platform, was used to present research statements and survey questions to participants. The study was accessible to participants through Amazon Mechanical Turk. Participants began by reviewing a recruitment statement. Next, participants answered the onboarding level questionnaire, gauging the levels at which they were onboarded (Compliance, Clarification, Culture, or Connection) (see Appendix A) and their perceived utility of onboarding. Next, participants completed a series of questionnaires measuring organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction. Finally, participants completed a demographic questionnaire and they were thanked and debriefed.

Sampling

A total of 734 participants were recruited for the current study from the online research platform, Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Research suggests that MTurk provides access to samples more representative of the population than university student participants (Mason & Suri, 2012). MTurk survey respondents additionally display survey response variability comparable to that of lab research participants (Mason & Suri, 2012). Because this study required that participants be employees of organizations, have job experience, and have experienced an onboarding process, it was deemed reasonable to utilize data from a crowdsourcing site to increase sample size and generalizability (Barger, Behrend, Sharek & Sinar, 2011; Buhrmester, Kwang & Gosling, 2011). Participant location was restricted to the United States as cultural and employee socialization processes differ across countries (Harzing & Sorge, 2003; Lee & Larwood, 1983). Participants were compensated $0.50 for their contribution to the study.

Participation requirements included: employment in the United States, currently employed at the organization where onboarded, and onboarding took place at least six months ago. These requirements were checked based on responses to the demographic survey. The rationale behind a six-month timeline is supported by research that shows it may take up to six months for a new employee to become fully acclimated in an organization, understand his or her job responsibilities and complete all necessary job entry training (Johnson & Senges, 2010; Korn/Ferry, 2007). Thus, six months may be reasonable in terms of allowing employees to develop fairly stable perceptions of OC, POS, and JS. Additionally, attention check items were included throughout the measures to ensure that participants were reading the items. An example is: "If you are reading this item, answer "3."" Participants who failed an attention check item were dropped from the study. Additionally, participants who did not receive onboarding, or did not indicate that they were onboarded at any of the four levels were dropped from the study. These requirements were checked based on what levels participants indicated they had experienced and examples of activities/information learned at these levels, via the onboarding level questionnaire. Finally, participants whose examples of onboarding provided in the open-ended questions were illegible, written in a language other than English, or were copied from an external source (such as a Google or Wikipedia search), were dropped from the study.

After dropping participants who had not been onboarded ($n = 143$, 18%), were not employed in the United States ($n = 52$, 7%), had been in their job for less than six months ($n = 32$, 4%), failed an attention check item ($n = 56$, 8%), or did not provide clear answers to the open-ended questions on the onboarding questionnaire ($n = 69$, 9%), 352 participants were dropped from the study. A total of 382 (52%) qualifying participants remained and were used in analyses.

Next, we examined the hierarchical assumption of onboarding levels. According to Bauer's (2010) theory of onboarding levels, each level presumes that previous levels have also been experienced.

Participants who had experienced onboarding levels in various combinations that were not hierarchical were dropped from the study ($n = 106$, 14%). Remaining participants who had experienced onboarding at level 1 ($n = 21$), levels 1+2 ($n = 64$), levels 1+2+3 ($n = 55$), or levels 1+2+3+4 ($n = 136$) were used in analyses ($n = 276$, 38%). See Table 1. Hypotheses were initially tested with the onboarding level combinations that conformed to Bauer's hierarchic assumption and then other onboarding level combinations were explored in further analyses.

TABLE 1
FREQUENCIES OF ONBOARDING LEVEL COMBINATIONS

		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
		21	6	7	2
Levels 1 + 2	Levels 1 + 3	Levels 1 + 4	Levels 2 + 3	Levels 2 + 4	Levels 3 + 4
64	*20*	6	7	5	0
		Levels 1 + 2 + 3	Levels 1 + 2 + 4	Levels 1 + 3 + 4	Levels 2 + 3 + 4
		55	*40*	9	4
					Levels 1 + 2 + 3 + 4
					136

Note: *Level 1 = Compliance; Level 2 = Clarification, Level 3 = Culture; Level 4 = Connection.*
Onboarding level combinations examined in planned analyses are bold.

Participants

Of the participants used in analyses in the current study, 53.9% identified as male ($n = 206$), 44.5% identified as female ($n = 170$), and 0.8% identified as other ($n = 3$). Approximately 22% were between the ages 18-25, ($n = 84$); 47.9% were ages 26-35 ($n = 183$); 18.8% were ages 36-45 ($n = 72$); 7.1% were ages 46-55, ($n = 27$); 3.7% were ages 56-65, ($n = 14$); and .3% were age 65+ ($n = 1$). The majority of participants (68.8%) reported their ethnicity as White/Caucasian, ($n = 263$); 9.4% reported as Black/African-American, ($n = 36$); 5.2% reported as Hispanic/Latino ($n = 20$); 14.1% reported as Asian/Pacific Islander, ($n = 54$); 1.6% reported as Native American, ($n = 6$); and .8% reported as multi-racial ($n = 3$). In terms of tenure, 31.2% reported 6 months-1 year, ($n = 119$); 50% reported 2-5 years ($n = 191$); 12.6% reported 6-10 years, ($n = 48$); 4.7% reported 11-15 years, ($n = 18$); 1% reported 16-20 years, ($n = 4$); .3% reported 21-25 years, ($n = 1$); and .3% reported 26-30 years, ($n = 1$).

Participants were coded by job level based on their job title and industry as Individual Contributor, Manager, or Executive Leader. Frequencies for job level were as follows: 63.6% were Individual Contributors, ($n = 243$); 31.4% were Managers, ($n = 120$); 3.1% were Executive Leaders, ($n = 12$); and 3.1% did not identify their job title ($n = 7$).

Measures

Level of Onboarding

The four-item Onboarding Questionnaire was developed to gauge the levels at which participants were onboarded. Onboarding was defined as "the process new employees go through to become introduced and adjusted to the organization, and is often characterized by on-the-job training and new hire administrative procedures." On the Onboarding Questionnaire were asked "During your onboarding

experience were you: (e.g., provided a sense of organizational norms?).” Each question also provided examples of activities that may occur at each level, drawn from research (Bauer, 2010; Bauer et al., 2007; Grusec & Hastings, 2015). Questions were answered “yes” or “no.” For example, to gauge onboarding at level 1 (Compliance), participants were asked “During your onboarding experience, were you educated on basic organization legal and policy-related rules and regulations? Examples of these may include, but are not limited to, employee dress code policy, time entry instructions, or employee handbook.” Each question measured participants’ experiences at each level of onboarding, with question 1 asking about level 1 of onboarding (Compliance) to question 4 asking about level 4 of onboarding (Connection). Additional space was provided for the participant to provide examples from their onboarding experiences. These responses were used to assist the researcher in determining whether each participant was in fact onboarded at the levels indicated, in addition to testing for English fluency as stated above.

Perceived Utility of Onboarding

Perceived utility of onboarding was measured using a modified version of the Attitudes Towards Training Utility Scale, a series of five questions utilized in a study conducted by Ford and Noe (1987) (α = .87). The measure was adapted to focus on the onboarding experience, rather than training. Questions were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). A sample item states, “*The onboarding program I have completed has been useful for my development as an employee.*” Ratings were summed for a total score. The internal consistency coefficient alpha for the current study was α = .93. Higher scores on this measure indicated higher levels of perceived utility of onboarding.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was measured using the 8-item Affective Commitment Scale, from Meyer and Allen’s Organizational Commitment Scale (1991). Only the affective scale was used because we were not interested in continuance or normative commitment as a result of onboarding, but rather feelings and attitudes toward their commitment to the organization. An example item is “*I would feel very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization,*” (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Coefficient alpha for this scale has been reported at α = 0.85, (Allen & Meyer, 1991). Questions on this measure are rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Four items on this scale were reverse-scored. Ratings were summed for a total score. The internal consistency coefficient alpha for this study was α = .90. Higher scores on this measure indicated higher levels of organizational commitment.

Perceived Organizational Support.

Perceived organizational support was measured using a short-form, 17-item version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS), developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). Many researchers utilize this widely accepted, short-form version of the highest loading items from the original, 36-item version, as the SPOS is unidimensional and has high internal consistency, α = 0.95 (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Questions on the SPOS were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Seven items on this scale were reverse-scored. Ratings were summed for a total score. The internal consistency coefficient alpha for the current study was α = .96. Higher scores on this measure indicated higher levels of perceived organizational support.

Job Satisfaction.

Job satisfaction was measured by the eight-item Job In General (JIG) scale (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson & Paul, 1989). Participants were asked if they agreed with statements beginning with, “*My job in general is GOOD...*” answering “yes, if it describes it,” “no, if it does not describe it” or “not sure, if you cannot decide” Answers were coded as Yes = 3, Not sure = 1, No = 0. Three items on this scale were reverse-scored. Then, ratings were summed for a total score. Higher scores on this measure indicated higher levels of job satisfaction. The internal consistency coefficient alpha for previous research was α = .91 (Ironson, et al., 1989); for the current study was α = .78.

Demographics

Finally, participants were asked to report demographic information related to: sex, age, ethnicity, employment in the United States, job title, industry, tenure, whether or not they were onboarded, how long ago onboarding took place, and length of onboarding.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to testing hypotheses, descriptive statistics and coefficient alphas were calculated (Table 2). Coefficient alphas indicated that all measures had an internal consistency of $\alpha = 0.75$ or higher. Onboarding level was not significantly related to age, $(r (379) = .04, p = .52)$; job level $(r (373) = -.09, p = .13)$; tenure $(r (380) = -.02, p = .76)$; or industry $(r (379) = -.06, p = .29)$.

In addition to Bauer's hierarchic assumption, she also suggested how frequently each level is observed. Bauer (2010) purports that nearly all organizations cover the first level of onboarding, Compliance (99%); the second and third levels, Clarification and Culture are met by approximately half of organizations (50%); and the final level, Connection, is met by 20% of organizations. Participants in the current study reported the following when asked if they were onboarded at each level: Compliance (91.9%), Clarification (83.5%), Culture (62%), and Connection (53.1%). A Chi Square Goodness of Fit test was conducted to examine if the levels of onboarding reported by participants were significantly different from Bauer's assumption. The test was found to be statistically significant, $\chi^2 (3) = 162.35, p = .001$. The results suggest a significant difference between the levels employees experienced than the expected frequencies.

TABLE 2
CORRELATION MATRIX

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Onboarding Level[a]	3.11	1.01	-							
2. Age[b]	53.8	0.17	.04	-						
3. Job Level[c]	1.38	0.55	-.09	.06	-					
4. Tenure[d]	41.08	44.64	-.03	.43**	.12*	-				
5. Job Satisfaction[e]	2.50	0.69	.20**	.06	.07	.08	(.78)			
6. Organizational Commitment[f]	4.51	1.39	.20**	.09	.07	.14**	.75**	(.90)		
7. Perceived Organizational Support[f]	4.62	1.36	.25**	-.01	-.01	-.01	.71**	.80**	(.96)	
8. Perceived Utility[f]	5.04	1.25	.32**	.03	-.05	.02	.41**	.50**	.52**	(.93)

Hypothesis Tests

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to test the effect that Onboarding Level had on the dependent variables [perceived utility of onboarding (H1), organizational commitment (H3), perceived organizational support (H4), and job satisfaction (H5)]. Pillai's Trace indicated that there was a significant effect of Onboarding Level, $v = .17$, $F (3,273) = 4.10$, $p = .001$. Follow up univariate ANOVAs were conducted for each dependent variable.

Hypothesis 1 expected that employees onboarded at the highest level, Connection, would have higher levels of perceived utility of onboarding than those at the other three levels (Compliance, Clarification, and Culture). A significant effect of Onboarding Level was found for utility, $F (3, 273) = 11.07$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .109$. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test revealed that participants onboarded at the Culture level (1+2+3) ($M = 26.92$, $SD = 5.60$) and Connection level (1+2+ 3+4) ($M = 29.15$, $SD = 5.38$) expressed significantly higher levels of perceived utility than those onboarded at the Compliance (1) ($M = 23.00$, $SD = 7.49$) and Clarification levels (1+2) ($M = 25.81$, $SD = 6.86$). See Table 3. There was no significant mean difference found between the Culture (1+2+3) and Connection levels (1+2+3+4). Hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

TABLE 3
PERCEIVED UTILITY OF ONBOARDING BY ONBOARDING LEVEL MEANS

Onboarding Level	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Level 1	22.10	7.49	21
Level 1 + 2	25.81	6.86	64
Level 1 + 2 + 3	26.93	5.61	55
Level 1 + 2 + 3 + 4	29.15	6.29	136

Note: *Higher scores reflect higher perceived utility of onboarding. Maximum score = 35. N = 276.*
Hypothesis 2 expected that individuals who were onboarded at the fourth level (Connection) would have greater organizational commitment than those who were onboarded at the other three levels (Compliance, Clarification, Culture). A significant effect of Onboarding Level was found for organizational commitment, F (3, 273) = 4.92, p = .002, partial η² = 0.05. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test revealed that participants onboarded at the Connection level, (1+2+3+4) (M = 38.51, SD = 10.97) expressed significantly higher levels of organizational commitment than Clarification level (1+2) (M = 32.78, SD = 11.72) and Culture level (1+2+3) (M = 33.91, SD = 11.21). There was not a statistically significant difference in organizational commitment between Connection (1+2+3+4) and Compliance (1) levels. See Table 4. Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

TABLE 4
AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT BY ONBOARDING LEVEL MEANS

Onboarding Level	M	SD	N
Level 1	33.48	12.73	21
Level 1 + 2	32.78	11.72	64
Level 1 + 2 + 3	33.91	11.21	55
Level 1 + 2 + 3 + 4	38.51	10.97	136

Note: *Higher scores reflect higher levels of organizational commitment. Maximum score = 56. N = 276. Hypothesis 3 predicted that individuals onboarded at the fourth level (Connection) would have higher levels of perceived organizational support than those onboarded at the other three levels (Compliance, Clarification, Culture). A significant effect of Onboarding Level was found for perceived organizational support, $F (3, 273) = 8.827$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$. Participants onboarded at the highest level, Connection (1+2+3+4) (M = 80.54, SD = 22.34) expressed significantly higher levels of perceived organizational support than Compliance (1) (M = 66.43, SD = 19.82), Clarification (1+2) (M = 68.48, SD = 22.25), and Culture (1+2+3) levels (M = 66.05, SD = 22.34). See Table 5. Hypothesis 3 was supported.*

TABLE 5
PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT BY ONBOARDING LEVEL MEANS

Onboarding Level	M	SD	n
Level 1	66.43	19.82	21
Level 1 + 2	66.48	22.25	64
Level 1 + 2 + 3	66.05	19.78	55
Level 1 + 2 + 3 + 4	80.54	22.34	136

Note: *Higher scores reflect higher levels of perceived organizational support. Maximum score = 112. N = 276. Hypothesis 4 predicted that individuals onboarded at the fourth level (Connection) would have higher levels of job satisfaction than those onboarded at the other three levels (Compliance, Clarification, and Culture). A significant effect of Onboarding Level was found for job satisfaction, $F (3, 273) = 4.406$, $p = .005$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test revealed that participants onboarded at the highest level, Connection (1+2+3+4) (M = 19.66, SD = 6.47) reported higher levels of job satisfaction than those at the Compliance (1) (M = 15.57, SD = 8.03), Clarification (1+2) (M = 16.50, SD = 8.25), and Culture (1+2+3) (M = 16.71, SD = 8.49). (See Table 6). Hypothesis 4 was supported.*

TABLE 6
JOB SATISFACTION BY ONBOARDING LEVEL MEANS

Onboarding Level	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Level 1	15.57	8.03	21
Level 1 + 2	16.50	8.25	64
Level 1 + 2 + 3	16.71	8.49	55
Level 1 + 2 + 3 + 4	19.66	6.47	136

Note. *Higher scores reflect higher levels of job satisfaction. Maximum score = 24. N = 276.*

Exploratory Analyses

A total of 382 participants met survey participation criteria for this study. Of those participants, 276 had experienced onboarding levels hierarchically. Due to the high frequencies of level combinations at levels 1+3 ($n = 23$) and levels 1+2+4 ($n = 42$) (Table 1), these two level combinations were added to the analyses to assess their impact on the results. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to test the effect that additional onboarding level combinations (1, 1+2, 1+2+3, 1+2+3+4, 1+3, 1+2+4) had on all dependent variables (perceived utility of onboarding, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction). After adding participants who had experienced levels 1+3 and levels 1+2+4, a total of 341 participants were examined in exploratory analyses. Pillai's Trace indicated that there was a significant effect of Onboarding Level, $v = .19$, $F (6, 335) = 3.33$, $p < .001$. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs were conducted for each dependent variable. Only significant differences for the added onboarding levels (1+3 and 1+2+4) are reported. Post-hoc analyses revealed significant differences for onboarding levels (1+3 and 1+2+4) on perceived utility. Those who were onboarded at levels 1+3 had significantly lower scores on perceived utility ($M = 23.45$, $SD = 4.96$) than the Connection (1+2+3+4) level ($M = 29.15$, $SD = 5.38$). Those who were onboarded at levels 1+2+4 had significantly higher scores on perceived utility ($M = 27.45$, $SD = 5.75$) than those at the Compliance level (1) ($M = 22.10$, $SD = 7.68$) (See Table 7). There was no significant difference for onboarding levels (1+3 and 1+2+4) and organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, or job satisfaction.

TABLE 7
PERCEIVED UTILITY BY EXPANDED ONBOARDING LEVELS MEANS

Onboarding Level (6)	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Level 1	22.10	7.49	21
Level 1 + 2	25.81	6.86	64
Level 1 + 2 + 3	26.93	5.61	55
Level 1 + 2 + 3 + 4	29.15	6.29	136
Level 1+3	23.45	4.96	20
Level 1+2+4	27.45	5.75	40

Note. *Higher scores reflect higher perceived utility of onboarding. Maximum score = 35. N = 276.*

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of onboarding levels (Compliance, Clarification, Culture, and Connection) on subsequent work attitudes (perceived utility of onboarding, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction). It was predicted that participants who were onboarded at the highest level, Connection, would have significantly higher work attitudes.

Participants were asked to complete a series of self-report questionnaires regarding their onboarding experiences to determine the level of onboarding received, as well as several job attitude surveys.

Employees who experienced onboarding at the Culture level (1+2+3) and Connection level (1+2+3+4) expressed significantly higher ratings of perceived utility than those who experienced onboarding at the Compliance level (1) or the Clarification level (1+2). There was no significant difference between Culture and Connection levels. It is reasonable to believe that employees given an opportunity to build connections and an internal network during their onboarding program find the program more valuable, as they are not only introduced to their duties, company policy, and norms, but also to their peers and colleagues who may serve as sources of information and social support. Employees also expressed higher ratings of perceived utility having completed the first three levels. It may be possible that the complex content delivered in Culture and Connection may have increased employees' perceptions of their onboarding program's utility. Because the information delivered at Culture and Connection levels are more complex than that which is delivered in Compliance and Clarification, employees may feel better equipped to do their jobs having been provided with more information.

Onboarding level also impacted organizational commitment. Interestingly, employees who were onboarded at the Compliance (1), Clarification (1+2), or Culture (1+2+3) levels did not express levels of organizational commitment that were significantly different from each other. These results may suggest that an employee who is onboarded at the Culture level (1+2+3) may not be any more or less committed to the organization than those who were onboarded at the Compliance (1) or Clarification (1+2) levels. The introduction of the fourth level, in combination with the previous three levels, led to a significant increase in organizational commitment, but only in comparison to the Clarification level (1+2). Organizational commitment was not significantly different between levels 1 and 4 or levels 3 and 4. While level 1 was not statistically different from level 4, the results of the other analyses in this study make a strong case for the Connection level (1+2+3+4) of onboarding programs to positively influence the other work attitudes, perceived organizational support and job satisfaction.

Employees expressed significantly higher levels of perceived organizational support when onboarded at the Connection level (1+2+3+4) than those onboarded at other levels. These results indicated that employees who were introduced to colleagues and given the opportunity to build an internal network perceived the organization as being more supportive of them as an employee. This notion makes sense, as much of the support felt by an employee may stem from the level of support they feel within their organizational network. These findings were consistent with research conducted by Allen and Shanock (2013) in that positive social interactions with organizational members during organizational entry were positively correlated with perceived organizational support. Employees who reached the Connection level in their onboarding indicated higher levels of perceived organizational support. If organizations foster opportunities to meet with key leaders, set up 1:1 meetings with colleagues and team members, or attend events with coworkers outside of work, it is reasonable to expect that their employees' perceptions of organizational support would be higher.

Respondents who reported being onboarded at the Connection level (1+2+3+4) reported significantly higher levels of job satisfaction than those who were onboarded at all other levels which supports previous research (Ashford & Black, 1996; Louis, Posner & Powell, 1985). These researchers found that the more information delivered and relationships built during organizational entry, the greater levels of job satisfaction indicated by respondents. This makes sense, as employees who are onboarded at the highest level typically receive the most information in their first few months on the job and have had the chance to network internally, thus building relationships which may enhance job satisfaction.

Social Information Processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), wherein job satisfaction is influenced by information available to employees, often via statements made by other coworkers may also help explain the results. Social information processing occurs when an employee hears evaluative statements from coworkers about their jobs feels inclined to agree with them so as to "fit in." New employees may come to adopt these sentiments as well, as coworkers provide information on how to react to and perceive their environment (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Employees who have reached the

Connection level in their onboarding are given the opportunity to meet with several coworkers who perhaps influence their job satisfaction in a positive way.

The results of this study have considerable implications for organizations looking to increase the impact of their onboarding programs for new employees. There is support that if organizations include all four levels of onboarding in their programs, they are likely to see increased perceptions of onboarding utility, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction. The importance of including these levels is demonstrated by the significant, positive effect that reaching the highest level, Connection, had on these attitudes. For organizations to ensure a robust, comprehensive onboarding program that effectively introduces an employee to their job, organization, and colleagues, these four levels must be achieved. Moreover, if employees experience all four levels, they will likely experience significantly greater perceptions of utility, organizational commitment, organizational support, and job satisfaction. Additionally, results indicate that the positive correlations onboarding level had with subsequent job attitudes were not related to other factors such as job level, tenure, or industry. This suggests that the attitudes expressed by participants are influenced by the extent of their onboarding, particularly if they reached the fourth and highest level, Connection. Effective onboarding in addition to the attitudes examined in this study has shown to positively impact other areas of the organization including engagement, performance and decreased turnover (Cable, et al, 2013; Klein & Weaver, 2000; Lavigna, 2009; Snell, 2006). By integrating all four levels of onboarding into their programs, organizations could expect a powerful impact on employee work attitudes, and other key areas as well.

Limitations

One limitation for the current study was data collection through the use of MTurk. Although MTurk has shown to be a valid, representative source of sample data (Harzing & Sorge, 2003; Lee & Larwood, 1983; Mason & Suri, 2012), the sample for this study (734 participants) was reduced by nearly half (382). This occurred after participants failed the manipulation checks, did not indicate that they had experienced onboarding, or did not write legible examples of onboarding in English as first-hand experiences. Final analyses only included those who had been onboarded and met all other participation criteria. This reduction in the sample may not have been as severe with the use of a pre-survey to determine qualification for participation, as only those who fulfilled these criteria would be asked to participate.

Additionally, the variable onboarding level mostly met the assumptions of Bauer's (2010) onboarding levels theory which suggests that onboarding levels are hierarchical or, that the highest level of onboarding met by a participant assumes all lower levels have been met. However, a portion of the respondents who participated did not experience this. After examining the frequencies of onboarding level combinations (see Table 1), the researcher found that while respondents' onboarding level experiences mostly met this assumption (72%), there were a number of respondents who experienced onboarding in other combinations of levels, (e.g., 1+3, 1+2+4, etc.) rather than in hierarchical progression (28%). For planned analyses, the researcher examined those who had reported levels hierarchically, which caused a reduction in sample size. There were not many changes in results with the addition of the level combinations 1+3 and 1+2+4, as the findings from these analyses did not differ from those found in planned analyses.

Future Research

A potential research contribution this study provides is the measure created to examine Bauer's onboarding levels, as none existed prior to the current study. The current study made an initial attempt at measuring this construct with a self-report instrument which may be useful to other onboarding researchers. It would be interesting to examine whether participants' views of the onboarding program are consistent with those of the onboarding developers. The measure could provide insight into the effectiveness of companies' onboarding programs. Organizations would better be able to identify which of the four onboarding levels in their programs that may be missing, so they can modify and restructure their programs to meet all levels.

Another direction for future research would be to replicate this study with different work attitudes, such as motivation or engagement, or behavioral outcomes such as turnover or promotions. One might find that a relationship exists between the scope of an onboarding program and the positive or negative consequences for other outcomes for the organization or individual employees. It would be interesting to see if the absence of higher onboarding levels has an inverse impact on counter-productive work behaviors, or if the presence of higher levels of onboarding might have a positive impact on organizational citizenship behaviors. Such relationships would again support the importance and impact of a good onboarding program on organizational outcomes.

A final option for future research would be to examine time spent in onboarding. Higher levels of onboarding may require more time and perhaps times spent in onboarding affects perceptions of onboarding effectiveness. Researchers may explore what percentage of time employees spend within each of the four levels to see whether this has an impact on perceived utility, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, or job satisfaction. This may reveal that more time in certain levels or more time spent overall may produce more positive employee attitudes. If such relationships were to emerge, this would greatly assist human resources professionals in designing effective onboarding programs.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effects of onboarding levels on perceived utility, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction. Participants onboarded at all four of Bauer's (2010) onboarding levels indicated significantly higher ratings of perceived utility, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and job satisfaction. Respondents did not indicate that these levels are entirely hierarchical in nature, as 28% of participants indicated their onboarding experiences fell within a number of other level combinations. However, when examining the specific combinations of levels described by Bauer, significant differences between groups were found such that participants onboarded at the Connection level (1 + 2 + 3 + 4) reported significantly higher levels of perceived utility and the work attitudes measured in this study than participants who reported any other combination of onboarding levels. These results emphasize the importance that an onboarding program cover elements of all levels, Compliance, Clarification, Culture, and Connection to equip employees better with the necessary information to be successful on the job.

REFERENCES

Allen, D. G. & Shanock, L. R. (2013). Perceived organizational support and embeddedness as key mechanisms connecting socialization tactics to commitment and turnover among new employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 350-369.

Allen, N. J & Meyer, J.P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role organization. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 847-858.

Ashford, S. J. & Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(2), 199-214.

Barger, P., Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., & Sinar, E. F. (2011). I-O and the crowd: Frequently asked questions about using Mechanical Turk for research. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 49*(2), 11-17.

Bauer, T. N. (2010). Onboarding new employees: Maximizing success. *Alexandria VA: SHRM Foundation*.

Bauer, T. N., Bodner, B. E., 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.

Bauer, T. N. & Green, S. G. (1994). Effect of newcomer involvement in work-related activities: A longitudinal study of socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(2), 211-223.

Bielski, L. (2007). Getting to "yes" with the right candidates: Best practice tips on recruiting and "onboarding" look at process and technology in balance. *American Bankers Association Banking Journal, 99*(3), 30-34, 51.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(1) 3-5.

Cable, D.M., Gino, F., & Staats, B.R. (2013). Reinventing employee onboarding. *MIT Management Review, 54*(13), 23-28.

Chiaburu, D. S. & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1082-1103.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 500-507.

Everson, K. (2015, July 17). Nike's Andre Martin: Just learn it. *Chief Learning Officer.* Retrieved from http://www.clomedia.com/articles/6377-nikes-andre-martin-justlearn-it

Ford, K. J., & Noe, R. A. (1987). Self-assessed training needs: The effects of attitudes toward training, managerial level, and function. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(1), 39-53.

Gillespie, M. A., Balzer, W., Brodke, M. H., Garza, M., Grebec, E. N., Gillespie, J. Z., Gopalkrisnan, P. Lengvel, J. S., Sliter, K. A., Sliter, M. T., Withrow. S. A., & Yugo, J. E., (2016). Normative measurement of job satisfaction in the US. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *31*(2), 516-536.

Graybill, J.O., Carpenter, M.T.H, Offord, J., Piorum, M., & Shaffer, G. (2013). Employee onboarding: Identification of best practices in ACRL libraries, *Library Management, 34*(3), 200-218.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 463-488.

Grusec, J. E. & Hastings, P. D. (Eds.). (2015). *Handbook of socialization: theory and research* (2nd Ed.) New York: The Guildford Press.

Gundry, L. K. & Rousseau, D. N. (1994). Critical incidents in communicating culture to newcomers: the meaning is the message. *Human Relations 47*(9), 1063-1088.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1974). The job diagnostic survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects. *Technical Report prepared for Office of Naval Research Manpower Administration*, 1-88.

Harzing, A-W. & Sorge, A. (2003). The relative impact of country of origin and universal contingencies on internationalization strategies and corporate control in multinational enterprises: Worldwide and European perspectives. *Organization Studies, 24*(2), 187-214.

Holton, E. F. (1996) New employee development: A review and reconceptualization. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 7*(3), 233-252.

Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 193-200.

Johnson, M. & Senges, M. (2010). Learning to be a programmer in a complex organization: A case study on practice-based learning during the onboarding process. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 23*(2), 180-194.

Kammeyer-Mueller, J., Wanberg, C., Rubenstein, A., & Song, Z. (2013). Support, undermining, and newcomer socialization: Fitting in during the first 90 days. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(4), 1104-1124.

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.

Korn/Ferry International White Paper. (2007). *A review of onboarding literature.* Los Angeles, CA: Dai, G. & De Meuse, K. P.

Lavigna, B. (2009). Getting onboard: Integrating and engaging new employees. *Government Finance Review, 25*(3), 65-70.

Lee, Y. & Larwood, L. (1983). The socialization of expatriate managers in multinational firms. The Academy of Management Journal, *26*(4), 657-665.

Louis, M. R., Posner, B. Z., & Powell, G. N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 857-866.

Mason, W. & Suri, S. (2012). Conducting behavioral research on Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Behavioral Research Methods, 44*(1), 1-23.

Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1984). Testing the "side bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372– 378.

Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61-89.

Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14,* 224-247.

Perrot, S., Bauer, T.N., Abonneau, D., Campoy, E., Erdogan, B., & Liden, R.C. (2014). Organizational tactics and newcomer adjustment: the moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Group & Organization Management, 39*(3), 247-273.

Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 698-714.

Ruona, W.E., Leimbach, M., Holton, E.F., & Bates, R. (2002). The relationship between learner utility reactions and predicted learning transfer among trainees. *International Journal of Training and Development, 6*(4), 218-228.

Saks, A.M. (1996). The relationship between the amount helpfulness of entry training and work outcomes. *Human Relations, 49*(4), 429-451.

Salancik, G.R. & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23*(2), 224-253.

Scott, K. D. & Taylor, G. S. (1985). An examination of conflicting findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*(3), 599-612.

Shore, L. M. & Tetrick, L. E. (1991). A construct validity study of the survey of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(5), 637-643.

Singh, H. (2003). Building effective blended learning programs. *Educational Technology, 43*(6), 51-54.

Snell, A. (2006). Researching onboarding best practice: Using research to connect onboarding processes with employee satisfaction. *Strategic HR Review, 5*(6), 32-35.

Solinger, O.N., van Olffen, W., Roe, R. A., & Hofmans, J. (2013). On becoming (un)committed: A taxonomy and test of newcomer onboarding scenarios. *Organization Science, 24*(6), 1640-1661.

Tannenbaum, S. I., Mathieu, J. E., Salas, E. & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (1991). Meeting trainees' expectations: The influence of training fulfillment on the development of commitment, self efficacy, and motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 759-769.

Viana, D., Conte, T., & de Souza, C. (2014). Proceedings from the 26th International Conference on Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering: *Knowledge transfer between senior and novice software engineers: A qualitative analysis*. Vancouver, BC.

Wallace, K. (2009). Creating an effective new employee orientation program. *Library Leadership & Management, 23*(4), 168-176.

Wanous, J. P. (1992). *Organizational entry: recruitment, selection, orientation, and socialization of newcomers* (2nd ed.) Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

APPENDIX
Onboarding Level Questionnaire

For each question, please indicate which of the response options describes your onboarding experience.

ONBOARDING is defined as the process new employees go through to become introduced and adjusted to the organization, and is often characterized by on-the-job training and new hire administrative procedures.

During your onboarding experience, were you:

1. Educated on basic organization **legal and policy-related rules and regulations**? Examples of these may include, but are not limited to, employee dress code policy, time entry instructions, or employee handbook.

   ☐ YES
   ☐ NO
   If you answered NO, please skip to the next question.
   If you answered YES, please provide examples of **legal and policy-related rules and regulations** that you were educated on during your onboarding experience:

2. Educated about the **expectations of you in your job**? Examples of these may include, but are not limited to, daily responsibilities, how to write reports, or performance evaluation criteria.

   ☐ YES
   ☐ NO
   If you answered NO, please skip to the next question.
   If you answered YES, please provide examples of **expectations of you in your job** that you were educated on during your onboarding experience:

3. Provided a sense of **organizational culture**? Culture can be defined as shared assumptions, values, and beliefs, which governs how people behave in organizations. These shared values have a strong influence on the people in the organization and dictate how they dress, act, and perform their jobs. Examples of this may include, but are not limited to, lunch hour preferences, employee birthday observances, or team-oriented v. independent work environment.

   ☐ YES
   ☐ NO
   If you answered NO, please skip to the next question.
   If you answered YES, please provide examples of **organizational culture** that you were educated on during your onboarding experience:

4. Given the opportunity to foster **interpersonal relationships and networks**? Examples may include meet & greet with key leaders, lunch with coworkers, introductory meetings with members of the organization across departments and/or work teams.

☐ YES
☐ NO

If you answered NO, please skip to the next question.

If you answered YES, please provide examples of **interpersonal relationships and networks** that you were given the opportunity to foster during your onboarding experience: