Navigating the Hybrid Onboarding Process – A Study on Coordination Across Generations in the Hybrid Workplace

BACHELOR'S DEGREE PROJECT
THESIS WITHIN: Business Administration
NUMBER OF CREDITS: 15 ECTS
PROGRAMME OF STUDY: International Management

AUTHORS: Antonia Matisic, David Högman

JÖNKÖPING May 2023
Abstract

Background: In the post-pandemic era the implementation of hybrid workplaces has only increased within organisations. Offering the ability to work from home has resulted in increases in both satisfaction and performance on various levels. However, this new trend has brought new challenges for organisations. The onboarding process is crucial for the integration of new employees into the organisation and must be appropriately adapted to this new way of working.

Purpose: The thesis aims to provide valuable insight for organisations on how they can effectively manage organisational socialisation and the onboarding processes for hybrid workplaces. With the goal of effectively integrating new hires into the company culture and their role with a focus on how organisations can best adapt to the new employees' demographical differences during the process.

Method: The research was designed by using interpretivism philosophy with an abductive approach. Two Individuals with experience with hybrid work were interviewed in order to investigate the current hybrid work environment. In addition, a survey was distributed that inquired about participants' experiences and expectations of the hybrid workplace and their onboarding process where a total of 136 responses were used in the study.

Conclusion: The study found that there exists a disparity between the perception and the reality of the hybrid workplace. The current socialisation and onboarding processes are inadequate for appropriately integrating all new hires into the company. Therefore, companies need to adapt their processes accordingly to generational differences in order to successfully onboard new hires into the hybrid workplace.
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1. Introduction

The chapter aims to introduce the reader to the background of the thesis, the study’s research question and problem discussion, the purpose, and potential implications as well as the delimitations of the study.

1.1 Background

Teleworking was first coined by Nilles et al. (1976) in the 1970s and has since then with the introduction of new technologies into the workplace transformed the work form into what we today refer to as remote work, working from home, or hybrid work. When the Covid-19 virus was declared a pandemic in early 2020 (Liu et al., 2020) employers and companies had to adjust and adhere to the different regulations at hand. These clear changes and regulations that companies were now facing initiated a transition towards digital and hybrid workplaces to be able to efficiently continue business operations (Bick et al., 2020). The pandemic shed light on today's rapidly changing business environment and organisations started facing challenges of maintaining and managing control, coordination, and collaboration within the hybrid workplace.

A crucial part of the success of these factors (managing control, coordination, and collaboration) is the proper introduction of new employees into the company, ensuring they have all the tools they need. To effectively ensure a good introduction of new employees into the company the adoption of an efficient onboarding process by organisations is crucial. The onboarding process is the practices that companies put in place to introduce new employees to their company culture and values while also providing role clarity for the individual (Jeske & Olson, 2021). The onboarding process is commonly integrated into the organisational socialisation of new employees in a company (Klein & Polin, 2012) and there is an increase in the need for efficient digital onboarding processes in the hybrid and digital workplace (Sani et al., 2023). The onboarding process must be managed and coordinated to ensure that new employees are successfully integrated regardless of their previous experiences. However, the trends following the Covid-19 pandemic and the subsequent shifts in work practices brought forth new challenges for organisations' onboarding processes in the hybrid workplace.
Most companies strive towards having a diverse workforce and the onboarding process is a crucial part of integrating new hires into the company to ensure diversity is maintained (Jeske & Olson, 2021). One demographical difference amongst employees that is existent in almost any company is employees from different generational cohorts and these diverse employees, due to their upbringing and age differences, tend to value different motivators in the workplace.

1.2 Problem Discussion

Even though researchers have investigated the implications of an effective onboarding process (Bauer, 2010; Capitano et al., 2021; Cesário & Chambel, 2019; Chillakuri, 2020; Klein & Polin, 2012; Klein et al., 2015; Sani et al., 2023), there is currently little research on the post-covid workplace and there is still confusion about how to successfully onboard and integrate workers in the hybrid work context. Many studies emphasize the value of the onboarding process for employee retention, social capital, and strategic advantage (Derven, 2008; Jeske & Olson, 2021; Korte & Lin, 2013). But it's crucial to understand that throughout the onboarding and socialisation process, technology cannot completely replace in-person interactions (Razmerita et al., 2016). Jeske and Olson (2021) and Sani et al. (2022) discuss the idea of the online onboarding process and its implications for recruits, outlining the various components of how new employees are affected by this process and the potential implications that can impact companies.

During 2020, there was a shift from centralised offices to home offices due to the pandemic (Mukherjee & Narang, 2022). The trend of home offices and the increase in remote work continued after the pandemic as companies offered employees the opportunity to work from home. (Kagerl & Starzetz, 2023). According to Halford (2005), the hybrid workplace concept enables employees to work from a multitude of different locations for work assignments, this includes both the centralised office and working from home but can also include additional locations outside the office. Current knowledge is mostly centred on the advantages and disadvantages of hybrid work (Bellmann & Hübler, 2021; Petani & Mengis, 2021; Toscano & Zappalà, 2020; Tyagi & Pandita, 2022; Yang et al., 2023). Several articles concluded that hybrid work can increase job satisfaction and improve the work-life balance for employees (Bellmann & Hübler, 2021; Golden et al., 2008; Kagerl & Starzetz, 2023; Petani & Mengis,
Conversely, other research has demonstrated that remote employment might enhance feelings of isolation and impair social support (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Kniffin et al., 2021). Additionally, researchers also found that it can be challenging for managers to inspire workers, build a sense of belonging, and help them identify with the company's values due to hybrid workplaces and the growing use of digital technologies because of remote work. (Petani & Mengis, 2021; Tyagi & Pandita, 2022). However, several duties relating to the workplace, like socialising and training, are preferred by employees to be undertaken in corporate offices. (Kagerl & Starzetz, 2023; Yang et al., 2023).

Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z are three of the generations that make up the workforce (Raišienė et al., 2021). Workplace frameworks and structures are influenced by the beliefs and interests of each generation and vary between generations. Generation X put a high importance on meaningful work through social constructs in addition requires self-determination and training to succeed (Raišienė et al., 2021; Van Rossem, 2021). Social contact is highly valued by Generation X, making it challenging for them to use Internet communication tools (Chopra & Bhilare, 2020). Contrarily, Generation Y and Generation Z were both raised with technology incorporated into their daily life making them better prepared to adapt to changes in technology in the workplace and integrating them into their work habits (Chillakuri, 2020; Jayathilake et al., 2021; Widyaputri & Sary, 2022). According to Raišienė et al. (2021), employer attitudes towards remote and hybrid work are dependent on age, and most recent literature (Chillakuri, 2020; Jayathilake et al., 2021; Raišienė et al., 2021; Van Rossem, 2021; Widyaputri & Sary, 2022) explains the differences in motivational factors regarding the various generational cohorts. The understanding of how motivational elements have been impacted when firms have made the journey to a hybrid workplace is missing from present studies.

1.3 Implications

Therefore, the study assumes importance as the hybrid workplace presents unique challenges for managers and organisations, and thus calls for a well-established onboarding program to successfully onboard in the hybrid work environment. In a study conducted by Boston Consulting Group, 51% of managers reported that they experience difficulties maintaining work culture, especially during onboarding when implementing a hybrid work model (Ferreira
et al., 2020). The hybrid workplace might be the place of the future and we need to research it. In a survey conducted by McKinsey & Company with over 25 000 participants in 2022, the researchers found that over 58% of Americans were already offered the opportunity to work from home at least once a week (Dua et al., 2022). The trend of adopting the hybrid workplace is growing in the post-covid workplace. With limited research on the topic, this thesis aims to further expand knowledge within and contribute a deeper understanding of the topic.

1.4 Purpose

By examining this issue, the thesis will aim to provide valuable insight for organisations on how they can effectively manage and coordinate the onboarding process in a hybrid workplace. As the move towards a hybrid workplace has become an increasing trend worldwide it has been followed by new challenges for organisations in terms of onboarding new employees and integrating them into the organisation's culture and processes. The main aspect of how the research is conducted will pivot the focus on how organisations can best maintain, manage, and coordinate new employees' demographical differences during the onboarding process. Providing valuable insights into how managers shall effectively manage and coordinate onboarding processes in a hybrid workplace can improve organisations' ability to attract, retain, and develop talent, ultimately enhancing their overall performance. By interviewing individuals currently employed in organisations which have implemented hybrid workplace practices the study will be able to provide important insight into the topic and combined with the survey that will be distributed the researchers will be able to identify trends in the expectations vs experience and identify an experience gap and draw conclusion upon what organisations will have to overcome to manage their onboarding process and hybrid workplaces most efficiently. Ultimately, through this research, the aim will be to provide valuable insight into this challenge faced by managers, organisations, and employees in the hybrid workplace and pinpoint the most critical elements required for the structuring of a successful onboarding process which will provide significant benefits for both current literature and practitioners.
1.5 Research Question

The research question that will be explored in this thesis is:

How can organisations best coordinate the onboarding process in a hybrid workplace of different generations?

1.6 Definitions of Key Terms

**Hybrid workplace** - Work arrangement where employees are allowed to perform part of the contracted working hours from their home (or another out-of-office environment). It can also be referred to as remote work, teleworking, or work from home (Grzegorczyk et al., 2021; Mukherjee & Narang, 2022).

**Organisational Socialisation** - The process an individual goes through in the organisation where they acquire the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume their role in the company (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

**Onboarding** - The process of incorporating new employees into the organisation by introducing the organisation’s structure, culture, vision, mission, and values while being integrated with the new team and colleagues (Bauer, 2010).

**Generational Differences** - Distinct differences in beliefs, politics, or core values. between birth cohorts who share the same and unique understanding due to their shared experience in a similar socio-historical context in that they were born and lived (Raišienė et al., 2021).

1.7 Delimitations

To ensure the scope of the research the selection of individuals for the data collection where delimited to people with and without experience in the hybrid workplace and limited to the generations Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z, making the target population on the larger spectrum. The data collection for the interviews was limited to individuals with current, or past, experience to focus the information collected about the thesis. This thesis aims to investigate the phenomenon of onboarding in the hybrid workplace and its implications and with the time frame of the study, it is delimited to a cross-sectional study.
2. Frame of reference

In this chapter, the authors will first present the concept and current literature regarding the hybrid workplace. Furthermore, the theory regarding onboarding will be presented, tied together with the concept of generational differences in the workplace. To support our findings in our thesis we will evaluate according to the ERG theory and its implications, and this literature review aims to give an insight into what the current literature states regarding the mentioned subjects and theories.

2.1 Literature Search Method

The aim of the conducted literature review was to get a broad insight into the development of different work setups, the hybrid workplace, the onboarding process, and generational differences that exist in the workforce. By determining the scope of the current research regarding the mentioned subjects, knowledge gaps and topics for further research could be identified. Furthermore, by gaining this knowledge on the scope of the current literature the authors display an understanding of how these different topics together have had an impact on the changing business environment that we see today.

For the frame of references the relevant articles were targeted with the keywords: “Work from home”, “Working from home”, “Remote work”, “Hybrid Workplace”, “Onboarding”, “Organisational Socialisation”, “Generations”, and “intergenerational differences”. These keywords were searched individually and thereafter in combination with one another, some examples are, “Work from home AND Onboarding”, “Organisational Socialisation AND Generations”, and “Remote work AND intergenerational differences”. By searching the selected keywords both individually and in combinations, the authors could determine research where the different fields of interest were interrelated while also getting a deeper insight into the separate construct of subjects.

When the keywords and subjects were determined, multiple databases were used to conduct the search, these were primarily Primo, Google Scholar, Scopus, Emerald Insight, Wiley, and ScienceDirect. The literature review was aimed at getting an insight into how the stated
different subjects and constructs have developed over time therefore no limitation on the publication date was set. Older research is included as well as more current to gain this broader insight. In addition to the initial searches, further sources were also used and found through elected literature’s stated references to gain a further understanding of the topic.

The initial search of literature gave a collection of sources that was further narrowed down to fit the research topic by reading the abstract and gaining insight into relevance. Subsequently, to narrow down our selection even further, the introduction and findings were read and evaluated regarding relevance again to the research topic. By this systematic approach, 74 articles were determined relevant and used throughout the research.

**2.2 Literature review**

**2.2.1 Organisational Socialisation**

Organisational socialisation was early researched and defined by Van Maanen and Schein (1979) and they theorised and created the early model for organisational socialisation. The definition of the theory that they developed is “*organisational socialisation is then the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organisational role*” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 211). The early work presented by Van Maanen and Schein (1979) was a detailed analysis of six different tactical dimensions within the socialisation process that managers and organisations can utilise as tactics for socialising new employees into the company. As Van Maanen and Schein (1979) identified these tactical dimensions, later Jones (1986) conducted empirical research and suggested that these tactics fall on the spectrum between individualised (informal) and institutionalised (formal) socialisation tactics (Saks & Gruman, 2012). Subsequently, researchers have built upon this theory to further explain and develop the current literature within the theory of organisational socialisation (Bauer et al., 2007; Cheng et al., 2022; Saks et al., 2007; Saks & Gruman, 2012).

The different approaches or tactics that organisations undertake regarding newcomers' socialisation process falls under the spectrum between individualised and institutionalised
approaches (Allen, 2006; Perrot et al., 2014; Saks et al., 2007). The individualised socialisation approaches would be those situations where the responsibility falls on the individual in their socialisation process, the informal and unstructured approaches, whereas if an organisation uses structured and formal procedures to facilitate the socialisation process it will be categorized as institutionalised socialisation (Perrot et al., 2014). The difference between informal and formal approaches to socialisation tactics refers to how the information is presented to the new hire, formal being more direct role learning from the company level while informal tactics refer more to those where learning takes place in the working groups at the place of the job (Jones, 1986).

How organisations tactically shape and form the socialisation process is closely related to the new hire's adjustment into their role and the organisation (Bauer et al., 2007). Bauer et al. (2007) developed and supported the theory on how the organisational socialisation process together with how the new hire seeks out information in their new role both influence how well a new hire in an organisation adjusts to their new role. A well-designed tactical organisational socialisation process, in harmony with how the new hire seeks out information, leads to role clarity, self-efficacy, and social acceptance (Bauer et al., 2007). Researchers agree that these intrapersonal positive effects of a well-designed organisational socialisation process led to more distal outcomes that are related to job attitudes and behaviour (Spagnoli, 2020). Some of these attitudes and behaviour refer to organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and retention and the current development in our economy has heightened the importance of employee recruitment and especially retention since the workforce during the last decade has become more and more mobile (Allen, 2006; Bauer et al., 2007; Saks et al., 2007; Spagnoli, 2020).

What researchers are investigating more recently is how the organisational socialisation process has been affected by digitalisation and how currently more and more organisations are adopting the idea of virtual work environments (Asatiani et al., 2021). While early research focuses more on the face-to-face interactions that are occurring during the organisational socialisation process (Jones, 1986; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) researchers like Asatiani et al. (2021) highlight the current communicational environment where communication is more extensively mediated through technology. An important factor, that becomes a larger challenge for organisations with an adopted hybrid work environment, is the employer's ability to navigate the organisational
culture (Asatiani et al., 2021) which is one of the core implications of the organisational socialisation process (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

2.2.2 Onboarding

Bauer (2010) defined onboarding as “the process of helping new hires adjust to social and performance aspects of their new jobs quickly and smoothly” (p.1), but Capitano et al. (2021) also state the importance of understanding this process the new hire undergoes while learning about their new responsibilities and work culture. The concept and terminology of onboarding started to be investigated by researchers in the early 1990 and the term onboarding evolved from the early research by Van Maanen and Schein (1979) (Bauer & Erdogan, 2012; Chillakuri, 2020) that theorised and created the early model for organisational socialisation. Current research and literature state that many researchers derive their theories on onboarding based on the organisational socialisation model developed by Van Maanen and Schein (1979) (Bauer et al., 2007; Capitano et al., 2021; Cesário & Chambel, 2019; Chillakuri, 2020; Klein & Polin, 2012; Klein et al, 2015; Korte & Lin, 2013; Sani et al., 2022), although the concept of onboarding is further theorised with a modern perspective in more recent research. More recent literature discusses how the onboarding process has developed to incorporate digital aspects in many companies and its implications (Jeske & Olson, 2021; Sani et al., 2022). Many studies and academics have highlighted the importance of the onboarding process regarding company strategic advantage (Derven, 2008), social capital (Korte & Lin, 2013), and employee retention (Jeske & Olson, 2021). Furthermore, a successful and organised onboarding process for new hires also contributes to the employee's loyalty and personal feeling towards the company which fosters a collaborative work environment (Cesário & Chambel, 2019; Chillakuri, 2020).

Onboarding is also referred to by academics and HR professionals as the organisational socialisation process of new employees (Bauer, 2010; Klein & Polin, 2012) but there are some disagreements among scholars on whether these two definitions mean to describe the same theory (Klein et al., 2015). The authors Klein et al. (2015) view them as two separate constructs as they state that the organisational socialisation process focuses mainly on the individual employee and how they adjust to a new work environment while onboarding states more on the
process and practices a business can focus on to make this process as effective and sufficient as possible. In this study, the onboarding process will be viewed as a separate construct from the organisational socialisation process (Jeske & Olson, 2021).

The transition we can see in today's changing business environment towards a more online-based onboarding landscape has not only affected the channels of communication, how and by whom the communication is transacted, but also aspects like social interaction and maintaining inclusive diversity in the workforce (Jeske & Olson, 2021). The research conducted by Sani et al. (2022) shows that during the pandemic and the rising implementation of the hybrid workplace model, some of the top concerns and issues experienced by employees who went through an online onboarding process are a lack of connectedness, lack of adequate social interaction and lack of role clarity. Companies need to make sure that onboarding, online or not, meets the needs of new hires by giving them the correct tools and initiatives to fully grow into their new role (Chillakuri, 2020).

2.2.3 The evolution of the hybrid working form

The practice of working remotely also referred to as teleworking dates back to the 1970s, first explored by Nilles et al. (1976), who coined the term teleworking and argued that with the emergence of new technologies, people should start teleworking in an effort to decrease congestion and air pollution in urban areas while increasing worker productivity and reduce costs for employers. The development and emergence of new technologies, teleworking expanded and became more popular and was seen as a new way of working (Venkatraman, 1994). However, the adoption of traditional telework eventually faced stagnation or even decline, whilst the spread of new technologies accelerated, especially in many emerging economies (Messenger & Gschwind, 2016).

As technology continued to develop and telework decreased, workers started to work more independently (Lee & Brand, 2005). This led to a more flexible and multi-locational work model which decreased the need for office space and caused managers to look for alternatives to better suit multi-locational work (Vartiainen et al., 2007). The activity-based office is defined
commonly among authors as a flexible solution with distinct spaces or zones for various types of activities which typically include open spaces for teamwork, quiet spaces for tasks that require concentration, spaces for phone calls, and formal and informal meeting areas where employees frequently switch between workstations based on task-related needs. (Appel-Meulenbroek et al., 2011; Danielsson et al., 2015; De Croon et al., 2005; Golden, 2007). However, multiple authors have found that changing to an activity-based office often results in negative outcomes for the organisation (Brunia et al., 2016; Haapakangas et al., 2018; Ruohomäki et al., 2019; Sirola et al., 2021). Environmental satisfaction decreased as a result of the changing work environment (Haapakangas et al., 2018; Ruohomäki et al., 2019). Workers felt they were unable to influence the decision-making and design process in this new office landscape resulting in decreased employee satisfaction and job productivity subsequently (Brunia et al., 2016; Sirola et al., 2021).

As the pandemic forced many to change their work locations from centralised offices to home offices. Working from home, also referred to by scholars as remote work became more prevalent. The percentage of Americans that worked from home increased from 8.2 per cent in February to 35.2 per cent in May 2020 (Bick et.al., 2020). Although the change to home offices and hybrid workplace solutions was due to external factors, the positive results and following improvement in worker satisfaction and the work-life balance, in combination with the shortcomings of the activity-based office, became a better alternative for those who previously used activity-based offices and resulted in many companies continuing to offer workers the opportunity to work from home even after the pandemic (Kagerl & Starzetz, 2023). Around the world, businesses are attempting to adopt hybrid workplaces that will permit workers to work remotely on certain days and physically attend the office on other days. (Petani & Mengis, 2021).

The hybrid workplace model is defined by the authors Grzegorczyk et al. (2021), as a work arrangement in which “workers can telework for a proportion of their contracted working hours within the limits of individually or collectively negotiated work arrangements” (p.11). The hybrid workplace offers workers the opportunity to work from home and can. Whilst there is a consensus amongst scholars that working from home has resulted in higher job satisfaction
among workers (Kagerl & Starzetz, 2023; Petani & Mengis, 2021; Yang et al., 2023). However, authors have found that workers prefer certain work-related tasks performed in corporate offices such as socialising, getting trained, and training others (Yang et al., 2023). Other scholars also remark that the hybrid workplace and increased use of digital tools through remote work hardens managers' ability to motivate employees and foster a sense of belonging and identification with corporate values (Petani & Mengis, 2021; Tyagi & Pandita, 2022). In this study, the hybrid workplace will be seen as any workplace that offers its employees the ability to work from home anywhere from 1 to 5 days a week whilst still offering the opportunity to work in a centralised office space.

2.2.4 Generational Differences in the Workforce

Research around the concept of generational differences regarding beliefs, values and attitudes gained attention from researchers in the 1970s Markides (1978) and Penn (1977) further contributed to research regarding these generational differences with support regarding the proposition of the existence of generational differences and that these can be measured. Different Generations can be explained as “different birth cohorts who share the same and unique understanding due to their shared experience in a similar socio-historical context that they were born and lived in” (Raišienė et al., 2021, p. 3). Although in this study the main definition of “generation” is the birth year or biological age differences, it is important to mention that this is only one of many definitions of “generation” (Cogin, 2012; Urick et al., 2017). Urick et al. (2017) lifted the criticism of earlier literature for not considering the cultural impacts and differences in life experiences when basing assumptions on generational differences. The importance here is to understand that several factors, for example, religion, ethnicity, or marital status, should be taken into consideration when defining different generations (Grubb, 2016). Looking at the workforce that we see in the employee market today, three of these are, Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z (Raišienė et al., 2021). These different generations all have different values, preferences, and expectations (Raišienė et al., 2021) that shape the work structure and frameworks. Chopra and Bhilare (2020) highlighted the impact that technological advancement has had on work structures and frameworks within companies and how different generations are affected.
2.2.4.1 Work Values within Generation X

Generation X (born 1964 - 1976) shares a lot of similarities with the values of previous generations that value meaningful work through social constructs although Generation X values and requires training and autonomy to thrive in their work environment (Van Rossem, 2021; Raišienė et al., 2021). Generation X highly values the importance of their autonomy and places high importance on feeling free from supervision (Van Rossem, 2021; Raišienė et al., 2021). Generation X, highly values social contact to be motivated and therefore might have a harder time with online communication platforms as a substitute for face-to-face contact (Raišienė et al., 2021). Furthermore, the generation has a very hard-working attitude where hard work is the prominent factor of success (Raišienė et al., 2021).

2.2.4.2 Work Values within Generation Y

Generation Y (born 1983 – 1995) is the first generation where technology is an integrated part of their life and this makes this generation cohort more adaptable to the current technological changes in work environments (Chopra & Bhilare, 2020; Raišienė et al., 2021; Widyaputri & Sary, 2022). This generation find meaning in their work through adequate training, opportunities for career development (Raišienė et al., 2021) and varied work (Van Rossem, 2021; Widyaputri & Sary, 2022). Since this generational cohort values personal development, the phenomenon of work-life balance became more of a reality for this group rather than the opportunity it was in the past (Raišienė et al., 2021). Further expectations of work that this generation holds are immediate feedback autonomy and formal training opportunities (Chopra & Bhilare, 2020; Raišienė et al., 2021; Widyaputri & Sary, 2022).

2.2.4.3 Work Values within Generation Z

Generation Z (born after 1995) is the generation cohort, like Generation Y, that has been growing up with the internet as a basic human need (Jayathilake et al., 2021). When it comes to work-life satisfaction and motivation this generation of workers highly values instant and frequent feedback, work-life balance, personal connection with their teams, adequate training and a deep understanding of the companies’ values and strategic goals (Jayathilake et al., 2021; Chillakuri, 2020). It should be noted that Generation Z shares a lot of the qualities of Generation
Y, both tech-savvy, entrepreneurial and career advancement-orientated (Chillakuri, 2020; Van Rossem, 2021). What several authors agree upon that differs Generation Z from the other birth cohorts is that they “generally do not settle for the status quo” (Chillakuri, 2020, p. 1288) meaning that they are more ambitious and if their expectations are not met at the employment, they would prefer to look for other opportunities (Chillakuri, 2020; Jayathilake et al., 2021).

2.2.4.4 Differences in Expectations

Companies and organisations need to realise the difference in expectations when managing their workforce (DelCampo et al., 2010; Phillips, 2018). Today's workforce is widely spread across different generations and these different generations have different expectations of what their employee should provide for them in terms of benefits, pay, job security, career development, and training (DelCampo et al., 2010; Moore et al., 2015). Expectations differ from values in the sense that employee expectations are what the employee thinks the employer will provide in exchange for what the individual will contribute to the company more than just the individual's wants and needs (Moore et al., 2015).
2.3 Theoretical Framework

Organisational socialisation is the process where employees acquire the social skills and knowledge to be able to assume an organisational role and this is a process that is continuous throughout the time of employment (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). The onboarding process is the practices that an organisation puts into place to introduce new employees and facilitate organisational socialisation (Bauer, 2010). Previous research states that the change in work agreements towards hybrid work has had implications on the socialisation of employees within organisations (Asatiani et al., 2021). As demonstrated, organisational socialisation in the hybrid workplace is a continuous process while onboarding is the practices that facilitate the relationship. What this thesis aims to investigate is what generational differences exist in the expectations and experiences in the hybrid onboarding process, and how companies can shape the onboarding process accordingly for optimized success. Therefore, this theoretical framework was created to illustrate the theory that underlies the research question.

Figure 1 - Theoretical Framework
3. Methodology & Method

The following chapter presents the methodological approach of the study. It describes and argues for the chosen research philosophy, approach, strategy, and design. Further, the data collection and analysis process will be explained. Finally, it will outline the ethical considerations taken for this study.

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Research Philosophy

The research philosophy refers to the philosophical framework a researcher or scientist uses as a guide in the construction of the research (Collis & Hussey, 2013). Furthermore, the chosen research philosophy is the perceived reality, truth, and knowledge by the researcher (Ryan, 2018). The five major philosophies within the subject of business and management are positivism, critical realism, interpretivism, postmodernism, and pragmatism (Saunders et al., 2015).

Positivism refers to the philosophy that has its roots in natural science and it assumes the belief that reality is independent and separate from us humans (Collis & Hussey, 2013). Research within this philosophy is based on empirical research (Collis & Hussey, 2013) and yields data and facts that are not influenced by human interpretation or bias (Saunders et al., 2015). Critical realism builds on the same perception as positivism, reality is external and independent, but assumes that this assumption must be taken one step further and consider the underlying reality structures that gave the results of the observation (Saunders et al., 2015). A researcher that sticks to realism and empirical evidence but looks at the larger picture of what only a small part is revealed by observations, leans towards critical realism (Saunders et al., 2015). Interpretivism evolved as a response to the critique towards positivism since this philosophy did not meet the needs of social science (Collis & Hussey, 2013). The aspect that separates this philosophy from positivism is that interpretivism states that humans create meanings and are therefore different from physical phenomena (Saunders et al., 2015). Postmodernism is the philosophy that seeks to question and expose the power relations that aid dominant realities and by this challenge the
rooted ways of thinking and established knowledge (Saunders et al., 2015). By doing this, the post-modern researcher tries to give a voice to previously excluded ways of seeing by trying to give them legitimacy (Saunders et al., 2015). Lastly, Pragmatism argues that research begins with a problem and the ambition of its contribution is to develop practical solutions to practices (Saunders et al., 2015).

The nature and aim of this research are to investigate and understand how the different generational cohorts expect and experience the change towards hybrid work arrangements, what different social meanings the different investigated groups have created and how this might influence the onboarding process of these individuals. An interpretive researcher within business and management research would try to understand the world of the participants from their point of view (Saunders et al., 2015) and therefore the research will follow the framework of interpretivism in its research philosophy.

### 3.1.2 Research Approach

The authors have decided to follow an abductive approach to the research. There are three different types of research approaches (inductive, deductive, and abductive) (Creswell, 2014). With the inductive research approach, researchers start by identifying a specific observation and or data and thereafter collect data to explore this phenomenon to identify existing themes and patterns. From these patterns and themes, researchers generate and develop theories or adapt an existing one. Building an understanding and developing theory from the bottom up from the observations and data collected (Saunders et al., 2015). Conversely, the deductive approach starts with a theory and then data is collected in a highly structured manner to ensure replication and reliability and then test the selected theory through rigorously testing a series of propositions (Saunders et al., 2015). The abductive approach combines the inductive and deductive approaches, starting with an observation of an event and subsequently developing a plausible theory which can explain what was observed. The theory is then revisited with new data and is revised as necessary (Saunders et al., 2015).
The abductive approach was deemed the best approach for this study. Given the recent emergence of the hybrid workplace, the existing research on onboarding in this specific context is limited. There is a need to expand and modify the existing knowledge regarding onboarding practices in the hybrid workplace. Therefore, the abductive approach can be utilised in the research to develop and refine existing theories to better align with the unique changes as a result of the hybrid work environment.

As the research aims to identify the difference in experiences versus expectations of the hybrid workplace and its onboarding experience between different cohorts. Therefore, the deductive approach that builds on existing theories and literature becomes inappropriate due to the lack of literature on the current topic. Nor is the inductive approach fully appropriate for the study, as the aim of the research is not to build new theories based on the findings. Thus, the abductive research approach was chosen for this study.

### 3.1.3 Research Strategy

The two paradigms of research strategy are qualitative and quantitative where qualitative research aims to study the participant's meanings and relationships for the development of frameworks, while quantitative aims more at investigating the relationship between variables through statistics and graphical techniques (Saunders et al., 2015). Quantitative research is primarily used to test theories through the examination of relationships between set variables whilst qualitative research aims to explore and understand the meaning individuals or groups attribute to a social or human problem (Creswell, 2014). The interpretivist approach requires researchers to use a subjective analysis of people’s experiences and expectations, and the abductive approach is used to test the phenomenon by identifying themes and testing it through data collection (Saunders et al., 2015). Both connect to qualitative research understanding the importance of feelings and personal experiences investigated. Therefore, qualitative research is selected as the strategy that will be used for this study. Qualitative research gives more validity whilst quantitative research provides more reliability however, qualitative research often involves subjectivity as it explores through subjective experiences, perspectives, and interpretations of research participants (Collis & Hussey, 2021; Creswell, 2014).
3.1.4 Research Design

To achieve the purpose of the research strategy, the researchers conducted two semi-structured interviews, additionally, a survey was distributed. Interviews can be used by researchers to ask purposeful questions about a topic to gather valid and reliable data relevant to the research question and or objectives (Saunders et al., 2015). To be able to thoroughly probe the topic and gain a deep understanding, semi-structured interviews were used. Semi-structured interviews allow the interviewee to explain and build on their responses, enabling the researchers to gain useful data and the ability to explore the topic in-depth and gain an understanding of the reasons and opinions of the research participants (Saunders et al., 2015). The data collected from the interviews were utilised in the creation of real-life vignettes to further support the qualitative analysis of the survey. Vignettes are a collection of group values, beliefs, norms, and behaviours (Bloor & Wood, 2006) and this will support the analysis and findings of the survey data collection. Vignettes are commonly used as a technique in in-depth interviews where the vignette provides a scenario related to the topic being investigated (Bloor & Wood, 2006). In this research, the vignette will be a small case study, investigating what the situation looks like currently in the hybrid workplace, to further support the data collection from the survey regarding experiences and expectations in the hybrid workplace.

As surveys allow the collection of standardized data from a sizable population (Saunders et al., 2015), the use of a survey will enable the authors to gather additional data from a wide range of respondents to be used and analysed in the study. From the data collected the authors will be able to identify trends, make connections between the data collected from the interviews and survey and draw inferences from the population.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Secondary Data

The data collection process can encompass either primary or secondary data, whereby primary data is derived from the primary source and secondary data is obtained from a pre-existing source (Collis & Hussey, 2021). In the opening stages of the research, secondary data was collected to gain an understanding of the present-day landscape of businesses regarding the
hybrid workplace, organisations' socialisation process, and their onboarding processes. Furthermore, secondary data was later collected and used in multiple facets of the study, the execution of the literature review, formulation of the research question, and validation of the outcomes. The techniques employed to obtain and implement this secondary data are described in Section 2.1, denoted as the Literature Review Method.

3.2.2 Primary data

Primary data can be collected and generated from experiments, surveys, interviews, or focus groups and secondary data needs to be already collected in another publication, databases, or internal records (Collis & Hussey, 2021). To collect the data required for the research, the authors conducted two separate interviews with individuals who are presently working in a hybrid workplace and additionally distributed a survey to respondents. The survey was designed to gain an understanding of what is happening to the people experiencing the changes, what the expectations are of people who have not yet experienced the changes, and its effect on organisations’ socialisation and onboarding processes within organisations. In addition, by speaking directly with employees, the study aims to uncover how businesses have adapted to the hybrid workplace its benefits, and what challenges have emerged.

3.2.2.1 Interviews

Interviews enable researchers to explore and collect data on the views, experiences, beliefs and/or motivations of individuals on specific matters. (Gill et al., 2008). There are three fundamental types of research interviews; structured, semi-structured and unstructured (Gill et al., 2008; Saunders et al., 2015). Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they have several key questions that help to define the areas to be explored but also allow the interviewer or interviewee to diverge to delve into an idea or response in more detail (Gill et al., 2008).

The researchers conducted two semi-structured interviews with two individuals that are currently employed within two separate organisations that have implemented hybrid workplace practices. The goal of the semi-structured interviews was to gain an understanding of the perspectives of working in a hybrid workplace. The questions used in the interviews were
developed to ask the participants about their personal opinions and reflections on working practices in the hybrid workplace to gain an understanding of their experiences, additionally, the thesis supervisor was consulted to ensure that the questions were framed optimally to obtain the most valuable data. The interviews were held and transcribed online through the platform Microsoft Teams.

The interviews were conducted during one week in April. Several topics that were relevant to the report were discussed throughout the interviews, which were 25 and 30 minutes long. The interviews focused on building an in-depth analysis of the participant’s experiences with the hybrid workplace and their onboarding process into the company to answer the research question. Around five minutes were devoted to explaining the aim of the study, the GDPR consent form, restating the interviewee’s rights and informal conversation; offering anonymity, and addressing concerns.

3.2.2.2 Survey

The data collected from the survey aimed to get a broader understanding of the current expectations and experiences within the hybrid workplace and the onboarding process within this work mode. The data and information already gathered from existing literature guided the creation of the questions. The questions were built using key concepts of socialisation, onboarding, and the hybrid workplace so that the survey could provide a deeper and broader understanding of the topics.

Surveys allow the collection of standardised data from a sizable population in an economical way and enable easy comparison between respondents (Saunders et al., 2015). A survey allows the researchers to collect data that can be analysed to identify potential trends between variables and provide the researchers with descriptions of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of the population (Creswell, 2014; Saunders et al., 2015). The choice was made to conduct a closed-ended survey to simplify the data collection and ensure a high response rate as possible.
The survey was distributed online to gather additional data about the subject and provide the researchers with a broader picture. The survey asked the participants about their experience or expectations of the hybrid workplace and the onboarding process. The survey was tailored based on the respondents’ answers consisting of between 16 to 19 questions (seen in Appendix 1.) based on the participants’ answers. Additionally, the thesis supervisor was once again consulted to ensure the relevancy of the questions and narrow the scope of the survey. The survey was distributed online for a duration of 28 days and collected a total number of 172 responses and 136 were applicable to be used in the study. The remaining responses in the survey were either incomplete or invalid and therefore excluded from the findings and analysis.

3.2.3 Sampling Approach

Since this thesis was conducted by gathering the primary data through both interviews and a survey, two different selection approaches were utilised. When choosing the individuals for the interview conducted, we needed to specifically target individuals that are currently working in a hybrid work setting, and thereby the approach to this selection falls under the purposive sampling approach (Collis & Hussey, 2021; Saunders et al., 2015). The type of purposive sampling used for the interviews was typical case sampling which refers to a selection that will produce an illustrative profile (Saunders et al., 2015). By this approach for this selection, we will be able to illustrate what is “typical” regarding the thesis subject for someone that is currently in that specific situation (Saunders et al., 2015). Since the interviews are undertaken to create vignettes, this approach is the most appropriate since it will give us an insight into what is currently happening for employees in the hybrid workplace.

The sampling approach undertaken for the selection of participants for the survey was convenience sampling. Convenience sampling refers to the selection of participants easily and conveniently without any obvious principles of an organisation in relation to our thesis subject (Saunders et al., 2015). Since the survey created for data collection for this thesis was aimed at both people with and without experience within the hybrid workplace, it gave us a large target group and therefore more validity in choosing this type of sampling approach. The usage of this approach is widely used but could be easily prone to bias and different out-of-control influences (Saunders et al., 2015). Although this might be some of the risks of this approach, due to our
limited access to networks and available individuals, this approach was chosen for the selection of participants.

### 3.2.4 Data Analysis

Thematic analysis aims to search for themes and patterns in the collected raw data for further analysis (Saunders et al., 2015; Thompson, 2022). The raw data that is primarily collected is first coded to be able to identify the themes that are related to the research question (Saunders et al., 2015). Thematical analysis is used for all data sets, small and large, and the orderly and logical way of the approach gives it a systematic approach to the analysis (Saunders et al., 2015). Using this approach with a philosophical assumption of an interpretivist aspect gives the researcher the possibility to explore different interpretations and phenomenon that is investigated in the study (Saunders et al., 2015). When themes and patterns have been identified from the codes, further testing and development of theories can be made and lastly the drawing and verification of conclusions (Saunders et al., 2015). This thesis aims to develop a vignette describing what reality refers to for employees currently working in the hybrid workplace to support the findings of the conducted survey. Therefore, the thematic analysis of the interview data has been chosen to thoroughly explain and understand what the current situation might look like in the hybrid workplace. Thompson (2022) developed guidelines for the abductive thematic analysis that were used in the collection and coding of the raw interview data.

The transcriptions from the interviews were transformed into a more decentralised transcription to improve grammar and syntax and the initial coding was conducted in a timely matter after the interviews to not lose any context (Thompson, 2022). Coding is the process of giving each unit of data a code label that symbolizes or directly summarizes the meaning of that extract (Saunders et al., 2015). The codes that were developed from the raw data were divided and grouped into different categories and these categories were further grouped into themes.

In addition to the thematic analysis used in this study, a comparative analysis was utilised in the analysis to compare the data gathered from the various sources. The Comparative analysis can be used to identify broad themes, patterns or categories that emerge from qualitative
research studies, and the data can be captured and presented in a logical relation to the research question to provide a deeper understanding of the similarities and differences between the variables being studied (Hewitt-Taylor, 2001). Comparative analysis allows for systematic comparison, which, when properly applied, can help decide between competing theories (Collier, 1993). Comparative analysis is commonly used in one of four different contexts; case studies; statistical analysis; content analysis; and qualitative analysis (Collier, 1993). The authors intend to use comparative analysis in a qualitative context, which involves analysing the data collected in the interviews and surveys to identify similarities and differences (Collier, 1993; Della & Keating, 2008).

The abductive approach calls for a certain analytical approach to the data. The design of the survey was based on existing literature and created an understanding of what is happening in businesses regarding the hybrid workplace and onboarding. The survey data was then analysed using the comparative analysis between different generations and experiences and expectations. The interviews expanded the understanding of what is happening in the business environment and were then used to provide additional context and enhance the analysis of the survey data. By analysing the interview data through coding and development of themes the different trends were identified within the current business environment, enhancing the authors understanding and direction of the survey analysis.

### 3.3 Research quality

The key criteria that are taken into consideration regarding the research quality are credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability, and ethical consideration (Saunders et al., 2015; Stenfors et al., 2020). These need to be taken into consideration during the thesis process to make sure of the quality of the research.

#### 3.3.1 Credibility

The credibility of the thesis is concerned with whether the thesis subject is correctly identified and described (Collis & Hussey, 2021) and there needs to be a proper alignment between the theory, research question, data collection, analysis, and results (Collis & Hussey, 2021; Stenfors
et al., 2020). The methodology of the thesis needs to be well-demonstrated and justified to enhance the credibility of the study and research, explicitly making sure that the framework of the study is aligned with the research design, research question, methodology and lastly the findings of the study (Stenfors et al., 2020). The authors of this thesis have clearly stated throughout the methodology chapter what decisions have been undertaken and argued for these to ensure the credibility of the thesis.

3.3.2 Transferability

Transferability refers to the external validity of the research and thesis and if it is connected to whether the thesis can be applied to another situation where it is satisfactory similar, to permit generalization (Collis & Hussey, 2021; Saunders et al., 2015). Some generalizations can be taken from the findings of this study although one needs to take into consideration that age is not the only factor that separates generations from each other. In this study the generations are limited to age and therefore the study does not have full transferability.

3.3.3 Dependability

The dependability of the research focuses on whether the processes of the study are systematic, rigorous, and well-documented and could lead other researchers to replicate the process to conduct similar research (Collis & Hussey, 2021; Stenfors et al., 2020). If the processes of the data collection and analysis are described in a way that can be easily replicated, this would enhance the credibility of the study (Stenfors et al., 2020). The authors of this thesis have in the data collection chapter well described the collection of data from the interviews as well as from the survey and how this data was processed to ensure the trustworthiness of the process as well as dependability.

3.3.4 Confirmability

To ensure the confirmability of the research the researcher must describe the research process fully so that the reader can assess if the findings flow from the data (Collis & Hussey, 2021). This means that there needs to be a clear connection between the data and the findings of the
research (Stenfors et al., 2020). Without this connection, the findings would not be supported. When stating the findings of the research, it is of relevance to include quotes or other research data to enhance the confirmability of the research (Stenfors et al., 2020). The confirmation of the data in the thesis is undertaken by the examination of the findings concluded from the data collection in relevance to the already existing literature. Furthermore, the inclusion of quotes and other data is presented.

3.3.5 Ethical considerations

Research ethics refers to in what manners research is conducted and how the findings of the research are reported (Collis & Hussey, 2021). Several aspects should be taken into consideration in the ethical procedures of the research, some of these ensuring the dignity, privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity of the participants (Collis & Hussey, 2021). Other ethical considerations of the study that were undertaken were honesty and transparency (Collis & Hussey, 2021). The individuals that participated voluntarily in the study were informed of their confidentiality and anonymity as well as their right to exclude their answers if wished, and the questions in the survey were formulated such as no participant were excluded from the collection of data. The individuals that participated in the interviews were given a GDPR document to sign in advance of the conducted interviews stating their anonymity and confidentiality rights when participating in the study.

3.4 Research Limitations

Survey: One possible limitation of the survey is that the responses are self-reported, which may have resulted in participants interpreting the questions differently. This was counteracted by providing detailed explanations of concepts within the survey and phrasing the questions in a non-interpretive manner. Another potential limitation is the presence of recall bias, whereby participants may not accurately remember past events as they occurred.

Interviews: As the interviews were conducted online via Microsoft Teams it comes with inherent drawbacks such as the lack of body language and technological difficulties that may have affected the quality of the interviews.
**Empirical findings:** In relation to the limitations of data collection, there is only a one-sided perspective of Generation X since this generational category is missing responses from individuals without experience in the hybrid workplace.

**Time and resource constraints:** The time frame for the research has limited the collection of primary data, leading to incomplete results regarding the research topic. With a longer timeframe for the primary data collection, more respondents could have been reached giving more comprehensive results.

**Data collection:** Due to the researchers limited access to networks, there was limited access to possible respondents for the survey, limiting the data collection.
4. Empirical Findings

This chapter aims to provide the reader with a comprehensive presentation and explanation of the empirical findings obtained from the interview in the form of a vignette, followed by the survey data presented in various tables and figures.

4.1 Vignette

This chapter presents a small case study of the two interviews conducted. The classification and coding process resulted in four themes that are presented and illustrated below in separate paragraphs. The coding process was the result of the first-order codes, synthesized into second-order categories that resulted in the themes of recurring patterns “Operational Productivity”, “Communication strategies”, “Employee Socialisation”, and “Training and onboarding process”.

The first interview was with Tech Specialist who is employed within the information technology sector in a company that operates worldwide. The second interview was held with the Accountant in a service company that specialises in equipment rental, operating in Europe. The second interview was held with the Accountant in a service company that specialises in equipment rental, operating in Europe. Both participants work within the hybrid work environment and have completed their initial onboarding processes within their respective companies.

4.1.1 Operational Productivity

![Figure 2 - Theme 1](image-url)
The two participants' work setups shared multiple similarities, among them the time spent working remotely. The two employees worked from home for half of their workweeks, while the other half was required to be present in the office. In both instances, their employer specified this requirement as a condition of their employment. It is noteworthy that the Tech Specialist was operating in a relatively more decentralised team, while the Accountant was not.

“So, in ... we have the recommendation that we should work 50% from the office, 50% from remotely.” - Tech Specialist

The increased flexibility of daily life activities was mentioned as a benefit of the hybrid work set-up by both participants. Being able to still work from home even if sick felt like an increase in productivity for both the participants and the company. This was highly looked upon during the COVID-19 pandemic since this was the case for a lot of the employees in the company. One participant also mentioned that their productivity is higher when working from home since they can put high focus on their tasks without disturbance. To collectively increase productivity in the team both mentioned the importance of tools like team chats and telecommunication tools to increase connectedness amongst the entire team.

“I think that the hybrid workplace is really good for the fact that you can be more flexible and everything, especially about daily life.” - Tech Specialist

Drawbacks of the hybrid work set-up included the lack of socialisation among employees, distractions in the home environment, productivity loss for more extroverted employees, and issues related to task completion. Both participants highlighted that teamwork and collaboration with colleagues are more efficient in the office but that this issue is somewhat addressed with the implemented collaboration and communication tools. Lastly, both participants discussed the strain on mental health during remote work and showed appreciation towards the ability to work in the office under a hybrid work setup as it more easily facilitated socialisation with colleagues.
“I think of course it affects you when you work at home, you aren’t as effective as you can be at the workplace. Because at the workplace you have more colleagues to discuss different matters with, in contrast to when you are working from home.” – The Accountant

4.1.2 Communication strategies

Recurring remote calls were utilised by both participants as a way of facilitating communication between employees. Additionally, they highlighted the importance of being able to connect or reach out to the team digitally to maximize work efficiency. However, it was also noted that employees heavily rely on quick responses through various digital communication tools, which may occasionally go unnoticed by their colleagues and impede the progression of work tasks. The informal but frequent 5-minute chats that typically occur in the office were missed by both participants since these meetings facilitate problem-solving and socialisation.

“But you don't get that every 5 minutes to just quickly say something to your colleague, which I think is a very valuable thing that you start to realize when you go from remote work to hybrid” - Tech Specialist

“Because if you are in the office, it's much more efficient and quicker to ask someone what we can do and what could be improved.” – The Accountant

Both participants were asked what internal digital tools their current employer is providing them for their daily tasks and facilitate communication within the team. The interviewees predominantly rely on Microsoft Teams, as it facilitates communication, information sharing, and motivation within the team. Other tools mentioned were Yammer, Viva, Champion, e-mail, and other telecommunication tools. Tech Specialist described Yammer as a very effective
internal “social media” tool that facilitates information sharing within the company without confidentiality issues. Viva and Champion are both used for daily work tasks by Tech Specialist and lastly, The Accountant primarily utilised e-mail and other telecommunication tools besides Microsoft Teams.

“We also use Yammer which is basically a social media product that we use in order to share basically whatever you want.” - Tech Specialist

“We use Microsoft Teams for most of it and we also e-mail each other for more external communication.” – The Accountant

4.1.3 Employee socialisation

Both participants agreed that the hybrid workplace set-up aided socialisation at work in contrast to fully working remotely as it provided employees with valuable time in the office to connect with the rest of the company. Work calls were another activity that helped promote team connectedness since most socialisation activities were carried out at the in the office.

“But there are plenty of like meetings in order to make the team feel like a team, which is good.” - Tech Specialist

“I don't wanna say we have some social activities when we work from home most of the social activities happen when we are at the office...” - The Accountant
In terms of motivation in the hybrid work setup. The Tech Specialist said that they incorporate digital tools such as Yammer and Microsoft Teams to motivate one another. With these, the employees working with the Tech Specialist can acknowledge each other's accomplishments and get accredited for their own accomplishments within the team. Motivation for the Accountant in the digital workplace was not as prominent since work tasks and assignments were more autonomous in nature when working from home. The activities to promote motivation within the team for the Accountant were undertaken by the employees themselves.

“So, I definitely think it is key in the hybrid workplace showing it off (gratitude). So, there are a few tools available for it.” - Tech Specialist

“If you work at home, you have to take the most initiative by yourself.” – The Accountant

There were multiple factors mentioned by both interviewees that helped facilitate connectedness within the team. Recurring digital meetings and calls on a weekly basis. These digital meetings aided in the cohesiveness of the teams and facilitated teamwork and support within the team. Furthermore, it was mentioned that team feeling, and connectedness, need to be there for employees to want to reach out to each other regarding different matters. The Accountant further mentioned that in their team, a lot of the digital team activities were undertaken by the team itself, with no direction from the company.

*I feel that is one of the biggest issues when it comes to remote work, just basically team spirit and issue in getting started from the beginning*” - Tech Specialist
4.1.4 Training and onboarding process

The two interviewees varied quite substantially in their responses. Tech Specialist had their onboarding together with a larger group with subgroups depending on which department they were placed in, and the onboarding process was one year long. The initial onboarding process made sure that the Tech Specialist knew the company's values, mission and vision while also facilitating the social introduction to the rest of the team and company as well as learning their daily tasks. The majority of the Tech Specialist’s onboarding sessions were undertaken digitally with continuous check-ins to ensure everyone in the onboarding group was moving forward accordingly. Conversely, The Accountant had a shorter onboarding process of 6 months and was not assigned a specific onboarding group. The onboarding process was exclusively on-site and more focused on the work tasks, lacking socialisation activities. Additionally, for The Accountant the team leader was mainly responsible for the onboarding process.

“I actually just graduated from my onboarding process two weeks ago. Our onboarding process is very extensive.” - *Tech Specialist*

“I got my own onboarding process for like one week and during that week I had to learn all the daily basis work stuff... and then after the onboarding process continued for 6 months.” - *The Accountant*

The Tech Specialist during their onboarding process underwent activities such as workshops, teachers' courses, and onboarding speed dating with fellow employees. The interviewee placed
significant emphasis on these factors and experienced them as important aspects in their growth into their role and company. The Accountant was less satisfied with their onboarding process and mentioned that the company is currently developing an onboarding guide for new employees. However, the interviewee noted that these aspects were not present during their onboarding process.

“What we get different sorts of discussion possibilities, workshops or possibilities and you can also join guided teacher courses and things like that to become more technical and more aware of the company structure.” - Tech Specialist

“I think it's better now. We didn't have any work instructions in the beginning because nobody had the time to write down all the work instructions.” – The Accountant

The Tech Specialist found that having an onboarding group throughout the whole experience contributed to a feeling of security, as there was always someone to relate to throughout the process. When connected with a larger group the interviewee experienced that new employees always had someone to turn to regarding feelings and questions in the onboarding process. Furthermore, the digital onboarding process for the Tech Specialist opened up the possibility to get to know people from all over the world while also developing their understanding of different people from different cultures and varied ways of working. However, the shortcomings of the onboarding processes were that the socialisation amongst team members that were lost due to the digital set-up which was highlighted by both participants. The Accountant further mentioned that their expectations of working from home were higher than what reality was, ending in disappointment on different levels. Moreover, the learning implications that the participants felt during their onboarding process were firstly the adaptation to a new work mode from what they had experienced before. The Tech Specialist highlighted the fact that it was harder to learn different aspects of the job role since face-to-face interactions were lacking. Additionally learning from each other through informal socialisation strategies was also something that both implied was missing.
“I think one of the most difficult things that we are facing when working, remotely primarily, is the difficulty of actually learning from each other.” - Tech Specialist

“The transition from there is quite hard in the beginning because you have all the social activities at the office and not at home.” – The Accountant

### 4.2 Qualitative Survey Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Generation Z</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.79%</td>
<td>16.18%</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>42.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.88%</td>
<td>16.91%</td>
<td>9.56%</td>
<td>57.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.68%</td>
<td>33.09%</td>
<td>13.24%</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 - Number of respondents per generation*

As seen in Table 1, the survey had a total number of 136 respondents eligible to be part of the study. The respondents ranged from Generation Z (aged 18-24) to Generation X (aged 45-64) with the majority of respondents being part of the Generation Z cohort at 53.68%. Followed by Generation Y at 33.09%, and lastly Generation X at 13.24%. The gender of the respondents was relatively even with a slight bias towards female respondents in all categories but only Generation X showed a clear bias towards female respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Generation Z</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Experience</td>
<td>52.05%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>63.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>47.95%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>36.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 - Number of respondents with hybrid workplace experience per generation*

The results from the survey show that 66.67% of Generation Y have experience with the hybrid workplace, followed by 38 respondents from Generation Z (52.05%) and 18 respondents from Generation X (100%). On the other hand, 36.76% of the respondents (50 individuals) have no experience with the hybrid workplace, with the highest percentage being Generation Z (47.95%). Most respondents have experience in the hybrid workplace, 63.27%, however, Generation Z have a fairly even distribution of hybrid versus non-hybrid workers whilst
Generation X is heavily skewed with no respondents without hybrid experience and Generation Y having twice as many with hybrid experience versus those without.

### 4.2.1 The Hybrid Workplace Experiences

![Figure 6 – Days spent working remotely per week](image)

Most respondents work 3 days remotely, 27.91%. However, a closely ranked alternative was 2 days, with 24.42% of answers. These two selections represent approximately 53% of the responses, suggesting that the majority of individuals working remotely have an even split between working from home and spending their time in the office.
Out of the 86 respondents who all had experience working within a hybrid workplace the majority, 85%, had a positive opinion towards it. The trend was prevalent throughout the different generational cohorts with 80%, 90%, and 83% of Generation Z, Y and X respectively showing positive opinions towards the hybrid workplace. Overall, there's a clear consensus across all generations that opinions of the hybrid workplace are positive with only 6 respondents, almost 7% holding negative opinions of the hybrid workplace.
Figure 8 - Years of working in a hybrid or digital workplace

Figure 8 shows the number of years spent working in a hybrid or digital workplace by generation. The majority of Generation Z (57.89%) have been working in a hybrid workplace for less than a year, while the highest percentage of Generation Y (53.33%) have been working in a hybrid workplace for 1-2 years. On the other hand, the majority of Generation X (38.89%) have been working in a hybrid workplace for 3-4 years with none of them working less than a year within a hybrid workplace and 33.33% having spent more than 5 years within a hybrid working situation. Overall, most respondents (40.70%) have been working in a hybrid workplace for 1-2 years.
Figure 9 - Satisfaction with the current work situation

Figure 9 shows respondents' satisfaction with their current work situation. The majority of Generation Z is somewhat satisfied at 52.63%, the majority of Generation Y is extremely satisfied, while Generation X is split between being somewhat satisfied and extremely satisfied. When looking at the overall satisfaction one can see that most respondents within the generations are satisfied with their current work situation, with 76.31%, 93.33% and, 83.33% for Generation Z, Y and X respectively and only a small percentage expressing dissatisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Generation Z</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video conferencing tools - (Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Google Meet, etc)</td>
<td>97.37% 37</td>
<td>100.00% 30</td>
<td>94.44% 17</td>
<td>97.67% 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration platforms - (Slack, Microsoft Teams, Asana, Trello, etc.)</td>
<td>76.32% 29</td>
<td>76.67% 23</td>
<td>44.44% 8</td>
<td>69.77% 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud storage and file-sharing tools - (Google Drive, OneDrive, etc.)</td>
<td>76.32% 29</td>
<td>76.67% 23</td>
<td>55.56% 10</td>
<td>72.00% 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual whiteboards - (Miro, Mural, Google Jamboard, etc.)</td>
<td>21.05% 8</td>
<td>20.00% 6</td>
<td>11.11% 2</td>
<td>18.60% 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant messaging tools - (Slack, WhatsApp, etc.)</td>
<td>71.05% 27</td>
<td>76.67% 23</td>
<td>72.22% 13</td>
<td>73.26% 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital tools used in the hybrid workplace</td>
<td>Usage Rate</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management tools - (Asana, Trello, Jira, etc.)</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document collaboration tools - (Google Docs, Office 365, etc.)</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement tools - (TINYpulse, Officevibe, etc.)</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical devices (Computer, Tablet, etc.)</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please specify)</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - Digital tools used in the hybrid workplace

The most widely used digital tool in the hybrid workplace is video conferencing tools with 97.67% of all respondents reporting using it to conduct their daily work tasks. Other very popular tools used across all generations are document collaboration tools and instant messaging tools which are used by a majority of employees across all generations, with usage rates ranging from 57.89% to 76.67% and 71.05% to 76.67%, respectively. Employee engagement tools are used the least across all generations while virtual whiteboards and project management tools are used less frequently across all generations, with usage rates ranging from 11.11% to 31.58%. One respondent reported “SAP”, an artificial solutions platform, shown as “other” in the table.
Figure 10 shows that the greater part of the respondents has not experienced any difficulties in communicating or socialising in the hybrid workplace. However, although most of the respondents reported no difficulty socialising, the number of respondents that reported that they had experienced difficulties with socialisation and communication is not insignificant at almost 40%. Additionally, the results show no sign of additional difficulties with communications due to generations with an even distribution throughout the different age groups.
Figure 11 - Effects in productivity due to communication difficulties

Among the respondents who experienced difficulties communicating in the hybrid workplace shown in Figure 11, 50% of them report that they experience clear negative consequences because of not being able to communicate sufficiently, whilst only 15% reported that it did not have an effect. Generation Z was also the one who reported the highest number of people that experienced the negative consequences with 71.43% whilst Generation X was the lowest at 28.57%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Connection Challenges</th>
<th>Generation Z</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty collaborating with my colleagues.</td>
<td>75,00%</td>
<td>45,45%</td>
<td>66,67%</td>
<td>62,07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty communicating effectively with my colleagues.</td>
<td>50,00%</td>
<td>45,45%</td>
<td>66,67%</td>
<td>51,72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I’m missing out on valuable information or insights.</td>
<td>91,67%</td>
<td>63,64%</td>
<td>83,33%</td>
<td>79,31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel isolated or disconnected from my colleagues.</td>
<td>66,67%</td>
<td>54,55%</td>
<td>50,00%</td>
<td>58,62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Averages</td>
<td>70,83%</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>52,27%</td>
<td>5,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workplace Motivation Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel less motivated to excel in my role.</td>
<td>41,67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27,27%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel less invested in my work.</td>
<td>50,00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27,27%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty adapting to new teams or projects.</td>
<td>33,33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45,45%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Averages</strong></td>
<td>41,67%</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>33,33%</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-life Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My creativity and innovation have been negatively impacted.</td>
<td>16,67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,09%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have experienced increased stress or burnout.</td>
<td>16,67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27,27%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work-life balance has been negatively impacted.</td>
<td>25,00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27,27%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Averages</strong></td>
<td>19,44%</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>21,21%</td>
<td>2,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4 - Problems that respondents experience due to difficulties communicating*

Table 4 shows the different challenges that the respondents experienced because of difficulties in communication separated into three different head categories, Workplace connection challenges, Workplace motivation challenges, and work-life challenges. The most common problems reported across all generations were feeling like they were missing out on valuable information or insights (67.65%), having difficulty collaborating with colleagues (52.94%) and, feeling isolated or disconnected from colleagues (50%). Generation Z reported feeling isolated or disconnected from colleagues (57.14%) and having difficulty communicating effectively with colleagues (42.86%) as their top concerns. On the other hand, Generation X reported feeling less motivated to excel in their role (42.86%) and experiencing increased stress or burnout (28.57%) as their main problems.
4.2.2 The Hybrid Onboarding Experience

Out of the respondents that had experience working within the hybrid workplace, 70.93% experienced an onboarding process. Generation Y had the highest proportion with 76.67% while Generation Z was the generation with the lowest participation with only 65.79% of the respondents reporting having been part of an onboarding process and 72.22% of Generation X.

*Figure 12 - Introduced with an onboarding process*
Figure 13 - How long was the Onboarding Process

Figure 13 show the frequency of how long the participants had their onboarding process. The majority of all the respondents reported an onboarding process shorter than three months (90.16%) with minimal difference between categories. Generation X differ somewhat from Generation Z and Generation Y with 15.38% of respondents reporting an onboarding process of 3-6 months.
The findings in Figure 14 show that most participants reported having experienced an on-site onboarding process (47.54%). None of the participants from Generation X reported experiencing a digital onboarding process. Additionally, the results show that both Generation X and Y have mostly experienced on-site onboarding with 76.92% and 47.83% respectively, although most of Generation Z reported having a hybrid onboarding process (44.00%).
Figure 15 - How relevant respondents' onboarding processes were for their role

Figure 15 shows how relevant the onboarding that the respondents received for their current positions was. For Generation Z, 60% of their respondents considered their onboarding to be definitely relevant while 28% believed it was probably relevant. Among Generation Y respondents, 39.13% thought it was definitely relevant and 52.17% it was probably relevant. For Generation Y, 46.15% thought it was definitely relevant, and an equal amount believed it to be probably relevant. Overall, 49.18% of all respondents believed that their onboarding process was definitely relevant to their work role while 40.98% thought it too probably be relevant. It shows that a clear majority of 90% experienced that their onboarding process was to some extent relevant to their current work role.
Figure 16 - Respondents that connected socially during the onboarding process

The results in Figure 16 show that the highest percentage of respondents who connected with their team and colleagues during the onboarding process is Generation Z at 72%, followed by Generation Y at approximately 65%, and the lowest was Generation X at almost 54%. In terms of those who did not connect with their team and colleagues during onboarding, the percentage is relatively low across all generations, with the highest being 15.38% in Generation X. These findings suggest that the majority of respondents in all generations felt that they were able to connect with their team and colleagues during the onboarding process. However, around a 5th of all respondents, 21% were unsure about their answers with the biggest uncertainty in Generation X bringing some ambiguity to the results.
### Table 5 - The challenges faced by respondents during the onboarding process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Generation Z</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty connecting with colleagues and team members</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to necessary tools and technologies</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling isolated or disconnected from the organisation’s culture</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>32.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear expectations or responsibilities related to remote work</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>39.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty managing work-life balance when working from home</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>11.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical difficulties with remote communication or collaboration tools</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>22.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the various challenges faced during the onboarding process, it indicates that the biggest challenge overall was “Unclear expectations or responsibilities related to remote work” among both Generation Z at 56% and Generation Y at 34.78%. However, the most common challenge for Generation X at 30.77%, disregarding the individuals that didn’t answer was “Feeling isolated or disconnected from the organisation’s culture”, which also was the second most common overall. The least common challenge overall was “Technical difficulties with remote communication or collaboration tools”, with 14.75%.
4.2.3 The Hybrid Workplace Expectations

The data presented in Figure 17 shows that most of both Generation Z and Generation Y believe it will probably be hybrid with 48.57% and 46.67% respectively, whilst 37.14% of Generation Z and 40% of Generation Y believe it will definitely be hybrid, suggesting that 85.74% of Generation Z and 86.67% of Generation Y believe that hybrid workplaces will be more prevalent in the future. When looking overall only a small percentage believe that their employment will not be hybrid in the future, with 8% thinking probably not and 6% definitely not.

Figure 17 - Respondents' expectations of future employment
Displayed in Figure 18 shows the number of days respondents expect to work remotely. Most of Generation Z and Generation Y believe that they will spend 2 days working remotely in a hybrid work setting with 42% of Gen Z and a majority of respondents 53.33% of Generation Y. The second most popular option was 1 day with 11 responses overall (22%) and only a single respondent from Generation Z believed that they would spend the full work week of 5 days remotely. Overall, the vast majority (88%) believe that they will spend between 1-3 days of their work week out of the office in the future.
Figure 19 shows that flexibility in working hours and work location is highly valued by both Generation Z and Y. The most popular option for Generation Z is "Very important," which was selected 14 times or 40% of the responses. For Generation Y, the most popular option is also "Very important," with 7 selections or 46.67% of the responses in addition to being the most popular option overall, selected by 42% of all respondents. On the other hand, the least selected option for both Generation Z and Y, as well as overall, is "Not important at all," which only received 3 selections or 6% of the total responses.
The majority of respondents from Generations Z and Y anticipate that a hybrid workplace will have a favourable influence; correspondingly, 31.43% and 26.67% anticipate it will be extremely positive and 40% and 60% anticipate it would be somewhat positive. Overall, 76% of respondents believe the impact will be beneficial. Only a small percentage of respondents anticipate a negative impact, 11.43% of Generation Z expect a somewhat negative impact while 6.67% of Generation Y and 8.57% of Generation Z anticipate extremely negative impact.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social interactions with colleagues to build relationships and establish a sense of community</th>
<th>68,57% 24</th>
<th>60,00% 9</th>
<th>66,00% 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in the onboarding process to accommodate different learning styles or needs</td>
<td>20,00% 7</td>
<td>26,67% 4</td>
<td>22,00% 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive introduction to the company’s culture and values</td>
<td>31,43% 11</td>
<td>46,67% 7</td>
<td>36,00% 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clear understanding of how success will be measured in the role</td>
<td>42,86% 15</td>
<td>26,67% 4</td>
<td>38,00% 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2,86% 1</td>
<td>0,00% 0</td>
<td>2,00% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6 - Expected training and support received during the onboarding process*

The data in the table above shows that the majority of both generations expect opportunities to ask questions and receive feedback, social interactions with colleagues to build relationships and establish a sense of community, access to necessary equipment and tools for the job and, a comprehensive introduction to the company policies and procedures with the options selected by 60% or more from both Generation Z and Y. However, there are some differences between the two generations. Generation Z places a higher importance on a clear understanding of how success will be measured in the role (42.86%), whereas Generation Y places a higher importance on a comprehensive introduction to the company’s culture and values 46.67%. Additionally, both generations have a relatively low percentage of respondents who expect flexibility in the onboarding process to accommodate different learning styles or needs, with Generation Z having the lowest percentage 20.00%.
Figure 21 - Requirement of additional tools in the hybrid workplace

Figure 21 presents the responses of Generation Z and Generation Y on the requirement for additional tools in the hybrid workplace. A clear majority of both generations indicated a need for additional tools, with 74.29% of Generation Z and 80.00% of Generation Y with positive responses while only a small amount of the respondents from both Generation Z and Y indicated that the tools currently available to them would be sufficient.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Generation Z</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloud storage and file-sharing tools - (Dropbox, Google Drive, OneDrive, etc.)</td>
<td>77.14% 27</td>
<td>73.33% 11</td>
<td>76.00% 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration platforms - (Slack, Asana, Trello, Basecamp, etc.)</td>
<td>42.86% 15</td>
<td>33.33% 5</td>
<td>40.00% 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document collaboration tools - (Google Docs, OneDrive, Microsoft Office 365, etc.)</td>
<td>54.29% 19</td>
<td>60.00% 9</td>
<td>56.00% 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement tools - (TINYpulse, Officevibe, etc.)</td>
<td>17.14% 6</td>
<td>20.00% 3</td>
<td>18.00% 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant messaging tools - (Slack, Microsoft Teams, WhatsApp, etc.)</td>
<td>65.71% 23</td>
<td>53.33% 8</td>
<td>62.00% 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical devices (Computer, Tablet, Phone etc.)</td>
<td>68.57% 24</td>
<td>60.00% 9</td>
<td>66.00% 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management tools - (Asana, Trello, Jira, etc.)</td>
<td>28.57% 10</td>
<td>20.00% 3</td>
<td>26.00% 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video conferencing tools - (Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Google Meet, Skype, etc)</td>
<td>91.43% 32</td>
<td>80.00% 12</td>
<td>88.00% 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual whiteboards - (Miro, Mural, Google Jamboard, etc.)</td>
<td>34.29% 12</td>
<td>26.67% 4</td>
<td>32.00% 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 - Tools expected to be needed in the Hybrid Workplace

Table 7 shows the participants' selection for what is the most important tool for effectively working in a hybrid workplace. For both generations video conferencing tools were the most important tool, with 91.43% of Generation Z and 80% of Generation Y respondents expecting to need them and 88% overall. Cloud storage and file-sharing tools are also considered essential by a large proportion of respondents from both generations, with 77.14% of Generation Z and 73.33% of Generation Y respondents selecting them. Physical devices, such as computers and tablets, were also deemed important by more than two-thirds of all respondents. Collaboration platforms, document collaboration tools, and instant messaging tools were selected by around half or more of the respondents. Virtual whiteboards and employee engagement tools were considered less important, with fewer than 35% and 18% of respondents selecting them respectively.
Figure 22 - Importance of collaboration and team spirit between colleagues

Figure 22 shows the importance of collaboration and team spirit among colleagues for respondents. For Generation Z 34.29% consider it extremely important while 31.43% consider it very important and the remaining 34.29% moderately important. Among Generation Y, a higher percentage of 53.33% consider collaboration and team spirit extremely important, 20.00% very important and 26.67% moderately important.
4.2.4 The Hybrid Onboarding Expectations

Figure 23 shows whether the survey participants expect an onboarding process for their future employment. Most individuals expect an onboarding process for their future employment with the majority of respondents from both Generation Z and Y, with 51.43% of Generation Z and 66.67% of Generation Y selecting "Definitely yes" while Generation Z and Generation Y37.14% and 26.67% answered “probably yes” respectively. Overall, 56% of all respondents expect an onboarding process with only a small percentage of respondents selecting "Definitely not" or "Probably not", 8% collectively.
Figure 24 displays that the majority of both Generation Z and Y expect the onboarding process to last no more than 3 months with 54.29% and 53.33% respectively. 34.39% of Generation Z and a third of Generation Y expect the onboarding to be between 3-6 months while only a small percentage of respondents have no specific expectation of the onboarding length. Furthermore, it shows that most respondents expect an onboarding period of no longer than 6 months.
Table 8 - Things expected to be covered during the onboarding process

Table 8 shows that the respondents have a wide range of expectations with four different categories being selected by more than 60% of the participants. Despite this, Generation Z and Generation Y have common expectations for the onboarding process. Specifically, a significant majority of Gen Z (71.43%) and Gen Y (73.33%) respondents expect opportunities to ask questions and receive feedback, while 68.57% of Gen Z respondents prioritise social interactions with colleagues for building relationships and establishing a sense of community. Additionally, 65.71% of all respondents expect access to necessary equipment and tools, and 60% of both Gen Z and Gen Y participants indicated the importance of a comprehensive introduction to company policies. However, there are some differences in expectations between the two groups, with Generation Z placing higher importance on a clear understanding of how success will be measured in the role, while Generation Y places higher importance on a comprehensive introduction to the company's culture and values.
5. Theoretical Discussion

The following chapter aims to discuss the data presented in the finding regarding existing literature and will provide a deeper understanding of the findings presented in the previous chapter. Examining the data from different perspectives and uncovering meaningful insights that can help to answer the research questions and achieve the research objectives.

5.1 Socialisation and Onboarding in the Hybrid Workplace

The finding shows that a minor majority of individuals currently do not experience any difficulties socialising in the hybrid workplace. However, a significant proportion of participants still face challenges with socialisation in the hybrid workplace. Socialisation is an integral part of the introduction to the company and helps employees and managers to successfully complete their tasks productively. As discussed by Spagnoli (2020) successful socialisation can enhance job satisfaction, improve performance, and increase retention among employees.

Generation Z showed the least difficulty between the generations regarding socialising in the hybrid workplace with 36.84% reporting that they experienced difficulties socialising. However, the findings showed a clear trend that Generation Z suffered most in performance when unable to socialise with more than 71.43% of the ones that reported difficulties socialising showing that they had experienced negative effects in terms of their performance as a consequence.

Conversely, Generation Y showed the highest difficulty to socialise in the hybrid workplace (43.33%), while showing a significantly lower negative effect on their work performance from not socialising than Generation Z (38.46%), suggesting that despite facing difficulties in socialising with their colleagues they are able to remain productive in their work tasks without the support from colleagues.

Finally, Generation X, shows similar ease to socialising in the workplace to Generation Z with only 38.89% reporting difficulties, however, in contrast, Generation X show the lowest
negative effect on performance because of communication difficulties in their work which could be in part attributed to the difference in working values as found in previous research (Raišienė et al., 2021; Van Rossem, 2021) asserting that Generation X places a higher value on autonomy and is less dependent on support from supervisors. Furthermore, a correlation between greater work experience and pre-existing work habits prior to transitioning to a hybrid work arrangement results in better performance with a higher inclination to operate autonomously and reduced dependence on guidance and oversight from managers and supervisors.

While all generations show negative results as a result of communication barriers. Table 4 presents the type of challenges the different generations face as a result of difficulties communicating in the hybrid workplace. The most prevalent problems were caused by challenges resulting in limited workplace connections and socialisation with colleagues and managers, with 62.93% of the respondents selecting at least one of the four challenges under the category. Generation Z shows having the most difficulty with workplace-related challenges, referring to both workplace motivation as well as workplace connections whilst Generation X shows facing the most challenges with personal-related challenges with inadequate communication. However, the findings show that when it comes to the work-life balance only Generation Y and Generation Z have experienced negative effects as a result in difficult communication consistent with previous research suggesting their perceived value in work-life balance (Chillakuri, 2020; Jayathilake et al., 2021; Raišienė et al., 2021). Overall, Generation Y exhibits a standard performance between the two other generations, suggesting a possible trend of younger generations' decline in performance may be attributed to work-life-related issues, while older generations' performance may be more influenced by their personal life. Jones (1986) was one author that early defined informal socialisation tactics as being those where learning takes place in the work environment amongst colleagues. Based on the findings, it is plausible to suggest that with the increased use of digital tools and remote work during the onboarding process the informal socialisation strategies become less efficient in helping new hires learn their role. This, in turn, can cause difficulties when the new hires are unable to socially connect with their colleagues.
As displayed in Figure 14 in the findings there is a clear trend of the onboarding moving towards a hybrid and/or digital setup. For Generation X a majority was on-boarded on-site (76.92%) whilst Gen Z had a majority on-boarded in a hybrid or completely digital manner (68.00%). This trend might be seen since there has been an increase in the adaptation of the hybrid workplace over the last decade, foremost during and after the COVID-19 pandemic (Kagerl & Starzetz, 2023). Younger generations (Generation Z and Generation X) are being introduced to the hybrid way of working at a higher frequency than older generations due to the changing business environment.

The majority of all generational categories experienced an onboarding process that was less than 3 months (Figure 13) and all generations in the study agreed that the onboarding process was relevant regarding their success at their new job if one looks at the frequency of answers in Figure 15. This indicated that the participants, with experience regarding the onboarding process in the hybrid workplace, felt like this was a factor that contributed to their excelling in their role. This supports previous literature suggestions of the importance of the onboarding process in relation to how new employees learn and get into their new role (Bauer; 2010, Capitano et al., 2021).

The participants were asked whether the communication and socialisation among employees were sufficient for them to be satisfied in the onboarding process. Looking at the trend here between the generations one can see that Generation Z was the generation that had the highest frequency of participants that felt connected to their team in the onboarding process (72.00%) while Generation Y had the highest frequency of participants not feeling connected to their team during the onboarding process (17.39%). Looking at the challenges that the participants felt during their onboarding processes we can clearly identify that “Unclear expectations or responsibilities related to remote work” and “Feeling isolated or disconnected from the organisation’s culture” were the most prominent two factors that were highlighted by the participants. Raišienė et al. (2021) stated that Generation Y highly values adequate training opportunities and this can relate to the shortfalls that this generation has expressed in the survey results in regard to participants in this generational cohort feeling like they experienced unclear expectations in regard to their home working agreements.
5.2 Meeting the expectations of the different generations

Most participants expected a hybrid workplace relatively similar to the one described by the experienced individuals with only subtle differences identified between them. Figure 21 in empirical findings shows how many of the respondents expected to require additional tools than what is currently available in order to work in the hybrid workplace. The high number of individuals who expect to need more digital tools to be able to work in a hybrid environment suggests that the younger generations (Generation Z and Y) believe that the current set of digital tools may not be sufficient to meet their needs in a hybrid work environment. However, when comparing this with what is found in tables 3 and 7 which show the tools used and the tools expected to be used in the hybrid workplace respectively. The expectations from both Generation Z and Generation Y are very similar to the tools currently utilised suggesting that individuals without experience in the hybrid workplace have a picture of what the work requires but exaugurated the number of tools needed to efficiently perform the work duties.

The findings derived from the survey data show that the generational differences between expectations and experience are not that vast regarding the hybrid workplace. However, the findings presented in Table 8 show that companies need to tailor their onboarding process to meet the different expectations and needs of different generations. Additionally, there are noteworthy distinctions between the expectations and experiences among the generations for the onboarding process and the way in which organisations facilitate the process of introducing new hires to the hybrid workplace.

As discussed previously regarding the participant's experience of the onboarding process in the hybrid workplace versus the expectations future employees have regarding this process, several important aspects need to be highlighted. The answers regarding participants' expectations of an onboarding process are almost exclusively “Definitely yes” or “Probably yes” across all generations. Looking back at what the experienced participants answered in the survey regarding their onboarding process, it deviates from the expectations as only around 70% of people working in a hybrid set-up underwent an onboarding process, which is consistent across all generational cohorts. If the expectations of the onboarding process are not met by new employees it carries the risk of causing dissatisfaction, as new hires may feel less confident in
their new roles. Consequently, this can have negative effects on various levels within the company aligned to the findings of Derven (2008), Korte & Lin (2013), and Jeske & Olson (2021), which highlight the disadvantaged experience by companies in similar circumstances.

Another indifference is encountered in the expectations and experience regarding the length of the onboarding process. While most experienced generations answered that their onboarding process was less than three months, the expectation of the length varies from this. Around 70% of the participants expect the onboarding to be less than three months and around 30% of the participants expect the onboarding to be 3-6 months in length. Different people might require different lengths of learning time as we can see from the expectations of the participants in the survey. Meeting this is important to make sure all employees feel the satisfaction of fitting into their roles after the onboarding process.

Furthermore, the main expectations are similar between Generation Z and Generation Y, both expecting to get “a comprehensive introduction to the company policies and procedures”, “access to necessary equipment and tools for the job”, “opportunities to ask questions and receive feedback”, and “social interactions with colleagues to build relationships and establish a sense of community”. When comparing this to what individuals have been experiencing as challenges during their onboarding process, the top issues for Generation Z and Generation Y were “difficulty connecting with colleagues and team members”, “feeling isolated or disconnected from the organisation’s culture”, and “unclear expectations or responsibilities related to remote work”. For Generation Z the issue of “unclear expectations or responsibilities related to remote work” was as high as 56.00% of the respondents. It can clearly be shown from our results that some of the most important factors regarding the onboarding process of future employees are shown to not be met by looking at people who have already experienced this process. Looking at Generation Z, if this generation expects to know company policies and procedures and have meaningful social interaction in the onboarding process, but instead feels isolated and disconnected from the company, this employee might take the decision to not continue in this role or not succeed in this role. An employee from Generation Y that is unsatisfied with their training could become ineffective in their role (Raišienė et al., 2021) while an employee from Generation Z might decide to take another work opportunity since this
generation is generation does not settle for the status quo and have less issue in pursuing other opportunities if the expectation is not met (Raišienė et al., 2021).

This study has found that there are some significant differences between expectations and experiences of the onboarding process in the hybrid workplace for Generation Z and Generation Y. The changing business landscape towards a more online-based onboarding has had its implications in the form of how communication has changed in the workplace (Jeske & Olson, 2021) and what is also mentioned by Sani et al. (2022) and supported in this study is that this change has led to employees expressing issues lacking connectedness, adequate social interaction, and insecurities regarding role clarity. What this research suggests is for companies to tap into the differences in expectations in different generations so that the onboarding process in the hybrid is tailored to the different needs and wants in the process. Implications of not having a successful onboarding process can lead to strategic disadvantage, loss of social capital, and decreased employee retention in companies (Derven, 2008; Jeske & Olson, 2021; Korte & Lin, 2013). Therefore, by supporting the fact of existing differences in expectations of the onboarding process in the hybrid workplace can help companies develop new strategies.

5.3 Differences between expectations and reality

There is both satisfaction and discontent regarding the hybrid work environment and the onboarding process in the investigated work environment. The Tech Specialist is found to have a more comprehensive and sufficient onboarding process while the Accountant underwent an inadequate onboarding process resulting in several disadvantages. The polarization between respondents in the survey data exists as well, as both content and discontent regarding factors within the hybrid onboarding process, show a relation to what was found during the interviews.

Inadequate socialisation and feelings of isolation are brought up in the survey, the findings show that both Generation Y and Generation Z felt these difficulties in the hybrid workplace and their onboarding process. Socialisation within the workplace is a crucial step for the employee to get adopted into the work environment and their role (Bauer et al., 2007) but it is also expressed to be an issue from the information given by the Accountant and the survey data,
expressing lack of role clarity and connection to the organisation. The findings also support previous research by Sani et al. (2022) that the top concerns with having a digital onboarding process are lack of connectedness, lack of adequate social interaction, and lack of role clarity. These are factors found in the survey to be the reality for Generation X, Generation Z, and to some extent in Generation Y.

As Asatiani et al. (2021) also highlighted, the implementation of hybrid work arrangements has an impact on employees’ ability to navigate the organisational culture. The survey respondents pointed out the importance of their expectations to have the opportunity to ask questions and receive feedback during their onboarding process. The Accountant mentioned that in their hybrid work environment, this is lacking to a certain extent and issues that arise might be put to the side until present in the office at a later stage. Furthermore, the survey data shows us that one of the largest challenges for onboarding within the hybrid workplace is individuals feeling disconnected from the organisational culture. This issue is also brought up by Jeske & Olson (2021) who mentioned that due to the changing business environment towards hybrid work arrangements, the way communication is being convened is also changing. Our findings point out that something is missing in the employees’ abilities to fully communicate and navigate the business culture and environment. This needs to be addressed already in the onboarding process to give the employees the best possible opportunities to learn and excel in their roles as well as get integrated into the company culture.
6. Conclusion

The aim of this chapter is to summarise and discuss the conclusion of the study and its key findings. How it has contributed to existing literature and its potential practical implications as well as potential areas for future studies on the topic.

The purpose of this study was to aim at providing valuable insight for organisations on how they can effectively manage and coordinate the onboarding process in a hybrid workplace. By exploring the expectations and experiences of the onboarding process in the hybrid workplace and providing evidence that expectations are not met, the authors aid the further strategic development of onboarding processes in various organisations. Therefore, the research provides an answer to the following research question and provides evidence from the analysis:

**RQ: How can organisations best coordinate the onboarding process in a hybrid workplace of different generations?**

The findings show the largest polarization between expectations and experiences is found in the onboarding process. The study found that the current onboarding and socialisation processes are inadequate for appropriately integrating all new hires into company cultures in hybrid workplaces and need to adapt their processes for different generations. There is a difference in the perception of what is required to perform in a hybrid workplace compared to reality which needs to be addressed during the onboarding process in order to ensure the successful integration of new talent to ensure job satisfaction and retention. As presented Generation Y and Generation Z feel the lack of role clarity and feeling of isolation in their onboarding processes while also pushing on the expectations of them needing sufficient training and adequate socialisation to be satisfied. Making these cohorts highly affected by the lack of informal learning strategies missing in the hybrid onboarding process.

This study contributes to the existing body of literature in various ways. Firstly, the researchers identify the factors most influenced by the shift to a hybrid onboarding process and the effects on socialisation among colleagues following a shift to remote work. Secondly, the researchers
present distinct findings of the existing differences between expectations of new hires and experiences within the hybrid workplace. This highlights the gap that organisations need to meet to fulfil employees’ expectations of future work.

6.1 Practical implications

By investigating the factors of discontent within the different generations regarding the onboarding process in the hybrid workplace while exploring what expectations the future workforce has, companies gain insight into the differences in generation within the workforce. The research has raised several aspects of where the onboarding process is lacking leading to employees not flourishing in their roles. By being conscious of what employees are expecting with their onboarding processes and what is absent in the hybrid workplace, companies can act accordingly and strategically coordinate the onboarding process appropriately. With the findings presented in this research, organisations can take the step of acknowledging generational differences in the onboarding and tailor it accordingly to ensure higher employee retention, increase organisational strategic advantage and decrease the loss of social capital.

6.2 Future research

This research is limited regarding data collection constraints, limited perspectives from the different generational cohorts, and time and resource constraints. Therefore, the authors suggest further research to get more comprehensive or directed findings:

1. This study had a limited number of participants from only three out of the four major generations currently active in the workplace, gathering a wider range of respondents from a more entire range of generations who are currently active workers would enable researchers to make better conclusions and strengthen the applicability of the findings.

2. Investigate more thoroughly the extent of adverse effect ineffective socialisation has on the hybrid organisation in the onboarding stages.
While this study focuses on the organisational socialisation and onboarding process within organisations, in general, a potential area of further research could be comparing industries and identifying whether there are industry-wide characteristics that alter the results.

This study was not delimited to individuals who are currently ongoing in their onboarding process. Future research with this delimitation to who are individuals currently in an ongoing onboarding process, could lead to more comprehensive results and eliminate some of the limitations of this study.
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8. Appendix

Appendix 1 - Survey

The Survey was used to investigate their experience and expectations of the hybrid workplace, and onboarding process and their potential opportunities and challenges.

Section 1. General questions

1. Age
   - 18-15 / 25-45 / 45-50 / 61+

2. Gender (male, female, other)
   - Male / Female / Other / Would not like to specify.

3. Current employment situation?
   - Employed / In-between jobs / Unemployed / Retired / Studying

4. What industry are you currently working in?
   - Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting
   - Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation
   - Construction
   - Education
   - Finance and Insurance
   - Government and Public Administration
   - Health Care and Social Assistance
   - Hospitality and Food Services
   - Information and Broadcasting
   - Legal Services
   - Manufacturing
   - Mining
   - Other Industries (including Homemaker, Military, Religious)
   - Publishing, Software, and Telecommunications
5. Do you have experience working in a hybrid or digital workplace?
   o Y/N

Section 2.1. Experience of the Hybrid workplace

6. To what degree are you working hybrid, how many days a week are you working remotely?
   o 1 day / 2 days / 3 days / 4 days / 5 days / Other (please specify)

7. What is your opinion about working in a hybrid or digital workplace?
   o Like it / Somewhat like it / Neither like it nor dislike it / Somewhat dislike it / Dislike it

8. How long have you worked in a hybrid or digital workplace?
   o Less than a year / 1-2 years / 3-4 years / More than 5 years

9. How satisfied are you with your current work situation?
   o Very Satisfied / More than Satisfied / Satisfied / Partly Satisfied / Not at all Satisfied

10. Does your company provide you with sufficient tools to perform your work-related tasks? Select those that apply to you.
    o Video conferencing tools - (Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Google Meet, Skype, etc)
    o Collaboration platforms - (Slack, Microsoft Teams, Asana, Trello, etc.)
Cloud storage and file-sharing tools - (Dropbox, Google Drive, OneDrive, etc.)
Virtual whiteboards - (Miro, Mural, Google Jamboard, etc.)
Instant messaging tools - (Slack, Microsoft Teams, Google Chat, WhatsApp, etc.)
Project management tools - (Asana, Trello, Jira, etc.)
Document collaboration tools - (Google Docs, Microsoft Office 365, etc.)
Employee engagement tools - (TINYpulse, 15Five, Officevibe, etc.)
Physical devices (Computer, Tablet, etc.)
Others (please specify) ____________________

11. **Have you experienced difficulties communicating or connecting socially with your colleagues in the hybrid or digital workplace?**
   - Y / N

*Section 2.1a. Social connection in the Hybrid workplace*

12. **Do you feel that not connecting socially has affected your professional capacity?**
   - Yes / Maybe / No

13. **If you answered “Yes” to the previous question, which of the following examples have you experienced? Please select all that apply.**
   - I feel less motivated to excel in my role.
   - I feel less invested in my work.
   - I have difficulty collaborating with my colleagues.
   - I have difficulty communicating effectively with my colleagues.
   - I feel like I'm missing out on valuable information or insights.
   - I feel isolated or disconnected from my colleagues.
   - I have difficulty adapting to new teams or projects.
   - My creativity and innovation have been negatively impacted.
   - I have experienced increased stress or burnout.
   - My work-life balance has been negatively impacted.
   - Other (please specify) ____________________
Section 2.2. Onboarding experience in the Hybrid workplace

14. Did your employer introduce you to the company with an onboarding process?
   ○ Y / N

15. If you answered “Yes” to the previous question, how long was your onboarding process?
   ○ Less than 3 months / 3-6 months / 6-9 months / 9-12 months / More than 12 months

16. In what way was your onboarding process structured to prepare you for working in a hybrid workplace?
   ○ Purely on-site / Hybrid (both on-site and digitally) / Purely digital

17. Was the training you received during onboarding relevant and helpful for your role in the company?
   ○ Definitely yes / Probably yes / Probably not / Definitely not / Don’t know

18. Did you feel connected to your team and colleagues during the onboarding process, despite working in a hybrid/digital workplace?
   ○ Y / N / M

19. Which of the following challenges did you face during the onboarding process as a result of working in a hybrid workplace? Please select all that apply.
   ○ Difficulty connecting with colleagues and team members
   ○ Lack of access to necessary tools and technologies
   ○ Feeling isolated or disconnected from the organisation's culture
   ○ Unclear expectations or responsibilities related to remote work
   ○ Difficulty managing work-life balance when working from home
   ○ Technical difficulties with remote communication or collaboration tools
   ○ Other (please specify) ________________________
Section 3.1. Expectations of the Hybrid workplace

6. Do you expect aspects of your work to be hybrid or digital in the future?
   o Definitely yes / Probably yes / Probably not / Definitely not

7. How many days per week would you expect to be working remotely?
   o None / 1 day / 2 days / 3 days - 4 days / 5 days / Other (please specify)

8. How important is flexibility in terms of working hours and location in a hybrid workplace?
   o Very Important / Important / Moderately Important / Slightly Important / Not Important

9. How do you think a hybrid workplace will impact your productivity and work-life balance?
   o Extremely Positively / Somewhat Positively / Neither Positively Nor negatively / Somewhat Negatively / Extremely Negatively

10. What kind of training or support do you think you'll need to work in a hybrid workplace? Please select all the options that apply.
    o Orientation to remote work policies and procedures
    o Training on remote collaboration and communication tools
    o Time management and organisation skills
    o Remote team-building and social skills
    o Cybersecurity and data privacy
    o Technical troubleshooting skills
    o Adapting to hybrid work culture
    o Ergonomic setup and wellness
    o Other (please specify) ________________________

11. Do you think you'll need more communication and collaboration tools to work effectively in a hybrid workplace?
    o Definitely yes / Probably yes / Might or might not / Probably not / Definitely not

12. What kind of tools would be helpful?
    o Video conferencing tools - (Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Google Meet, Skype, etc)
    o Collaboration platforms - (Slack, Asana, Trello, Jira, Basecamp, etc.)
    o Cloud storage and file-sharing tools - (Dropbox, Google Drive, OneDrive, etc.)
    o Virtual whiteboards - (Miro, Mural, Google Jamboard, etc.)
o Instant messaging tools - (Slack, Microsoft Teams, Google Chat, WhatsApp, etc.)

o Project management tools - (Asana, Trello, Jira, etc.)

o Document collaboration tools - (Google Docs, Microsoft Office 365, etc.)

o Employee engagement tools - (TINYpulse, 15Five, Officevibe, etc.)

o Physical devices (Computer, Tablet, etc.)

o Others (please Specify) __________________________

13. **How important is a sense of community and collaboration with colleagues in a hybrid workplace?**
    o Very Important / Important / Moderately Important / Slightly Important / Not Important

*Section 3.2. Onboarding expectations in the Hybrid workplace*

14. **Would you expect your new employer company to integrate an onboarding process for you when hired?**
    o Definitely yes / Probably yes / Probably not / Definitely not / Don’t know

15. **How long would you expect this onboarding process to be? Choose the option closest to your answer.**
    o Less than 3 months / 3-6 months / 6-9 months / 9-12 months / More than 12 months / No specific expectation

16. **Based on your expectations, what would you consider to be the most important aspect of an effective onboarding process?**
    o A comprehensive introduction to company policies and procedures
    o Access to necessary equipment and tools for the job
    o Opportunities to ask questions and receive feedback
    o Regular check-ins with managers or mentors
    o Social interactions with colleagues to build relationships and establish a sense of community
    o Flexibility in the onboarding process to accommodate different learning styles or needs
    o A comprehensive introduction to the company's culture and values
    o A clear understanding of how success will be measured in the role
    o Other (please specify)