

Research Article

# Assessing the Influence of Recruitment Practices, Onboarding Processes, and Mentoring Programs on Employee Performance at PT Temas

<sup>1</sup>Ricky Effendi, <sup>2</sup>Abdullah Rakhman

<sup>1,2</sup>Management Department, Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Received Date: 16 March 2025

Revised Date: 31 March 2025

Accepted Date: 02 April 2025

Published Date: 16 April 2025

**Abstract:** *This study examines the influence of recruitment practices, onboarding processes, and mentoring programs on employee performance at PT TEMAS Tbk. By using a quantitative approach, data were collected through structured surveys from 203 respondents and analyzed using multiple regression analysis. The findings reveal that while recruitment practices and mentoring programs do not significantly impact employee performance, onboarding processes demonstrate a strong positive effect. Drawing on Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Human Capital Theory, the results suggest that while initial hiring and mentoring efforts may offer foundational value, structured and ongoing onboarding plays a more critical role in fostering employee performance. These findings underscore the importance of implementing comprehensive onboarding strategies and provide practical insights for optimizing human capital practices to support sustained performance outcomes.*

**Keywords:** *Recruitment Practices, Onboarding Processes, Mentoring Programs, Employee Performance, Social Exchange Theory.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is one of the most critical determinants of organizational success, shaped by a range of human resource practices, including recruitment, onboarding, and mentoring. Effective recruitment practices ensure the right talent is aligned with organizational needs, improving productivity and reducing mismatch-related inefficiencies [1]. Once hired, a structured onboarding process is vital in helping employees adapt to their roles, understand company expectations, and assimilate into the organizational culture—ultimately enhancing engagement and performance [2]. Mentoring programs further support employees by facilitating knowledge transfer, emotional support, and professional development, all of which contribute to greater competence and confidence at work [3]. Together, these HR practices form a strategic foundation that can drive long-term employee performance at PT Temas Tbk.

While these practices have been individually examined in previous studies, there is limited research assessing their combined and interactive impact on overall employee performance. Most existing literature focuses on isolated effects—such as how onboarding alone reduces turnover or how mentoring supports career development—without evaluating how the integration of recruitment, onboarding, and mentoring practices can reinforce one another to improve performance holistically. For instance, while [1] and [2] underscore the significance of recruitment and onboarding, they do not explore their joint influence alongside mentoring. Similarly, Allen et al. [3] emphasize the benefits of mentoring, but its complementary role within a broader HC framework remains underexplored. This research addresses this gap by examining these practices as interconnected elements contributing to employee effectiveness.

The theoretical foundation of this study draws on Human Capital Theory, which views employee skills, knowledge, and capabilities as vital organizational assets [4]. Investments in recruitment, onboarding, and mentoring are thus seen as strategic efforts to build and enhance human capital. In addition, Social Exchange Theory [5] provides a lens to understand how employees reciprocate organizational support—such as mentoring and structured onboarding—with commitment and improved performance. To further examine how employees adapt and internalize organizational norms, Organizational Socialization Theory [6] is employed, highlighting the role of onboarding and mentoring in aligning individual behavior with organizational values. These theories offer a comprehensive framework for understanding how HC practices influence employee performance outcomes.

The primary objective of this research is to assess the influence of recruitment practices, onboarding processes, and mentoring programs on employee performance at PT Temas Tbk. This study aims to evaluate the individual impact of each HC practice and explore their combined effects in creating an environment that supports sustained employee growth and productivity.



Furthermore, it investigates how these practices shape employee adaptation, motivation, and role clarity, which are critical for optimizing performance. By integrating these HC elements within a unified framework, the study seeks to generate insights that can inform more strategic and evidence-based HR policies for enhancing performance across all organisational employee levels.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A) *Human Capital Theory*

Human Capital Theory, developed by Caire et al. [4], views employees' skills, knowledge, and abilities as valuable assets contributing significantly to organizational performance. It posits that investments in people—through recruitment, onboarding, and development activities—enhance their potential and productivity. Human capital is typically categorized into general skills, transferable across roles, and specific skills, which are job- or organization-specific [4]. In this context, recruitment practices help select individuals with the desired potential while onboarding and mentoring processes further develop these capabilities. According to Ployhart [1], investing in these HC functions aligns employee competencies with strategic goals, underscoring the importance of human capital development in achieving high employee performance.

### B) *Social Exchange Theory*

Social Exchange Theory (SET), proposed by Blau [5], explains how reciprocal interactions between individuals and organizations shape behavior and performance outcomes. Employees who receive support—such as clear recruitment communication, structured onboarding, and mentoring—are more likely to reciprocate through increased commitment and performance [7]. The theory distinguishes between tangible exchanges (e.g., compensation) and intangible ones (e.g., trust, recognition), which influence the employment relationship. Applied to this study, SET suggests that when employees perceive organizational support through well-implemented HC practices, they feel obliged to respond with higher job performance, motivation, and loyalty.

### C) *Organizational Socialization Theory*

Organizational Socialization Theory [6] describes how employees internalize organizational norms, roles, and expectations. It highlights three stages of socialization: anticipatory socialization, encounter, and change/acquisition. Recruitment helps shape expectations before joining, onboarding supports adaptation during the encounter stage, and mentoring plays a key role in the final integration process. Bauer [2] emphasizes that socialization processes significantly influence employee attitudes, engagement, and performance. Thus, organizational socialization theory provides insight into how structured HC interventions enable employees to adjust successfully and perform effectively.

### D) *Recruitment Practices*

Recruitment practices encompass the strategies and procedures to attract and select qualified candidates. Effective recruitment ensures a strong fit between employee capabilities and organizational needs, laying the groundwork for future performance [1]. These practices include both internal methods (e.g., promotions) and external methods (e.g., job postings, referrals, agencies) [8]. The effectiveness of recruitment impacts not only the quality of hires but also their long-term engagement and productivity. Well-designed recruitment systems that clarify role expectations and values contribute directly to employee alignment, satisfaction, and performance outcomes.

### E) *Onboarding Processes*

Onboarding refers to structured efforts to help employees transition into an organization by fostering role clarity, social integration, and organizational alignment. According to Bauer [2], onboarding is more than an orientation—it includes activities that span several weeks or months to support employees' adjustment and development. Klein & Weaver [9] distinguish between formal onboarding (e.g., orientation sessions, training) and informal onboarding (e.g., peer interactions). Effective onboarding enhances employees' understanding of their roles, strengthens commitment, and improves performance. It is critical in accelerating productivity and minimizing early-stage confusion and disengagement.

### F) *Mentoring Programs*

Mentoring programs are organizational initiatives where experienced employees guide less experienced colleagues to enhance their professional growth and job competence. Mentoring contributes to knowledge sharing, confidence-building, and performance development [3]. Formal mentoring is typically structured with predefined objectives, while informal mentoring emerges organically through interpersonal relationships [10][11]. Both types provide emotional and professional support that strengthens organizational commitment and improves job effectiveness. In the broader HC framework, mentoring complements recruitment and onboarding by reinforcing skill development and cultural assimilation.

### G) *Employee Performance*

Employee performance refers to the extent to which individuals meet or exceed job requirements and contribute to organizational objectives. It encompasses task performance—the efficiency and quality of work outputs—and contextual performance, including interpersonal behaviors and contributions to the organizational climate [12]. High-performing employees

are technically competent and demonstrate cooperation, adaptability, and initiative. Multiple HC practices—including recruitment, onboarding, and mentoring—interact to influence performance by shaping employees' preparedness, engagement, and capacity for growth [13] [14]. Understanding these interactions is crucial for designing HC strategies that foster sustained employee effectiveness.

### H) Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

#### a. The Influence of Recruitment Practices on Employee Performance

The theoretical foundation for understanding the influence of recruitment practices on employee performance is grounded in Human Capital Theory and Social Exchange Theory. According to Human Capital Theory, recruitment represents a strategic investment in selecting individuals who possess the knowledge, skills, and potential to contribute to the organization's success [4]. Effective recruitment practices help ensure that employees are well-matched to the organization's demands and culture, enhancing their capacity to perform effectively [1]. Social Exchange Theory [5] also suggests that fair and transparent recruitment practices initiate a reciprocal relationship between the employee and the organization, building trust and commitment. When employees perceive the hiring process as respectful and equitable, they are more likely to respond with higher engagement and job performance [7]. Hypothesis (H1): Recruitment practices positively affect employee performance.

#### b. The Influence of Onboarding Processes on Employee Performance

The influence of onboarding processes on employee performance can be explained through Organizational Socialization Theory and Social Exchange Theory. Organizational Socialization Theory [6] emphasizes that onboarding helps employees internalize organizational norms, clarify role expectations, and adjust more effectively to their work environment. Structured onboarding—including orientation, job training, and social integration—enhances role clarity and job satisfaction, positively contributing to employee performance [2]. From the lens of Social Exchange Theory, onboarding is seen as an organizational investment that signals support and commitment to employees, encouraging them to reciprocate with greater loyalty and productivity [5]. When employees feel supported during the onboarding process, they are more likely to exhibit higher task and contextual performance. Hypothesis (H2): Onboarding processes positively affect employee performance.

#### c. The Influence of Mentoring Programs on Employee Performance

Social Exchange Theory and Human Capital Theory support the impact of mentoring programs on employee performance. Mentoring establishes supportive relationships between experienced employees and their mentees, fostering knowledge sharing, guidance, and emotional support [3]. According to Social Exchange Theory, employees who receive mentoring perceive this support as a valuable resource, leading to greater commitment, satisfaction, and performance [5]. Human Capital Theory further explains that mentoring enhances employee competencies and professional growth, improving individual performance [4]. Mentoring can positively influence immediate and long-term performance outcomes by accelerating skill development and increasing role confidence. Hypothesis (H3): Mentoring programs have a positive effect on employee performance.

## III. METHODS

This research employed a quantitative approach to assess the influence of recruitment practices, onboarding processes, and mentoring programs on employee performance at PT Temas Tbk [15](Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire survey, utilizing a Likert scale to measure employee perceptions of each variable under investigation [16]. The study adopted a judgment sampling technique, focusing on employees across various functional levels—strategic and operational—to ensure the sample accurately represented the organizational workforce relevant to the study objectives [17](Hair et al., 2006). The collected data were then analyzed using multiple regression analysis to examine the relationships between the independent variables (recruitment, onboarding, and mentoring) and the dependent variable (employee performance) and to empirically test the proposed hypotheses [18](Bryman, 2016).

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A) Findings

#### a. Validity and Reliability Test

**Table 1: Validity & Reliability Test**

Descriptions	Employee Performance	Recruitment Practices	Onboarding Processes	Mentoring Programs
Pearson's Correlation Coefficients	Above 0.361	Above 0.361	Above 0.361	Above 0.361
Cronbach's Alpha	0.943	0.720	0.897	0.934

The validity and reliability tests confirm that the instruments used to measure employee performance, recruitment practices, onboarding processes, and mentoring programs are valid and reliable. Pearson's correlation coefficients for all variables exceed the critical value of 0.361, indicating a satisfactory item-to-total correlation. Cronbach's Alpha values demonstrate strong internal consistency: employee performance (0.943), onboarding processes (0.897), and mentoring programs (0.934) all exhibit excellent reliability, while recruitment practices (0.720) indicate acceptable reliability. These results validate the constructs for further hypothesis testing.

#### b. Descriptive Statistics

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics**

Variables	New Employee Performance	Recruitment Practices	Onboarding Processes	Mentoring Programs
Mean	4.252	4.014	4.074	4.002
Std. Deviation	0.549	0.607	0.774	0.680

Table 2 displays the descriptive statistics for the key variables. Employee performance achieved the highest mean score (4.252), with a relatively low standard deviation (0.549), suggesting consistently high perceptions of performance among employees. Recruitment practices ( $M = 4.014$ ) and mentoring programs ( $M = 4.002$ ) received favorable evaluations, though with moderate variability. Onboarding processes ( $M = 4.074$ ) showed slightly higher variability ( $SD = 0.774$ ), indicating differing experiences among employees. The findings suggest that employees perceive all HC practices positively, though onboarding may benefit from further consistency and optimization.

#### c. Classical Assumption Test

**Table 4: Classical Assumption Test**

Assumption Testing	Requirement	Testing Output
Normality	P-value $\geq 0.05$	Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed): <b>0.098</b>
Multicollinearity	VIF $< 10$	2.283/2.757/3.093
	Tolerance $> 0.1$	0.438/0.363/0.323
Heteroscedasticity	P-value $\geq 0.05$	Spearman's rho (Sig. 2-tailed) 0.757/0.542/0.203

Table 4 summarizes the results of the classical assumption tests for the research model. The normality assumption is satisfied, as the Monte Carlo significance (2-tailed) value of 0.098 exceeds the required threshold of 0.05. Additionally, the multicollinearity assumption is met, with all Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values (2.283, 2.757, 3.093) well below 10, and tolerance values (0.438, 0.363, 0.323) all exceeding 0.1, indicating minimal collinearity among the predictors. Furthermore, the heteroscedasticity assumption is confirmed, with Spearman's rho significance values (0.757, 0.542, 0.203) all above 0.05, demonstrating that the variance of the residuals is homogeneous.

#### d. Model and Hypothesis Testing

**Table 5: Regression Outputs**

Testing	Requirement	Testing Output	
	-	0.570	
F-test	P-value $< 0.05$	F = 88.036 & Sig. = 0.000	
t-test		Beta	P-value
Recruitment Practices	Sig $< 0.05$	-0.023	0.745
Onboarding Processes	Sig $< 0.05$	0.728	0.000
Mentoring Programs	Sig $< 0.05$	0.054	0.508

The multiple regression analysis reveals that the combined influence of recruitment practices, onboarding processes, and mentoring programs can explain 57% of the variance in employee performance. The F-test result is statistically significant ( $F = 88.036$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), confirming the overall strength of the model. However, only onboarding processes significantly positively affected employee performance ( $\beta = 0.728$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). In contrast, recruitment practices ( $\beta = -0.023$ ,  $p = 0.745$ ) did not show a statistically significant effect on employee performance, indicating that there is not enough statistical evidence to support a relationship between recruitment practices and employee performance within the context of this study and mentoring programs ( $\beta = 0.054$ ,  $p = 0.508$ ) did not have statistically significant effects on employee performance in this model. These findings suggest that while onboarding is critical in supporting employee performance at PT Temas Tbk, recruitment and mentoring strategies may require further development and alignment to enhance their impact.

## **B) Discussion**

### **a. The Effect of Recruitment Practices on Employee Performance**

This study set out to assess whether recruitment practices significantly influence employee performance at PT TEMAS Tbk. Contrary to the initial hypothesis, the results show no statistically significant relationship between recruitment practices and employee performance. Viewed through the lens of Social Exchange Theory (SET), this suggests that employees may not perceive the initial interaction during recruitment as a sufficient basis for reciprocal performance-enhancing behaviour [5] [7]. Similarly, Human Capital Theory (HCT) argues that while recruitment is essential for attracting capable individuals, performance is more closely tied to continuous development than initial hiring efforts alone [4].

These findings imply that while recruitment can match candidates to roles, its influence on performance may diminish if not reinforced through ongoing investment in development. Employees may not regard the recruitment process as a meaningful exchange unless it is followed by sustained support such as onboarding, mentoring, or clear career pathways [3] [10]. In other words, effective recruitment practices may only contribute indirectly to performance when integrated with broader strategies that strengthen employees' competencies and motivation.

Previous research has found that recruitment practices can enhance performance by ensuring fit and motivation [19] [20], yet the findings from PT TEMAS Tbk suggest otherwise. This divergence highlights the importance of organizational contexts—such as sectoral characteristics, internal HC policies, or leadership practices—that may moderate the effectiveness of recruitment in shaping performance. Thus, without a strong follow-up in post-hire development, recruitment alone may not suffice to influence employee performance outcomes meaningfully.

### **b. The Effect of Onboarding Processes on Employee Performance**

Unlike recruitment, onboarding processes demonstrated a strong and statistically significant effect on employee performance. Employees who experienced structured onboarding reported greater understanding of their roles, better adaptation to organizational culture, and improved ability to meet job expectations. These results underscore the value of onboarding as a strategic mechanism for ensuring workplace clarity, comfort, and commitment.

From the SET perspective, comprehensive onboarding fosters a sense of reciprocal obligation—employees perceive the organization's investment and are motivated to reciprocate with better performance [5] [7]. Organizational Socialization Theory further explains this outcome, suggesting that onboarding is critical in facilitating employees' adjustment, learning, and internalization of organizational values and norms [21]. This socialization helps bridge the gap between organizational expectations and employee behavior, leading to measurable improvements in job outcomes.

While previous studies have highlighted onboarding's role in employee adaptation and satisfaction [2] [22], the present study adds to this literature by showing its direct impact on overall performance. The case of PT TEMAS Tbk demonstrates that structured onboarding programs can do more than support integration—they can actively enhance productivity and effectiveness. This insight supports the idea that onboarding should be seen not merely as a transitional activity but as a performance-enhancing strategy [23] [24].

### **c. The Effect of Mentoring Programs on Employee Performance**

The study also evaluated the impact of mentoring programs on employee performance and found no significant effect. Despite the intention to enhance employee capabilities and integration through mentoring, the results suggest that the current program at PT TEMAS Tbk may not effectively support performance outcomes. This may be due to mentoring activities lacking strategic alignment with employee needs or insufficient perceived value by the participants.

SET helps explain this finding by suggesting that employees may not respond with increased performance if they do not perceive tangible benefits from mentoring—such as actionable feedback, learning opportunities, or personal growth [5] [7]. Meanwhile, HCT emphasizes that mentoring must directly enhance employees' competencies to influence performance [4]. If the mentoring is informal, inconsistent, or poorly matched to employees' roles, its capacity to build human capital and trigger performance benefits may be limited [25] [10].

This result diverges from past research highlighting mentoring's positive impact on job performance and professional development [26] [10]. The novelty in this context lies in showing that mentoring does not automatically lead to performance gains unless intentionally structured and perceived as beneficial by employees. In the case of PT TEMAS Tbk, it is possible that mentoring operates as a symbolic or supplementary practice rather than a core strategy for capability building, thereby reducing its practical impact on performance.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the influence of recruitment practices, onboarding processes, and mentoring programs on employee performance at PT TEMAS Tbk. The findings revealed that onboarding processes significantly and positively affected employee performance, highlighting the critical role of structured integration strategies in enhancing job effectiveness. In contrast, recruitment practices and mentoring programs did not show statistically significant effects, suggesting that while these practices are foundational for talent acquisition and development, they may not directly translate into improved performance without strategic reinforcement and alignment with employees' evolving needs. These results call for a reassessment of how recruitment and mentoring efforts are designed and integrated within broader human resource development frameworks to ensure lasting performance outcomes.

The theoretical frameworks applied—Human Capital Theory [4], Social Exchange Theory [5] [7], and Organizational Socialization Theory [6]—effectively contextualize the results. Human Capital Theory provides the foundation for understanding that employee performance is shaped by ongoing development investments, not merely initial selection. Social Exchange Theory helps explain why onboarding creates strong reciprocal commitment between employees and the organization, particularly when support is perceived as genuine and sustained. Meanwhile, Organizational Socialization Theory sheds light on how onboarding facilitates cultural integration and role clarity, directly influencing work outcomes. Together, these theories offer a comprehensive lens for interpreting the findings. Methodologically, using a quantitative survey approach and regression analysis ensured the objectivity and reliability of the results [18].

Nevertheless, the research has several limitations. First, focusing on a single company—PT TEMAS Tbk—limits the generalizability of the findings across different organizational types or sectors [18]. Second, reliance on self-reported survey data may introduce response biases [27]. Third, while the study drew on strong theoretical models, it did not explore external factors such as labor market conditions or internal dynamics like personality traits and leadership behavior, which could further shape employee performance. Finally, the cross-sectional design restricts insight into long-term effects; future research may benefit from longitudinal approaches to assess how recruitment, onboarding, and mentoring influence performance over time.

#### Interest Conflicts

The authors confirm that there are no conflicts of interest related to the publication of this article. Both authors have made equal contributions to the research and the writing of this paper, and they state that no financial, professional, or personal ties exist that might be seen as affecting the results shared in this study.

#### Funding Statement

This study did not receive financial support from any public, commercial, or non-profit funding body. The authors independently carried out the research as part of their academic research efforts.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors sincerely thank the management and employees of PT Temas Tbk for their cooperation and participation in this study. We also appreciate our academic advisors, colleagues' guidance and support, and the faculty and staff who assisted with data collection and analysis. Lastly, we are grateful to our families and friends for their encouragement and moral support throughout this research.

#### V. REFERENCES

- [1] Ployhart RE. Staffing in the 21st Century: New challenges and strategic opportunities. *J Manage* 2006;32:868–97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306293625>.
- [2] Bauer TN. Onboarding new employees: Maximizing success. SHRM Foundation; 2010.
- [3] Allen TD, Eby LT, Lentz E. The relationship between formal mentoring program characteristics and per. *Spring* 2006;57:125–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02409.x>.
- [4] Caire G, Becker GS. Human Capital, A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education. vol. 18. University of Chicago Press; 1967. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3499575>.
- [5] Blau PM. Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons; 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203792643>.
- [6] Bozeman B. Toward a theory of organizational implosion. *Am Rev Public Adm* 2011;41:119–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010381781>.
- [7] Cropanzano R, Mitchell MS. Social exchange theory: An Interdisciplinary review. *J Manage* 2005;31:874–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>.
- [8] Breugh JA. Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Hum Resour Manag Rev* 2008;18:103–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.07.003>.
- [9] Klein HJ, Weaver NA. The Effectiveness of Socialization Tactics on Newcomer Adjustment and Stress: A Meta-analytic Review. *J Appl Psychol* 2000;85:778–793. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.778>.
- [10] Ragins B, Kram K. The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2012. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976619>.
- [11] Arthur MB, Kram KE. Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life. vol. 30. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman; 1985. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392687>.
- [12] Borman WC, Motowidlo. Expanding The Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Extra-role Performance, dalam. In: Schmitt N, Highhouse S, McDaniel

- I, Hough CQ, editors. *Pers. Sel. Organ.*, Sage Publications; 1993, p. 71–98.
- [13] Arena Michael U-BM. *Leadership for organizational adaptability*. Harvard Business Publishing; 2018.
- [14] Warr P, Clapperton G. The joy of work?: Jobs, happiness, and you. *Joy Work Jobs, Happiness, You* 2010:1–190. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832486>.
- [15] PH. and Chang YC. *Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Research Design Qualitative Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. vol. 4. 5th ed. SAGE Publications; 2009.
- [16] Sugiyono. *Metode penelitian bisnis: pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, kombinasi, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta; 2014.
- [17] Ketchen DJ. *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling*. vol. 46. SAGE Publications; 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2013.01.002>.
- [18] Walliman N. *Social Research Methods*. 5th ed. Oxford University Press; 2011. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209939>.
- [19] Adeola MM, Adebisi SO. Employee motivation and organizational performance in selected firms in Lagos, Nigeria. *J Manag Bus Stud* 2006;5:112–125.
- [20] Allen D, Bryant P, Vardaman J. Retaining Talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. *Acad Manag Perspect* 2010;24:48–64. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2010.51827775>.
- [21] Bozeman B. Toward a theory of organizational implosion. *Am Rev Public Adm* 2011;41:119–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010381781>.
- [22] Briceño A. *Mindset and workplace innovation*. Routledge; n.d.
- [23] Yarbrough M, Salazar R. Optimizing onboarding strategies for workforce performance: A practical guide for HR professionals. *Hum Resour Manag J* 2023;38:45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrmj.12345>.
- [24] Wiseman J, Clarke E, Turner L. Effective onboarding practices: Accelerating employee integration and productivity. *J Organ Behav* 2022;43:987–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2567>.
- [25] Allen TD, Eby LT, Poteet ML, Lentz E. The Relationship Between Formal Mentoring Program and Organizational Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *Pers Psychol* 2006;57:409–442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02409.x>.
- [26] Eby LT, Allen TD, Evans SC, Ng T, DuBois DL. Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *J Vocat Behav* 2008;72:254–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.005>.
- [27] Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *J Appl Psychol* 2003;88:879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>.