International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 10 Issue: 11 | Nov - 2026 SJIF Rating: 8.659 ISSN: 2582-3930

Employee Lifecycle Management in HR Operations: A Process-Based Study of an Indian Automotive Organisation

Ojasvee Pimpalkar
Student, MBA (Human Resource Management), School of Business, Indira University, Pune

Abstract

Human resource activities that follow candidate selection are often managed as separate administrative tasks, although the output of each stage becomes the input of the next. This study examines employee lifecycle management from the perspective of HR Operations, with attention to how continuity, coordination, documentation, information accuracy, tracking, technology use and compliance are sustained across lifecycle stages. A qualitative, descriptive and process-oriented design was applied to a single Indian organisation operating in the commercial vehicle and automotive sector. The empirical basis is fourteen HR activities documented during an on-the-job training placement in the HR function. These activities were the units of analysis and were examined through lifecycle mapping, stakeholder mapping, assessment of recurring process requirements, technology-role analysis and output classification. No survey or interview data were collected and no inferential statistics were used. The fourteen activities were mapped to an eight-stage framework, with background verification and pre-onboarding and HR operations containing four activities each. Stakeholder coordination was present in thirteen activities, information accuracy in twelve, documentation in eleven, and follow-up and tracking and digital systems in ten each. Compliance appeared directly in two activities and operated as a cross-cutting requirement. Digital systems supported information flow and status visibility but did not remove the need for accurate inputs and human follow-up. The study proposes five measures: standardised lifecycle tracking, documentation checklists, clear process ownership, automation of repetitive tracking and reminders, and periodic compliance review. The findings offer a process-level perspective from one organisational setting and are not statistically generalisable. Employee lifecycle management in HR Operations is best understood as a connected system of dependent processes.

Keywords: Employee lifecycle management; HR operations; process management; onboarding; HR technology; stakeholder coordination; documentation; labour compliance; automotive sector; India

1. Introduction

An employee's association with an organisation moves through recognisable stages: the person is recruited and selected, receives an offer, completes pre-joining formalities, is onboarded, works within the organisation while HR maintains records and supports development and engagement, and eventually separates. Most HR departments organise their work around these stages, and each stage has its own procedures, documents and responsible people. The lifecycle view treats these stages as one continuous journey and not as unrelated transactions (Cattermole, 2019).

The practical significance of that view lies in dependency. Information collected when an offer is prepared is the information later used for background verification. Documents completed before joining determine whether onboarding can be completed on the joining date. The employee record created at onboarding is then drawn upon by later processes, including routine letters, stipend or payroll-related coordination and exit documentation. A delay or an error at one point is therefore seldom contained at that point. Thompson (1967) described this pattern as sequential interdependence, in which the output of one unit becomes the input of the next, and it makes coordination and information transfer central to how such work is managed.

HR Operations is the part of the HR function that carries much of this connecting work. It maintains employee records, prepares routine documents, follows up with candidates, employees, internal departments and external providers, and keeps track of what is complete and what is pending. Ulrich (1997) treated administrative efficiency as one of several roles HR must perform, alongside strategic and employee-facing roles. The lifecycle perspective suggests that this administrative role is also a continuity role, because it links the stages together.

Four supporting elements recur across the lifecycle. Documentation carries information from one stage to the next. Technology stores, moves and displays that information. Stakeholder coordination is needed because most activities

depend on a party outside the HR team. Compliance, particularly with labour requirements, constrains how processes are designed and recorded. In India, the consolidation of central labour legislation into four Labour Codes has made the last of these a continuing concern for HR practice (Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, 2025).

Existing research has examined many individual parts of this picture in depth, including recruitment, onboarding, engagement, training and HR technology. Fewer accounts describe, at the level of everyday process, how activities belonging to several lifecycle stages are connected and coordinated within HR Operations. The gap addressed here is therefore modest and specific. It is the need for a process-oriented understanding of how multiple lifecycle activities depend on one another, and of what those activities require in terms of coordination, documentation, information accuracy, tracking, technology and compliance.

This study addresses that need through an eight-stage lifecycle framework applied to fourteen HR activities documented in one Indian organisation in the commercial vehicle and automotive sector. It examines how the activities are distributed across the stages, what recurring requirements they share, how technology figures in them, and what practical measures the pattern suggests.

2. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

1. To study the key stages of the employee lifecycle in the selected organisation.
2. To understand the HR processes involved in managing the employee lifecycle in the selected organisation.
3. To identify the challenges and possible areas for improvement in employee lifecycle management in the selected organisation.

3. Theoretical Background and Literature Review

3.1 Employee lifecycle management as the organising framework

Armstrong and Taylor (2023) present human resource management as an integrated set of activities covering resourcing, learning and development, employee relations and digital HR, which provides the general setting in which lifecycle stages sit. Cattermole (2019) develops the lifecycle idea more directly, linking it to the employee value proposition, onboarding and retention-oriented practice. The two sources agree that HR activities gain meaning from their position in a sequence, although neither provides a process-level account of how the sequence is operated day to day. That is the level at which the present study works.

The framework applied here has eight stages: recruitment and selection; offer generation; background verification and pre-onboarding; onboarding and induction; HR operations; learning and development; employee engagement; and separation. Documentation, HR technology, stakeholder coordination and information accuracy are treated as supporting elements, and compliance is treated as a cross-cutting requirement. These are not treated as additional stages because they operate across the sequence and not at a single point within it. HR operations appears in the framework as the stage covering employee records, letters and routine administration during employment. The HR Operations function, by contrast, is the setting in which the whole sequence is observed.

3.2 Recruitment, onboarding and the entry stages

Breaugh (2013) reviews recruitment research and shows that recruitment practice influences applicant attraction and perceptions of the organisation, which makes the process consequential beyond the hiring decision. For HR Operations, recruitment also generates the candidate information carried into later stages.

The onboarding literature is larger. Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo and Tucker (2007), in a meta-analysis of 70 unique samples, found that socialisation tactics and newcomer information seeking were related to adjustment, and that adjustment was in turn related to job satisfaction, commitment, performance, intention to remain and turnover. Klein and Polin (2012) distinguish onboarding as a process through which newcomers acquire the knowledge, behaviours and relationships needed to become effective from administrative orientation alone. Cable, Gino and Staats (2013) reported that the design of the onboarding experience itself was associated with differences in newcomer retention in a field setting, which suggests that onboarding is not a neutral procedure. Recent survey-based studies point the same way.

Bowers, Thal and Elshaw (2023) relate onboarding experience to job satisfaction, commitment and job embeddedness, and Mosquera and Soares (2025) identify corporate, manager and coworker welcome as distinct onboarding dimensions linked to identification, wellbeing and turnover intention.

This body of work generally agrees that onboarding matters for outcomes. Its limitation for present purposes is that it concentrates on the newcomer's experience and outcomes, and says relatively little about the administrative groundwork (offer documentation, verification, identity and access arrangements) that has to be completed before the newcomer's experience can begin.

3.3 Process management, interdependence and coordination

Zare, Tahmasebi and Yazdani (2018) show that HR processes can be assessed systematically, using a process survey tool, to identify maturity gaps and prioritise improvement. This supports examining HR work as process rather than as a list of tasks. Thompson's (1967) account of sequential interdependence explains why such assessment needs to follow the links between activities. Gittell (2002), writing on relational coordination in care provider groups, argues that coordination depends on frequent, timely and accurate communication supported by shared goals and knowledge. Although that work was set in a different industry, it gives a useful vocabulary for processes in which completion depends on people in several roles supplying information at the right time.

3.4 Documentation and information management

Adom-Nyankey and Andoh (2021) study HR records management and stress the need for effective creation, maintenance, retention and disposition of records. Their setting is a university in Ghana, so the transfer to an industrial organisation is a matter of principle and not of direct comparison. The principle is relevant here: records are the mechanism by which information moves between stages, and weaknesses in how they are created or maintained affect everything that relies on them.

3.5 HR technology and digital HR

Strohmeier (2007) defines electronic HRM as the use of information technology to network and support at least two actors in the shared performance of HR activities, a definition that places coordination at the centre of HR technology. Marler and Fisher (2013) reviewed the evidence on e-HRM and strategic HRM and found that empirical support for strategic benefits was thin relative to the claims made for it. Stone, Deadrick, Lukaszewski and Johnson (2015) review how technology influences HRM and describe both its benefits and its limits, including continuing dependence on human interaction and inputs. Taken together, these sources suggest a measured reading of technology: it can change how HR processes are carried out, but its value depends on the processes and people around it.

3.6 Learning and development, and engagement

Salas, Tannenbaum, Kraiger and Smith-Jentsch (2012) review the science of training and emphasise that outcomes depend on organisational conditions before and after a session as well as on the quality of delivery. On engagement, Kahn (1990) identified meaningfulness, safety and availability as psychological conditions for personal engagement, Saks (2006) distinguished job engagement from organisation engagement and linked both to organisational practices, and Bakker and Demerouti (2008) connected engagement with the resources available in a job. These studies define why learning and engagement belong in a lifecycle account. They are mostly concerned with what produces learning or engagement, and not with the coordination work that makes such activities happen.

3.7 Labour and compliance considerations

India's four Labour Codes consolidate central labour legislation and provide a framework covering wages, industrial relations, social security, and occupational safety and working conditions (Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, 2025). For HR processes, this means that policies, records and employee-related procedures are designed and administered within externally set requirements. Compliance is therefore best read as a condition on process design, which supports treating it as cross-cutting.

3.8 Synthesis and research gap

Three points emerge from the literature. First, there is wide agreement that lifecycle stages matter and that early stages, particularly onboarding, are consequential. Second, the supporting elements examined here (coordination, records, technology, compliance) are each recognised in research, but usually one at a time. Third, the stage-specific literature tends to focus on the employee's experience or on outcomes, while the process-level work of moving information and actions between stakeholders receives less direct attention. The present study does not claim that this work is unexamined. It proposes that a process-based description of how several stages are linked through HR Operations adds a practical perspective to the existing evidence.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research design

The study uses a qualitative, descriptive, process-oriented design. This design was chosen because the research problem concerns how connected activities are carried out and what they require, and not how employees perceive them or how well the function performs. A process-oriented design allows activities to be examined in their working context and compared with one another, which a respondent survey would not allow. The single-organisation logic follows the general rationale for case-based inquiry, in which a phenomenon is examined within its real setting using several kinds of evidence (Yin, 2018).

4.2 Research setting

The setting is the HR function of an Indian organisation operating in the commercial vehicle and automotive sector. The organisation is not named, and organisation-specific internal information has been left out of the analysis. Activities are described at a general process level.

4.3 Unit of analysis and data basis

The unit of analysis is the HR activity. Fourteen activities were documented and analysed. These are units of analysis and not respondents, and the study has no sample of people in the survey-research sense. The empirical basis is the researcher's exposure during an on-the-job training placement in the HR function, with primary placement in HR Operations. Evidence came from direct observation of HR processes, practical participation in assigned activities, informal discussions with HR colleagues and stakeholders, review of process formats made available during the placement, and a structured activity log. The researcher supported or coordinated these activities and did not own all of them. Employee-level and candidate-level data were not used. Throughout the paper, the activities are described in terms of the researcher's actual level of involvement.

The fourteen documented activities were: recruitment drive coordination; document verification; offer generation; background verification; pre-onboarding; visitor management and identity card coordination; induction coordination; employee documentation and HR Operations; off-cycle letters; stipend coordination; learning and development; employee engagement; HR policy and labour code review; and exit documentation.

4.4 Analytical procedure

The analysis proceeded in six steps. First, each activity was mapped to one of the eight lifecycle stages. Second, depth of involvement in each stage was classified as high, moderate or limited, according to whether activities were performed directly and repeatedly, supported without end-to-end responsibility, or confined to a single defined task. Third, stakeholder involvement was mapped across ten process areas, which divide some lifecycle stages into more than one operational process, for the purpose of stakeholder and technology analysis only. Fourth, each activity was assessed for six recurring requirements: documentation, information accuracy, stakeholder coordination, follow-up and tracking, digital systems and compliance. A requirement was recorded as present where its absence would have prevented the activity from being completed correctly. Fifth, technology touchpoints were classified as direct, supporting or not observed. Sixth, the outputs of the activities were grouped into categories. The analysis relies on frequency counts and

descriptive interpretation. No statistical tests were applied, and no percentages are reported, because counts of fourteen activities are used to describe the scope and pattern of documented exposure and not to estimate population values.
The classification was carried out by the researcher, so no independent coding check was available. The study design addresses this by stating the criteria used for each classification, so that the basis of each count is open to inspection.

5. Analysis and Findings

5.1 The eight-stage framework and distribution of activities

All eight lifecycle stages were represented in the documented activities. Table 1 shows how the fourteen activities were distributed.

Table 1
Eight-stage employee lifecycle framework and documented activity exposure

Lifecycle stage	Documented activities	Number	Depth of involvement
1. Recruitment and selection	Recruitment drive coordination	1	Moderate
2. Offer generation	Offer generation	1	High
3. Background verification and pre-onboarding	Document verification; background verification; pre-onboarding; visitor management and identity card coordination	4	High
4. Onboarding and induction	Induction coordination	1	High
5. HR operations	Employee documentation and HR Operations; off-cycle letters; stipend coordination; HR policy and labour code review	4	High (three activities); moderate (one)
6. Learning and development	Learning and development	1	Moderate
7. Employee engagement	Employee engagement	1	Moderate
8. Separation	Exit documentation	1	Limited
Total		**14**	

Note. Compliance is a cross-cutting requirement and not a ninth stage. HR policy and labour code review is counted under HR operations because it supports policy administration.

Background verification and pre-onboarding and HR operations each contained four activities, the highest counts in the framework. The other six stages contained one each. Activity count and depth of involvement did not always move together. Onboarding and induction contained a single activity but was classified as high involvement because the activity required coordination from scheduling through to communication with the stakeholders concerned. HR policy and labour code review was classified as moderate because the researcher supported a policy comparison and did not own the compliance function. Separation involvement was limited to exit documentation, and the study does not describe the separation stage beyond that task. The distribution describes the scope of documented exposure. It does not indicate that any stage is more important than another in the organisation's HR function.
The concentration in background verification and pre-onboarding is better read alongside the stakeholder evidence in Section 5.2 than treated as a finding in itself. The four activities in this stage all fall in the interval between a candidate's

acceptance of an offer and the candidate's first day, and each depended on information being completed by one party and passed to another.

5.2 Stakeholder involvement across process areas

Table 2 presents the stakeholder types required by each of the ten process areas, together with the classification of technology use in each.

Table 2
Stakeholder involvement and digital touchpoints across HR process areas

Process area	Stakeholder types involved	Number of types	Digital touchpoint
Recruitment	HR team; candidates; managers and internal departments	3	Direct
Offer generation	HR team; candidates	2	Direct
Background verification	HR team; candidates; external service provider	3	Direct
Pre-onboarding	HR team; candidates; IT team; internal departments	4	Direct
Onboarding and induction	HR team; employees; managers and internal departments	3	Direct
HR operations	HR team; employees; external agency	3	Direct
Learning and development	HR team; employees; trainers	3	Supporting
Employee engagement	HR team; employees	2	Supporting
Compliance review	HR team	1	Not observed
Separation	HR team; employees	2	Supporting

HR was involved in all ten process areas, which is consistent with its role as the connecting function. Pre-onboarding involved the largest number of stakeholder types, four, spanning candidates, the IT team and internal departments. Background verification and stipend coordination depended on external parties, which created dependencies outside the direct control of the HR team. Compliance review was the only process area involving the HR team alone. The pattern indicates that HR process management consists substantially of coordinating information and actions between parties and not of HR carrying out each process independently.

5.3 Recurring process requirements

Table 3 shows how often each requirement was present across the fourteen activities.

Table 3
Recurring process requirements across documented HR activities

Process requirement	Activities in which present
Stakeholder coordination	13 of 14
Information accuracy	12 of 14
Documentation	11 of 14
Follow-up and tracking	10 of 14
Digital systems	10 of 14
Compliance	2 of 14

Stakeholder coordination was absent only from HR policy and labour code review, the one activity in which the HR team worked alone. Its presence in thirteen activities reflects the structure of the work: offers need candidates, verification needs an external provider, pre-onboarding needs the IT team and internal departments, and induction needs managers and new joiners. In each case HR could not close the activity without action from someone else.

Information accuracy, present in twelve activities, was recorded where an error would have carried into a later step. Employee and candidate details entered into records at one stage are used again in later ones, so the accuracy requirement attaches to the point at which information is first captured and not to the point at which it is later used. The two activities without this requirement were recruitment drive coordination and employee engagement.

Documentation was present in eleven activities. Learning and development, employee engagement and recruitment drive coordination were the activities in which a formal record was not a condition of completion. Where documentation was present, it served as the carrier of information to the next stage, which is the function attributed to records in the literature (Adom-Nyankey & Andoh, 2021).

Follow-up and tracking and digital systems were each present in ten activities, though not the same ten. Stipend coordination required follow-up without a digital system, while exit documentation involved a digital system without a follow-up requirement. Follow-up was present in the activities where completion depended on an external or delayed response, and that is where the work consisted partly of keeping the status of pending items visible.

Compliance appeared as a direct requirement in two activities, HR policy and labour code review and exit documentation. The lower count does not mean that compliance is less important in other activities. It means that compliance was not a separate task in most of them. It operated as a condition on how records, letters and policies had to be prepared, which is how a cross-cutting requirement behaves. Treating it as a ninth stage would have implied a point in the lifecycle at which compliance occurs, and the evidence does not support that reading.

5.4 The role of technology

Digital touchpoints were observed in nine of the ten process areas (Table 2). Direct use was observed in six areas and supporting use in three. In recruitment, offer generation, background verification, pre-onboarding, onboarding and HR operations, digital systems were used to store information, transfer it to another party and display the status of an activity. In learning and development, engagement and separation, digital tools supported communication and document preparation.

In the activities observed, digital systems reflected status but did not resolve it. Where information was incomplete or a verification result was pending, the system recorded the pending condition and the activity waited for a person to supply the missing input or follow up with the party concerned. The analysis therefore characterises technology by its role in information flow, tracking, processing and status visibility, and not as a replacement for judgement or verification. The study does not argue that technology should replace either.

5.5 Outputs of the documented activities

Table 4
Outputs generated across documented HR activities

Output category	Description	Number of activities
Formal documents	Offer documents, off-cycle letters, exit letters, employee records	4
Completed process steps	Verification coordination, pre-onboarding closure, information sharing with IT, stipend processing	6
Coordination outputs	Induction scheduling, training and engagement coordination	3
Analytical output	Policy and labour code comparison with clarification points	1
Total		**14**

Completed process steps were the largest category, with six activities. In these activities, the output was the movement of a process from one stage to the next and not a document. This matters for tracking, because completion that does not produce a visible document can only be monitored through status records. Four activities produced formal documents, three produced coordination outputs and one produced an analytical output.

5.6 Summary of findings

The analysis supports four findings. The documented activities covered all eight lifecycle stages, with varying depth of involvement. Background verification and pre-onboarding and HR operations contained the most documented activities, four each. Stakeholder coordination, information accuracy and documentation were the most consistently recurring requirements, present in thirteen, twelve and eleven activities respectively. Digital systems were observed across most process areas but served mainly to support information flow and status visibility, while accurate inputs and human follow-up remained necessary. Compliance operated as a cross-cutting requirement.

Taken together, the findings describe the lifecycle as a connected sequence of dependent processes. They describe how the observed processes are structured and what they require. They do not measure the performance or effectiveness of the HR function, because process-level performance measures such as turnaround time or completion rate were not available.

6. Discussion

Lifecycle continuity. The finding that activities were linked by information dependencies is consistent with the lifecycle perspective in Cattermole (2019) and with the account of sequential interdependence in Thompson (1967). The contribution of the present study is descriptive. It shows that in one organisation the links were visible in routine work: the same candidate information appeared in offer documentation, verification and pre-onboarding, and the closure of pre-onboarding was a condition for joining. The findings suggest that continuity in the lifecycle is not an abstract property but something HR Operations maintains through handovers.

The entry stages. Onboarding research establishes that newcomer adjustment and onboarding experience are associated with satisfaction, commitment and retention-related outcomes (Bauer et al., 2007; Bowers et al., 2023; Mosquera & Soares, 2025), and that onboarding extends beyond administrative orientation (Klein & Polin, 2012). The present findings add a view of the stage that precedes the newcomer's experience. The analysis indicates that the interval between offer acceptance and joining involved a dense set of administrative activities and the largest number of stakeholder types in a single process area. The study did not measure newcomer experience and cannot say whether these processes affect it. It does suggest that the administrative groundwork is a coordination task in its own right, and that onboarding as experienced by the newcomer rests on it.

Coordination and information accuracy. Gittell's (2002) account of coordination through timely, accurate communication fits the pattern in which thirteen of fourteen activities required coordination and twelve required accurate information. The fit is by analogy, since Gittell's setting was different, but the shared point is that coordination fails when information is late or wrong, and that this is a feature of how work is organised and not only of individual effort. The finding that follow-up was most common where completion depended on an external or delayed response supports this reading.

Documentation. The recurrence of documentation in eleven activities is consistent with the view that records carry information across stages and that their quality affects what depends on them (Adom-Nyankey & Andoh, 2021). The finding that a process step can be completed without producing a document, as in six activities, adds a qualification: documentation is necessary in most activities, but not every unit of HR work leaves a record that can be checked afterwards, which increases the importance of status tracking.

Technology. The observation that digital systems stored, transferred and displayed information but did not resolve pending items agrees with Stone et al. (2015), who note both the benefits of HR technology and its dependence on human inputs. It also fits Strohmeier's (2007) definition of e-HRM as technology that supports actors in shared HR activities. The finding is also compatible with Marler and Fisher's (2013) conclusion that strategic claims for HR technology outrun the evidence, in the narrow sense that the technology observed here was administrative and its value depended on the quality of the inputs. The study makes no claim about the strategic effects of technology.

Compliance. Compliance appeared directly in two activities yet constrained others, which matches the view of labour requirements as external conditions on how HR processes are designed (Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, 2025). This supports the treatment of compliance as a cross-cutting requirement.

Learning and engagement. The evidence on learning and development and on engagement is limited to one activity each, both classified as moderate involvement. The literature explains what produces learning and engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006; Salas et al., 2012). The present data speak only to the supporting coordination and communication through which such activities are organised, and the study draws no conclusion about their effectiveness.

Scope of the contribution. The findings are drawn from one organisation and fourteen activities. They offer a process-level perspective on how lifecycle activities connect in HR Operations. They do not represent all organisations, and they do not establish causal relationships.

7. Managerial Implications and Recommendations

The five recommendations below follow from the recurring requirements identified in the findings, particularly coordination, information accuracy and documentation. They aim to strengthen existing HR processes and not to replace them. The findings suggest these measures may support better visibility and accuracy, but the study did not test them and cannot show that they would improve outcomes.

Table 5

Summary of recommendations and their basis in the findings

Recommendation	Expected outcome	Basis in the findings
Standardised employee lifecycle tracking	Better visibility of pending and completed activities	Offer generation and background verification and pre-onboarding together contained five of fourteen activities
Standardised documentation checklists	Earlier identification of missing information and improved accuracy	Documentation and information accuracy were present in eleven and twelve activities
Clear process ownership	Greater clarity about responsibility for pending actions	Stakeholder coordination was present in thirteen activities
Automation of repetitive activities	Reduced manual effort in repetitive tracking and reminders	Digital touchpoints were observed in nine of ten process areas
Periodic compliance review	Timely identification of provisions needing clarification	Policy and labour code review identified points requiring confirmation

Standardised employee lifecycle tracking. What: a consolidated tracker for the offer-to-onboarding transition. How: each record would show the lifecycle stage, the responsible stakeholder, current status, pending action and expected completion date. Why and expected outcome: completed process steps were the most common output, and these leave no document to inspect, so status is visible only if it is recorded. A single tracker may make pending items and handovers easier to see.

Standardised documentation checklists. What: stage-wise checklists of required documents and information. How: checklists would be drawn from the process map for each stage and used when information is first captured and again before it is passed on. Why and expected outcome: information accuracy and documentation were among the most recurrent requirements, and errors carry forward. Checklists may help identify gaps earlier and improve accuracy at the point where it matters most.

Clear process ownership. What: defined responsibility for each step in processes involving several stakeholders. How: ownership would be mapped alongside the process, naming who supplies each input and who closes each step. Why and expected outcome: with coordination present in thirteen of fourteen activities and several dependencies outside HR, clear ownership may make it easier to see who is responsible for a pending action.

Automation of repetitive activities. What: automation of routine tracking, reminders and status notifications within existing digital processes. How: automation would be applied only where a task is repetitive and rule-based, such as reminders for pending documents, while verification and decisions remain with people. Why and expected outcome: digital systems in the study supported information flow but did not resolve pending items. Automating repetitive follow-up may reduce manual effort without removing the human judgement that accuracy depends on.

Periodic compliance review. What: regular comparison of HR policies with applicable labour requirements. How: the structured comparison format used in the policy review activity would be repeated at intervals, with points of uncertainty recorded separately and referred for confirmation. Why and expected outcome: compliance constrains many processes while appearing directly in few, so a periodic review may identify provisions needing clarification or updating before they affect records or letters.

Implementation sequence. The measures can be introduced progressively. The offer-to-onboarding process is the logical starting point, as it showed the highest concentration of activities and stakeholders. The existing process would first be mapped, including required information, responsible stakeholders and completion points. The tracker, checklists and ownership map would then be developed from that map, and suitable opportunities for automating repetitive follow-up identified. The approach could then be extended to other lifecycle stages, and its effectiveness reviewed periodically using process records and trackers.

The study did not provide sufficient evidence to recommend changes to compensation, retention, staffing levels, organisational structure or major new HR systems. Such recommendations would require employee-level or process-performance data.

8. Limitations

The findings are based on activities documented during a single placement period, so processes not encountered, and cycles of activity falling outside that period, are not represented. Access to employee-level information was restricted for confidentiality reasons, and attrition data, compensation information and individual records were neither available nor used. No structured survey or interview study was conducted, so the findings do not describe how employees or candidates experienced the processes. Process performance data such as turnaround times, completion rates and volumes were not available, and the counts reported are counts of documented activities, not measures of efficiency. Depth of involvement varied across stages, with separation observed through a single task, and Table 1 states this for each stage so that the weight of evidence behind each finding is visible. The classification of activities was carried out by the researcher without an independent coder. Finally, the findings are specific to the processes and the organisation studied and should not be generalised to the wider HR function or to other organisations without further study.

These limitations follow from the design and scope of a process-based study built on documented practical exposure. They are stated so that the findings are read against the evidence that supports them.

9. Scope for Future Research

The limitations point to several directions. Studies measuring process performance, such as turnaround time, completion rate and pending cases, would allow the structural findings reported here to be linked to process outcomes. Research collecting structured feedback from new joiners and candidates would add the experience perspective that this study could not provide, and could connect administrative groundwork to the onboarding outcomes examined in the literature. Evaluations comparing process results before and after the introduction of trackers, checklists or automation would test the recommendations directly. Studies covering the later and less-observed stages, particularly separation, in greater depth would extend the framework. Comparative studies across organisations in the automotive sector would show how far the patterns reported here hold elsewhere, and longitudinal studies following the lifecycle over a longer period would show how dependencies behave across cycles. None of these was undertaken in the present study.

10. Conclusion

This study asked how employee lifecycle management operates within HR Operations. In the organisation examined, the documented activities fell across all eight lifecycle stages, and the information produced at one stage was a requirement for the next. Background verification and pre-onboarding and HR operations contained the most documented activities, four each. Stakeholder coordination, information accuracy and documentation were the most consistently recurring requirements, followed by follow-up and tracking and digital systems. Compliance appeared directly in few activities but constrained how processes were designed and recorded, which supports treating it as a cross-cutting requirement and not as a ninth stage. Digital systems supported information flow and status visibility but depended on accurate inputs and timely human follow-up.

These results indicate that employee lifecycle management in HR Operations is best understood as a connected system of dependent processes and not as a set of isolated HR activities. HR Operations holds that system together through coordination, record-keeping and tracking. The five recommendations proposed (standardised lifecycle tracking, documentation checklists, clear process ownership, automation of repetitive tracking and reminders, and periodic compliance review) address these recurring requirements and are intended to strengthen existing processes. The findings come from one organisational setting and fourteen documented activities, and they provide a process-level perspective that further research can test and extend.

References

Adom-Nyankey, K., & Andoh, R. P. K. (2021). Effectiveness of human resource records management strategies at a university in Ghana. Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication, 71(8/9), 972–985. https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-04-2021-0059

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2023). Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice: A guide to the theory and practice of people management (16th ed.). Kogan Page.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. Career Development International, 13(3), 209–223.

Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: A meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes, and methods. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(3), 707–721. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.707

Bowers, B. S., Thal, A. E., & Elshaw, J. J. (2023). Onboarding: Just how important is it? Strategic HR Review, 22(5), 164–168. https://doi.org/10.1108/SHR-06-2023-0039

Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. Annual Review of Psychology, 64, 389–416. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143757

Cable, D. M., Gino, F., & Staats, B. R. (2013). Breaking them in or eliciting their best? Reframing socialization around newcomers' authentic self-expression. Administrative Science Quarterly, 58(1), 1–36.

Cattermole, G. (2019). Developing the employee lifecycle to keep top talent. Strategic HR Review, 18(6), 258–262. https://doi.org/10.1108/SHR-05-2019-0042

Gittell, J. H. (2002). Coordinating mechanisms in care provider groups: Relational coordination as a mediator and input uncertainty as a moderator of performance effects. Management Science, 48(11), 1408–1426.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692–724. https://doi.org/10.2307/256287

Klein, H. J., & Polin, B. (2012). Are organizations on board with best practices onboarding? In C. R. Wanberg (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of organizational socialization (pp. 267–287). Oxford University Press.

Marler, J. H., & Fisher, S. L. (2013). An evidence-based review of e-HRM and strategic human resource management. Human Resource Management Review, 23(1), 18–36.

Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India. (2025). Implementation of the four Labour Codes [Press release]. Press Information Bureau. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2192463

Mosquera, P., & Soares, M. E. (2025). Onboarding: A key to employee retention and workplace well-being. Review of Managerial Science, 19(12), 3687–3711. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-025-00864-3

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600–619. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169

Salas, E., Tannenbaum, S. I., Kraiger, K., & Smith-Jentsch, K. A. (2012). The science of training and development in organizations: What matters in practice. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 13(2), 74–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612436661

Stone, D. L., Deadrick, D. L., Lukaszewski, K. M., & Johnson, R. D. (2015). The influence of technology on the future of human resource management. Human Resource Management Review, 25(2), 216–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2015.01.002

Strohmeier, S. (2007). Research in e-HRM: Review and implications. Human Resource Management Review, 17(1), 19–37.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory. McGraw-Hill.

Ulrich, D. (1997). Human resource champions: The next agenda for adding value and delivering results. Harvard Business School Press.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Zare, M. S., Tahmasebi, R., & Yazdani, H. (2018). Maturity assessment of HRM processes based on HR process survey tool: A case study. Business Process Management Journal, 24(3), 610–634. https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-01-2017-0008