



# Employee Engagement and its Influence on Organizational Performance in Shri Sooryaa Build Pro (IND) PVT LTD

Arvind Kumar.R<sup>1</sup>

1 Student, Department of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science Technology & Advance Studies (VISTAS), Chennai

Dr. B. Kalaiyaran<sup>2</sup>

2 Assistant Professor, Department Management Studies, Vels University of Science Technology & Advanced Studies(VISTAS), Chennai

## How to Cite this Article:

Kumar.R, A. (2026). Employee Engagement and its Influence on Organizational Performance in Shri Sooryaa Build Pro (IND) PVT LTD. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, <i>02</i>(05).  
<https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i5.356>

## License:

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

© The Author(s). Published by International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management.



OPEN ACCESS



<https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i5.356>

## Abstract

Employee engagement is widely recognized as a critical antecedent of organizational performance, yet its dynamics in niche industrial sectors—particularly fire protection—remain underexplored. This study examines the various factors influencing employee engagement and their effect on organizational performance at Shri Sooryaa Build Pro (IND) Pvt. Ltd., a fast-growing fire protection systems company headquartered in Bangalore, India. Using a descriptive research design and a structured Likert-scale questionnaire administered to 100 employees, the study employs percentage analysis, Pearson correlation, and ANOVA to evaluate engagement dimensions including resource availability, role clarity, workload balance, recognition, supervisor support, inter-departmental communication, and career development. Results confirm strong positive correlations among all engagement variables and organizational effectiveness ( $p < 0.01$ ). ANOVA further establishes that career advancement, supervisory/supportive development, and supportive facilities are statistically significant predictors of employee performance improvement ( $F = 389.409$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ). The study concludes with actionable recommendations for HR practitioners in high-skilled technical sectors.

**Keywords:** Employee Engagement, Organizational Performance, Fire Protection Industry, Correlation, ANOVA, Career Development, Recognition



## 1. Introduction

Employee engagement—the degree of commitment, involvement, and emotional investment an employee holds toward their organization and its values—has become a central concern in contemporary human resource management. Pioneered by Kahn (1990), the construct encompasses physical, cognitive, and emotional dimensions of role performance and is widely acknowledged as a driver of productivity, retention, and business success.

Gallup's consulting research segments employees into three categories: engaged, not engaged, and actively disengaged. Disengagement is associated with apathy, absenteeism, and diminished organizational citizenship behavior, while high engagement correlates with teams that are 17% more productive and 21% more profitable (Gallup, 2017).

The fire protection industry in India represents an emerging yet safety-critical sector experiencing rapid growth, with the market projected to expand from USD 2.3 billion (2024) to USD 4.0 billion by 2033 at a CAGR of 6.07%. In this technically demanding environment, engaged employees are indispensable—not only for service quality but for the very mission of protecting lives and property. Despite this relevance, employee engagement in the fire safety sector has received scant academic attention.

This study addresses that gap by investigating engagement levels and their organizational performance implications within Shri Sooryaa Build Pro (IND) Pvt. Ltd., a south Indian fire protection firm founded in 2019 with 14 years of accumulated domain expertise across India and the Middle East.

## 2. Review of Literature

Kahn (1990) established that employees become psychologically engaged when they experience meaningfulness, psychological safety, and availability in their work context. Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) conceptualized engagement as the positive antithesis of burnout, characterized by energy, dedication, and absorption. Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) empirically linked engagement to business-unit profitability and customer satisfaction. Robinson, Perryman, and Hayday (2004) identified communication, employee participation, and managerial support as primary engagement drivers.

Saks (2006) demonstrated that job characteristics, recognition, and organizational support predict engagement; Bakker and Demerouti (2008) formalized these relationships in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, showing that adequate resources buffer against stress while fueling motivation. Christian, Garza, and Slaughter (2011) confirmed engagement's positive effect on task performance and organizational citizenship. Anitha (2014) further identified leadership quality, teamwork, and compensation as significant determinants of engagement in Indian organizational contexts.

More recently, Albrecht et al. (2019) positioned engagement as one of the foremost drivers of long-term organizational performance, echoing findings that engaged employees contribute to innovation, efficiency, and competitive advantage.

## 3. Objectives

**Primary Objective:** To identify factors influencing and driving employee engagement at Shri Sooryaa Build Pro (IND) Pvt. Ltd.

**Secondary Objectives:**

- To assess the level of commitment and job involvement among employees.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the employee-management relationship.
- To determine key drivers of engagement and their influence on organizational performance.

## 4. Research Methodology

### 4.1 Research Design

A descriptive research design was adopted to characterize the current state of employee engagement in the organization and to examine relationships among engagement variables.



## 4.2 Sample

The sample comprised 100 employees selected via convenience sampling from across operational departments. The sample is predominantly male (90%) and young, with 62% aged 20-25 years and 65% holding 0-5 years of experience—a profile typical of the fire protection industry's field workforce.

## 4.3 Instrument

A structured questionnaire incorporating a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) was used. Items covered nine engagement constructs (EE1-EE9) and one organizational effectiveness measure (OE1), plus four demographic variables.

## 4.4 Statistical Tools

Data were analyzed using percentage analysis, Pearson correlation, and one-way ANOVA with regression via SPSS. Reliability was established prior to inferential analysis.

## 5. Results and Discussion

### 5.1 Respondent Profile

**Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (n = 100)**

Variable	Category	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	90%
	Female	10%
Age	20-25 years	62%
	26-30 years	16%
	31-35 years	10%
	36+ years	12%
Experience	0-5 years	65%
	6-10 years	22%
	11+ years	13%
Monthly Income	Rs.15,000-20,000	27%
	Rs.20,000-30,000	24%
	Rs.10,000-15,000	21%
	Above Rs.40,000	17%

### 5.2 Engagement Dimensions – Percentage Analysis

Table 2 summarizes the proportion of positive responses (Agree + Strongly Agree) for each engagement item. The highest agreement was recorded for skill development opportunities (77%), followed by feeling safe at work (76%) and role clarity and resource adequacy (both 82%). The lowest positive score appeared for feedback and recognition (60%), suggesting room for improvement in formal recognition systems.

**Table 2: Positive Response Rates for Engagement Items**

Code	Engagement Item	Agree + Strongly Agree (%)
EE1	Adequate tools & resources	82%
EE2	Role clarity	82%
EE3	Manageable workload	66%
EE4	Meaningful work & pride	69%
EE5	Safe & comfortable environment	76%
EE6	Regular feedback & recognition	60%
EE7	Supervisor personal concern	67%
EE8	Trust in management	64%
EE9	Colleagues' quality commitment	66%
EE10	Skill development opportunities	77%
OE1	Opinions & suggestions valued	63%

### 5.3 Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation was conducted to examine inter-relationships among engagement variables and organizational effectiveness. All correlations are positive and significant at  $p < 0.01$ , confirming the interconnected nature of engagement dimensions.

The strongest single correlation observed is between meaningful work (EE4) and feedback/recognition (EE6) ( $r = 0.779$ ), emphasizing that appreciation is a powerful amplifier of work pride. Workplace safety (EE5) correlated highly with trust in management (EE8) ( $r = 0.728$ ), indicating that physical and psychological safety underpin organizational trust. Resource adequacy (EE1) showed a strong link with organizational effectiveness (OE1) at  $r = 0.716$ .

**Table 3: Selected Pearson Correlation Coefficients (all significant at  $p < 0.01$ )**

Variable Pair	r Value	Interpretation
EE4 - EE6 (Meaningful Work – Recognition)	0.779	Strongest link
EE1 - EE6 (Resources – Recognition)	0.743	Very strong
EE5 - EE8 (Safety – Trust in Management)	0.728	Very strong
EE1 - OE1 (Resources – Org. Effectiveness)	0.716	Strong
EE8 - OE1 (Trust – Org. Effectiveness)	0.700	Strong
EE7 - OE1 (Supervisor Care – Org. Effectiveness)	0.668	Moderate-strong

### 5.4 ANOVA – Regression Model

One-way ANOVA was used to test whether career advancement (CA), supervisory/supportive development (SD), and supportive facilities (SF) jointly predict employee performance improvement. The overall model is highly significant as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: ANOVA Results – Regression Model**

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Sig.
Regression	23.720	3	7.907	389.409	.000**
Residual	1.949	96	0.020	–	–
Total	25.670	99	–	–	–

\*\* Significant at  $p < 0.01$

The regression sum of squares (23.720) accounts for 92.4% of the total variance, leaving residual unexplained variance of merely 1.949. The null hypothesis is rejected: career advancement, supportive development, and adequate facilities collectively and significantly drive performance improvement.

## 6. Key Findings

- The workforce is predominantly young (62% aged 20-25) and early-career (65% with less than 5 years' experience), reflecting the sector's growing talent pipeline.
- Role clarity (EE2) and resource adequacy (EE1) recorded the highest engagement scores (82%), indicating effective onboarding and provisioning.
- Feedback and recognition (EE6, 60%) and trust in management (EE8, 64%) are the relatively weaker engagement dimensions and constitute priority improvement areas.
- All bivariate correlations among engagement variables and organizational effectiveness are statistically significant ( $p < 0.01$ ), confirming a holistic engagement ecosystem.
- ANOVA confirms that career advancement, supportive supervision, and workplace facilities are strong joint predictors of employee performance improvement ( $F = 389.409$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ).
- Most respondents (65%) expressed low intent to leave; 66% would recommend the organization as a good employer—indicating healthy baseline retention.

## 7. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following HR interventions are recommended for organizations in the fire protection and related industrial sectors:

1. Strengthen recognition programs – Implement structured monthly/quarterly recognition initiatives; feedback and recognition (EE6) showed the highest correlation with meaningful work ( $r = 0.779$ ).
2. Invest in career development – Structured mentorship and upskilling pathways are critical given the predominantly early-career workforce.
3. Enhance gender diversity – Women constitute only 10% of respondents; targeted recruitment and inclusion policies should be adopted.
4. Regular engagement surveys – Periodic pulse surveys allow early detection of disengagement triggers.
5. Improve workload monitoring – 15% reported unmanageable workloads; a workload audit linked to project scheduling can alleviate burnout risk.
6. Foster open communication – Platforms for employees to voice opinions should be institutionalized, as OE1 (opinions valued) showed a relatively lower positive score (63%).

## 8. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that employee engagement is a multi-dimensional and highly interconnected construct whose dimensions collectively influence organizational performance. In the fire protection industry—where precision, reliability, and safety-consciousness are business-critical—engaged employees are not a peripheral concern but a strategic necessity.



The strong correlation values (all exceeding  $r = 0.53$ ) and the highly significant ANOVA model ( $F = 389.409$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) provide compelling empirical support for investing in engagement practices: recognition systems, supervisory quality, career development, and adequate workplace resources. Organizations that prioritize these levers are better positioned to attract, retain, and leverage talent in India's rapidly expanding fire safety market.

## References

- Albrecht, S. L., et al. (2019). Employee engagement and organizational performance. *Organizational Dynamics*, 48(4), 100676.
- Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136.
- Gallup. (2017). *State of the Global Workplace*. Washington, DC: Gallup Press.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. Brighton: IES Report 408.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Shri Sooryaa Build Pro (IND) Private Limited – Company Profile. (2024). Retrieved from The Company Check & ZaubaCorp databases.