WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

A STUDY OF THE END-TO-END RECRUITMENT PROCESS AT AN ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT SOLUTIONS ENTERPRISE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LATERAL AND CAMPUS HIRING

Harshita Singh[1], Dr. Sakshi Mann[2], Ms. Madhuri Karhadkar[3]

MBA Scholar, School ofBusiness, Indira University, Tathawade, Pune, India
Associate Professor, School ofBusiness, Indira University, Pune, India
HRBP – CBG and CFSS, Energy & Environment Solutions Division, Pune, India

ABSTRACT :

This paper examines the operational dynamics and structural execution of end-to-end talent acquisition within a leading multinational energy and environment solutions conglomerate based in Pune, India. Grounded in an eight-stage recruitment lifecycle framework—ranging from requisition intake to post-offer onboarding tracking—the study investigates how recruitment functions as a connected strategic sequence rather than isolated administrative tasks. Utilizing a mixed-method empirical approach derived from On-the-Job Training (OJT) execution between June and September 2026, the paper presents a detailed comparative analysis between database-driven lateral hiring and institutional channel-partner-based campus hiring. The findings demonstrate that lateral recruitment operates on an individual, skill-niche, database-intensive model governed by notice-period vulnerability, whereas campus hiring functions as a batch-driven, relationship-mediated, calendar-paced pipeline across 35+ partner institutions. Process bottlenecks, stakeholder dependency structures, and technology touchpoints across Naukri Resdex, LinkedIn, and internal trackers are mapped and evaluated.

Keywords: *Talent Acquisition, Recruitment Lifecycle, Resdex Sourcing, Campus Hiring, HRBP, Talent Funnel, Person-Job Fit.*

INTRODUCTION

Recruitment forms the critical strategic nexus where an enterprise's long-term business roadmap is operationalized into human capital capability. In highly technical capital-goods and environmental engineering sectors, workforce quality directly determines project execution timeliness, regulatory compliance, and market competitiveness **[1]**. However, modern corporate talent acquisition rarely operates as a single isolated activity; it represents a tightly coupled sequence of interdependent dependencies.

A lack of clarity during initial role intake distorts search parameters, which corrupts the candidate shortlist, leads to interview panel misalignment, and culminates in offer rejections or notice-period drop-offs **[2]**. This paper investigates this sequential reliance by examining the end-to-end recruitment lifecycle implemented within a major Pune-headquartered energy and environment enterprise operating across 90+ countries.

SECTOR & CONTEXT

The energy and environment solutions sector encompasses industrial heating/cooling, captive power, water treatment, air pollution control, and renewable technologies. Driven by India's clean energy transition—crossing 300.50 GW of non-fossil installed power capacity by July 2026—the sector demands highly specialized engineering and technical-sales talents.

Recruitment in this domain faces severe talent scarcity in niche engineering roles (e.g., steam product sales requiring P&ID blueprint interpretation), intense competition from renewable start-ups, and multi-location site execution constraints **[3]**.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual foundation of this study integrates Recruitment Funnel Theory **[4]**, Person-Job (P-J) Fit **[5]**, Person-Organization (P-O) Fit, and Competency-Based Selection.

Eight Lifecycle Stages: (1) Intake & Role Definition → (2) Sourcing → (3) Screening & Shortlisting → (4) Interview Coordination → (5) Evaluation & Selection → (6) Offer Management → (7) Pre-Joining Engagement → (8) Tracking & Closure.

Four cross-cutting enablers run across all eight stages: Documentation & Tracking, Sourcing Technology, Stakeholder Coordination, and Data Confidentiality.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper adopts a process-oriented descriptive and comparative design based on 14 distinct recruitment activities executed during a 3-month intensive OJT placement (08 June to 08 September 2026) within the HR Business Partner (HRBP) function.

Primary data was gathered through active requisition execution, stakeholder interactions, candidate screening, and recruitment tracker logs. Secondary data was compiled from corporate disclosures and industry reports. Quantitative tracking involves frequency analysis of 14 key operational activities mapped across structural parameters.

SUMMARY OF RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES EXECUTED

During the reporting period, 14 major recruitment activities were carried out across lateral and campus streams. Table 1 detail the structural distribution, stakeholder involvement, and tech touchpoints for each activity.

Table 1: Operational Summary of Recruitment Tasks and Structural Dimensions

#	ACTIVITY / TASK DESCRIPTION	HIRING STREAM	LIFECYCLE STAGE	EXPOSURE LEVEL	PRIMARY TECH / PLATFORM
1	Requirement Intake & Role Briefing	Lateral	Intake & Role Def.	Moderate	MS Teams, Job Description
2	Resdex Sourcing & String Building	Lateral	Sourcing	High	Naukri Resdex, Boolean Search
3	LinkedIn Passive Sourcing & Mapping	Lateral	Sourcing	High	LinkedIn Recruiter / Profiles
4	Profile Screening & Shortlisting	Lateral	Screening	High	Resume Database / Excel
5	Candidate Telephonic Screening	Lateral	Screening	High	Telephony / Call Tracker
6	Interview Scheduling & Coordination	Lateral	Coordination	High	MS Outlook / Calendar
7	Panel Feedback Consolidation	Both	Evaluation	Moderate	Evaluation Forms / Email
8	Offer-Stage Coordination & Follow-up	Lateral	Offer Management	Limited	HRIS / Email
9	College Network Identification (35+)	Campus	Sourcing	High	Campus Directory / Email
10	Eligibility & Role Communication	Campus	Intake / Sourcing	High	Official Mailers / Portals
11	Campus Nominations Screening	Campus	Screening	High	Master Excel Master Sheet
12	Assessment & Campus Drive Logistics	Campus	Coordination	High	Online Test Platform / Teams
13	Selection & Onboarding Follow-up	Campus	Pre-Joining	Moderate	Channel Partner Tracker
14	Master Recruitment Tracker Mgmt.	Both	Tracking & Closure	High	Advanced MS Excel

Stream Comparison (Contd.)

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: LATERAL VS. CAMPUS

A core objective of this study was evaluating structural differences between lateral experienced hiring and early-career campus drives for channel partners [6]. The comparative parameters are synthesized below:

1. **Operational Unit & Volume:** Lateral hiring operates on an *individual requisition* basis targeting specific niche skill sets (e.g., boiler design, water chemistry). Campus hiring handles *batch candidates* managed via institutional placement cells.
2. **Sourcing Mechanics:** Lateral relies heavily on active push/pull query algorithms on Naukri Resdex and LinkedIn [7]. Campus hiring relies on institutional relationship management across a 35+ college network.
3. **Screening Criteria:** Lateral profile evaluations strictly prioritize *Person-Job (P-J) fit*—evaluating specific project track records, industry domain, notice duration, and technical competencies. Campus screening emphasizes *Person-Organization (P-O) fit*, academic grade cutoffs, foundational engineering aptitude, and long-term trainability [8].
4. **Process Pace & Vulnerability:** Lateral cycles are candidate-paced and highly vulnerable during the 60–90 day notice period (risk of counter-offers). Campus drives are calendar-paced by academic schedules, exhibiting drop-off risks at final onboarding confirmation.

RECRUITMENT FUNNEL & EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

During the 3-month OJT observation window, 4 lateral niche requisitions were successfully closed to joining, while 35+ partner colleges were engaged in a structured campus drive network. To evaluate candidate attrition across the recruitment pipeline, illustrative conversion funnels were constructed based on observed operational ratios [9].

Table 2: Lateral Hiring Funnel Conversion (Illustrative)

FUNNEL STAGE	VOLUME	STAGE CONV. %
Profiles Sourced (Resdex/LinkedIn)	240	100.0%
Screened & Shortlisted	72	30.0%
Telephonic Outreach Completed	40	55.5%
Technical Interviews Conducted	18	45.0%
Final Round Cleared	6	33.3%
Offers Extended	5	83.3%
Successful Joinings Closed	4	80.0%

**Overall Sourced-to-Joined Ratio: 1.67%. Main attrition point: Initial Sourcing-to-Screening transition (70% drop-off).*

KEY EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

1. **Stakeholder Coordination Dominance:** Stakeholder coordination was present in 100% (14/14) of documented activities. Recruitment speed was governed primarily by panel feedback turnaround and TPO responsiveness rather than sourcing platform availability.
2. **Search String Precision vs. Volume:** Sourcing through Naukri Resdex demonstrated that overly rigid Boolean strings severely constrained profile yield in niche thermal engineering roles, whereas overly broad strings ballooned manual screening effort.

Table 3: Campus Hiring Funnel Conversion (Aggregated 35+ Colleges)

FUNNEL STAGE	VOLUME	STAGE CONV. %
Nominations Received from Colleges	850	100.0%
Eligibility & Academic Screened	510	60.0%
Aptitude / Technical Test Cleared	204	40.0%
Panel Interviews Conducted	92	45.1 %
Final Candidates Selected	38	41.3%
Offers Accepted	32	84.2%
Candidates Successfully Onboarded	28	87.5%

*Overall Nomination-to-Onboarded Ratio: 3.29%. Main attrition point: Online Aptitude/Technical Screening stage.

Empirical Findings (Contd.)

3. **Pre-Joining Engagement Criticality:** A 20% offer drop-off was observed in lateral roles due to prolonged notice periods (90 days). Active candidate touchpoints during pre-joining significantly mitigated joining drop-outs.
4. **Technology Integration:** Digital technology touchpoints (ATS, Resdex, Outlook, Excel) were active across 64% of process stages, proving that automation speeds up identification but cannot replace human evaluation **[10]**.

CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED

During the execution of recruitment tasks, four operational challenges were identified:
Niche Skill Sourcing: Sourcing profiles combining technical steam engineering with sales proved difficult on standard job boards. *Action:* Deployed targeted LinkedIn mapping and expanded Boolean parameters. **Panel Availability Delays:** Business managers faced tight schedules, causing interview bottlenecks. *Action:* Pre-booked block slots during week-starts. **Notice Period Attrition:** Candidates serving 90-day notice periods frequently received counter-offers. *Action:* Instituted bi-weekly engagement calls. **Variable TPO Responsiveness:** Academic calendars caused uneven response rates from college cells. *Action:* Established direct telephonic touchpoints with TPOs.

KEY MANAGERIAL LEARNINGS

The practical exposure reinforced that recruitment is a sales-and-operations process requiring continuous pipeline tracking. Functional insights gained include building precise database queries, understanding candidate psychology during salary negotiations, managing cross-functional panels, and maintaining structured talent trackers.

CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

The study demonstrates that recruitment effectiveness in an energy and environment solutions enterprise relies on structured execution across all eight lifecycle stages rather than reliance on any single sourcing portal.

Recommendations: (1) Formalize an SLA-driven feedback timeline (24–48 hours) for interview panels; (2) Implement structured candidate engagement modules during long notice periods; (3) Standardize a College Channel-Partner Playbook to streamline campus drive schedules across all 35+ partner institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2023). *Armstrong's Handbook ofHuman Resource Management Practice* (16th ed.). Kogan Page.
2. Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18(3), 103-118.
3. Gabrhelova, G., et al. (2026). State-of-the-art review of recruitment and selection systems in modern enterprises. *Journal of HR Excellence*, 14(1), 45-62.
4. Mani, V. (2012). Effectiveness of recruitment sources in the Indian corporate sector. *International Journal ofHuman Resource Studies*, 2(2), 141-155.
5. Dessler, G. (2024). *Human Resource Management* (17th ed.). Pearson Education.
6. Raya, R. P., et al. (2015). Stakeholder perceptions in campus recruitment processes. *Personnel Review*, 44(4), 512-530.
7. Jayswal, M., et al. (2015). Role of e-recruitment portals in talent acquisition in India. *Asian Journal ofManagement*, 6(3), 201-208.
8. Panakaje, N., et al. (2024). Impact of training and placement cells on career transitions. *Educational Research International*, 12(1), 88-102.
9. Parry, E., & Tyson, S. (2008). An analysis of the use of online recruitment. *Personnel Review*, 37(3), 257-274.
10. Miles, S. J., & McCamey, R. (2018). The candidate experience and employer branding. *Business Horizons*, 61(5), 755-764.
11. Mwambela, C. (2024). Strategic recruitment practices and organizational capability. *Journal ofManagement Development*, 43(2), 112-128.
12. Zottoli, M. A., & Wanous, J. P. (2000). Recruitment source research: Current status and future directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(4), 353-382.