Influence job control and employee engagement on organizational commitment

Amjad Hussain

Affiliation: Assistant Director, Punjab Examination Commission, Lahore.

*Corresponding author email: amjadmsba@gmail.com

Abstract

The goal of this research is to check the relation between job control, employee engagement and organizational commitment. Organization should be explicitly interested by employee relation with their organization. It has been discovered that job control is fundamental for procuring a competitive advantage, improving firm execution and making progress in competitive business climate (Bond & Bunce, 2003). Further, it has been noticed that committed employees are key achievement drivers as they impact efficiency and other organizations results (e.g., monetary performance) (Marmot, Bosma, Hemingway, Brunner, & Stansfeld, 1997). To study the impact of job control on employee engagement and organizational commitment in all public and private sectors of Pakistan, the data is collected data employees working in these organizations. Hence, target population for this study comprises employees working in public and private sectors of Pakistan. It was found that job control have a weak positive relationship with engagement and it also has weak negative relationship with commitment. The result shows no significant difference between job control on employee engagement and organizational commitment. The results accepted the null hypothesis of the research and reject the alternative hypothesis. The study demonstrates the existences of weak positive relationships between employee engagement and job control.

Introduction

It should be noticed that job control itself might be a stressor whenever extraordinary control presents added effort, requests, and duty the individual sees as threat to assets. Be that as it may, if the individual is high in self-controlled they are bound to see the additional obligations of job control forcefully (Van Yperen & Hagedoorn, 2003). Studies (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006; Liu, E Spector, & M Jex, 2005) recommends that things can be "controllable"; that is, an

individual ought to have the chance to acknowledge or decrease the limits in job control. As indicated by (Fernet, Guay, & Senécal, 2004) job control (a particular sort of workplace activities in control) shows a worker's capacity to settle on choices about the span, position, and dissemination of work time; at the end of the day, self-rule over worktime. Also, there is a fact that (Kalimo, Tenkanen, Härmä, Poppius, & Heinsalmi, 2000) recognizes job control as a particular sort of control over job activities, many general proportions of job control join such ideas, including, for instance job control measure. People with job control (all the more explicitly, command over work routines) can make work plans that consider ideal time and length of relax time, prompting expanded time for improvement chances (Hahn, Binnewies, Sonnentag, & Mojza, 2011). Employees with elevated levels of job control have the chances to pick when they need a break and pick extra exercises that best match with needs of workplace (Reinecke, 2009).

Similarly employee Engagement has become progressively perceived as a key research point in the management sciences (Sonnentag, 2011). The commitment is complete identification with working efficiency (Rich et al., 2010), job duties and responsibilities (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009), and organizational citizenship behaviors (Moliner, Martinez-Tur, Ramos, Peiró, & Cropanzano, 2008), and contrarily studies with results, for example, employee turnover, and burnout (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2015). Employee engagement means to an inspirational state (Meyer & Gagne, 2008), described by applying one's full contribution and involvement in a work job (Kahn, 2010). Since Kahn (2010) fundamental research on engagement, have identified employee engagement as both a characteristic like and continuous creation of knowledge and working abilities, bringing about confusion over the security of the develop. For instance, conceptualizations range developed by Kahn's (1990) is a notion that connected with forms of organizational commitment and enhanced powerful brief quality of job behaviors.

Besides, with the excessive competition organizational commitment has progressively become a significant point to examine for researchers in business fields. This is for the most part because of the way that commitment has a relationship with significant variables relationships, for example, job satisfaction and turnover of employees (Cooper, Stanley, Klein, & Tenhiälä, 2016) A hypothetical clarification for this can be found in SET (Blau & Ryan, 1997). In view of this researches, employees who feel upheld and esteemed by their manager are probably going to offer

trust and commitment in return (Ng & Feldman, 2011). When employees feel upheld and remunerated by their manager, as indicated by researchers, they will be more dedicated towards the organization, which is organizational commitment. This will, lead to bring down turnover goal and higher job satisfaction. When investigating the writing on commitment, we can see many definitions. Commitment can, for instance, be characterized as "a psychological bond reflecting commitment to and duty regarding a specific objective at workplace" (Klein, Cooper, Molloy, & Swanson, 2014). Another meaning of commitment is given by (Meyer, Becker, & Van Dick, 2006). They characterize commitment as; "a power that ties a person to an objective at workplace and to a strategy of importance to that objective" (Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004).

Job control and Employee Engagement are essential factors that affect organizational commitment. The main problem usually faced by management is due excessive job control employee's engagement highly affected and their commitment with the organization can be less or more vice versa. Furthermore, due to COVID-19 many organization have moved from work from office to work from home and the instant transformation in work systems can have a collision on the job control of the workers (Bond & Bunce, 2003).Therefore, understanding employees' engagement and job control in relation to organizational commitment is essential for management in order to maintain high quality of employees within the organization and also continuing to provide excellent service to the employees. The main objective of this study is to examine the impact of job control and employee engagement on organizational commitment.

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of job control on the employee engagement and organizational commitment. The examination of background information is important to this study because it will help us to understand the impact of job control. The basic research aim of this quantitative study is to present a complete analysis of job control and employee engagement and its impact on organizational commitment.

Job Control

Job control might be explained and estimated severally. One translation is that of self-sufficiency, adequately all out command over the work. Moreover, it is explained, s either the measure of impact an individual has over his/her work or the degree of work he had. Thus, there is a plenty of expected pointers of what might be explained as employment control. Job control is a person's capability to effect what is going on in his or her working environment, in a specific to

influence working that are related to his or her personal aims. One result is that the utilization of various pointers in assessments of employment control may bring about various results (Marmot et al., 1997).

To analyze patterns in job control extra time, and develop 'task circumspection' lists (for example mirroring the control an individual has over his/her prompt work assignments). Although the fact that analyzing at times unique discrete time-frames, building distinctive lists and utilizing diverse information sources, for the most part, the end is that task attention decreases during the 1990s; levels off during the mid-2000s; and there is "no critical change. over the period 2006 – 2012" (Bond & Bunce, 2003) utilize the 1992 Employment in Britain Survey and the Skills Surveys of 1997 and 2001. They figure a composite tasks attention file utilizing reaction to inquiries regarding the impact an individual has over 'how difficult to work'; 'what undertakings to do'; 'how to do them'; and 'quality guidelines'. They distinguish a decrease in this file over the period analyzed. Jackson, Wall, Martin, and Davids (1993) develops a comparative record utilizing reaction to similar questions from the Skills Surveys of 1997, 2001 and 2006. He finds a decrease in the list for the period 1997 – 2001 yet contends that this level off during the period 2001 – 2006.4 (Bond & Bunce, 2003) utilize the (full) SES informational collection and utilize similar inquiries to deliver their standard errand watchfulness record, subsequently expanding their examinations of its pattern to 2012.

Employee Engagement

Macey and Schneider (2008) believed worker commitment has become an essential concentration for both exploration and practice far and wide. The components of commitment approaches range from social psychological research to formative brain science to philosophy and morals. (Saks & Gruman, 2014) showed commitment is an immediate estimation of authoritative adequacy as employment execution, quality, yield, business development, and benefits. Markos and Sridevi (2010) characterized commitment as "a solid connection among oneself and the occupation responsibility where individuals completely communicate philosophy, intellectually, and emotionally".

Employee engagement is limited approach to which employees feel involved about their jobs, are committed to the organization.

Employee engagement creates a framework for building commitment based on inspiring, rewarding, and involving employees in collaborative actions with human resource. The effective shift model of work engagement is the assumption that both positive and negative effects have important functions for work participation (Albrech, 2011). Work engagement is the involvement of the self and the presence of positive work-related feelings. (Handa & Gulati, 2014) emphasized organizations' need for "employees who are connected to their work and able to invest themselves fully in their roles, and who are proactive and committed to high quality performance standards". Challenges within organizations may influence the amount of work and performance of the individual and the organization. Much of the literature on employee engagement has focused on the benefits and drivers of engagement (. However, there is little accentuation on execution challenges and seeing how workers see cooperation. As per Robertson and Cooper (2010), one of the boundaries to accomplishing representative engagement is administration, as the regulatory structure of associations fundamentally influences its capability to connect with its workers. Furthermore, the discoveries of (Gruman & Saks, 2011) concluded that the outstanding burden, joined by helpless administration and ineffectual openness, are key difficulties to representative commitment. A challenge that may happen in building commitment depends on how representatives feel about their work experience (Albrech, 2011). On a very basic level, commitment is about whether a worker wants to invest optional effort into the work. (Parker & Sprigg, 1999) argued that drew in representatives display apparent behaviors, for example, belief in the association, want to improve their work, comprehension of the business technique, and teaming up with and helping colleagues. Moreover, connected with representatives exhibit additional exertion in their work, and consistently improving their range of abilities and information base. (Handa & Gulati, 2014) depicted shifting degrees of commitment that representatives can insight at work. Workers will in general be locked in or effectively separated. Drawn in representatives feel associated with their work a lot with passion.

Organizational commitment

The idea of responsibility has a lot of consideration since the 1950s. A pioneer in the region of responsibility, distinguished the difficulties related with characterizing authoritative responsibility and proposed one of the principal speculations on the idea of responsibility.

Organizational commitment is defined as a concept of an organization's employees psychology towards his/her involvement to the organization that he/she for which they are working.

Becker's theory originated from the possibility that representatives are submitted in light of the fact that they make " side bets ", or concealed speculations by staying in an association (Reichers, 1985).Which means, throughout some undefined time frame, a worker has made various speculations, for example, time, exertion and residency in an association. In the event that the worker were to leave, these ventures would be lost. For certain workers, the likely loss of these speculations and absence of choices to compensate for the misfortune, keep them focused on their association. Since (WeiBo, Kaur, & Jun, 2010) presentation of his idea and hypothesis on responsibility, numerous scientists have tried to grow and reclassify the idea into hierarchical and sociological research. Hierarchical responsibility is the measure of mental connection an individual has to an association. Pioneers are keen on discovering approaches to improve how laborers feel about their positions so these laborers will turn out to be more dedicated to their associations.

Job Control and Organizational Commitment

Researches are developing that upgraded control at work can be a significant component in employee' wellbeing and prosperity (Paul, 2002). Employees with low control can get disappointed and feel overlooked (Medibank, 2008). Judge and Bono (2011) found that there is a positive relationship between job control and organizational commitment. Administrators think about the main wellsprings of work pressure to be absence of control and work life balance (Gupta, Bindu, and Tyagi, 2009). The view of high work control supports the negative impacts of an upsetting work circumstance on a person's wellbeing and prosperity. A lot of studies connections job control to a few various types of pressures. Control can be over any part of work, including working environment, engagement, and how commitments are finished. Studies are developing that job control at work can be a significant component in employees' wellbeing and prosperity (Paul, 2002). Control over one's work (cutoff times, results and so on) strongly affects pressure, influencing a person's confidence, just as their capacity to accomplish work objectives. Employees

with low control can get baffled and feel overlooked (Medibank, 2008). Low occupation control is perceived as another significant wellspring of stress (European Risk Observation Report, 2009).

The relation between job control and organizational commitment starts from the psychological approach between the individual and the organization. Here, the people are seen as wise creatures who are essentially worried about responsibility since they realize that they are being paid for managing the work. In contrast to other stressing variables of workplace, working environment, including position pressure, are not explicit to a specific work and exist in different structures and degrees in all positions. Giving an individual an occupation, which isn't viable with their capacities and information or any adjustment in person's obligations can cause pressure. In such scenario job control is identified with workplace and its related components. We accept that psychological acknowledgment can direct this grounded connection between job control and word related wellbeing and profitability. As indicated above, individuals who don't attempt to stay away from or control inward occasions have more attentional assets and take part in less avoiding behaviors (Bond and Hayes, 2002). They are, subsequently, better ready to see how much they have control in a given circumstance; and, since they are not very avoidant, they may, through experimentation, figure out how they can most viably utilize this control, to act in a way that is reliable with their qualities and objectives (e.g., augmenting their work system, emotional wellness, and organizational commitment). Research of job related wellbeing and execution have recognized that giving individuals command over their work serves to improve psychological wellness, organizational commitment, and execution (e.g., the workplace characteristics (Hackman and Lawler, 1971), the social and cultural frameworks (e.g., Emery and Trist, 1960), job related theories (Frese and Zapf, 1994; Hacker, Skell, and Straub, 1968), and the motivation and satisfaction models all are studied on the basis employees behaviors (Karasek, 1979)). In accordance with these theories of job control and employee wellbeing is considered a part of organizational commitment. People are required to overlook the misfortunes making blocks toward better occupation execution paying little mind to whatever occurs in the workplace. It is accepted that laborers won't leave their exhibitions alone influenced by those events. Their responsibility will stay pretty much at a similar level within the sight of high ongoing position control just as without it. This fragmented perspective on people even proposes that for most of laborers act in social behaviors, job control is the focal life interest.

Job control and employee engagement

Employees occupation needs and employment assets impact her/his representative commitment. Employment needs, for example, a high work pressure, passionate requests, and job pressure may prompt low job satisfaction, debilitated wellbeing and finally to less commitment. Job assets, for example, social help, execution input, and self-governance may affect a persuasive cycle, prompting position related learning, job satisfaction, leadership skills, responsibility and employee commitment. Employment needs, work assets and individual variables (for example job environment, capacity to adjust work and family needs) as indicators of job control. Accordingly, a hypothetical relation among job control and organizational commitment can be set up (Bond & Bunce, 2003). Moreover, the writing proposes that unnecessary degrees of job control experienced by employees limit their intellectual and enthusiastic accessibility for job. Employee's passion and psychological accessibility for work is a key for her/his work commitment (Marmot et al., 1997). Along these lines, job control is proposed to have a negative relationship with organizational commitment to such an extent that more significant levels of job control experienced by a worker is probably going to bring about lower level of her/his resulting work commitment (Marmot et al., 1997). Likewise, the developing writing in employee job control propose that variables impact worker commitment are contrarily identified with worker commitment Smith et al. (1997) Job control is resulted from excessive levels of stress, this stream of literature also suggest a negative relationship between job control and employee engagement. In such situations, individuals see no reason to work hard at a task and gets unmotivated leading to poor performance. When there is a high level of work pressure, it leads to high stress, anxiety and unhappiness. As individuals are overwhelmed by the volume and scale of competing work demands, and they may start to panic leading to poor performance. Accordingly, (Karasek, 1990) suggests that the peak performance is achieved when people experience a moderate level of job control. Similarly, (Kossek et al., 2006), based on the motivation theory suggest that work pressure and work engagement has a strong relationship. Accordingly, a moderate level of job control has the ability to motivate employees resulting in high engagement. The researches uncovered six fields of work-life that may either lead to commitment: work pressure, job control, remuneration and reward, community and social support, perceived justice, and moral values. They found that a manageable remaining burden, sensations of decision and control, proper acknowledgment and prize, a strong work network,

reasonableness and equity, and significant and esteemed work can contribute decidedly to work commitment.

Researches have suggested that there is a high degree of job control which would bring about an ideal degree of employee engagement. Lower level of job control emphatically identifies with employee engagement. In any case, after a specific point, job control adversely identifies with organizational commitment to such an extent that expanded degree of job control diminishes employee commitment. To give a similarity, having a reduced work time disregarding a specific level of pressure forced on employees, will help them more proficient utilization of assets and spotlight more on work than when there are no time limits of work. Nonetheless, having such a large number of assignments to deal with in too brief period will expand employee pressure and therefore the nature of their result may lead effect employee engagement (Liu et al., 2005).

2.6 Employee engagement and organizational commitment

Employee engagement commitment has picked up a lot of acceptance and the information is needed by stakeholders identified with the representatives and organizations. All the more as of late, worker commitment has created huge premium among HR experts as a few analysts guarantee commitment has a positive relationship with consumer loyalty, profitability, benefit, representatives' maintenance and organization achievement and benefit (Saks & Gruman, 2014). They contend that representative commitment is significant for 'important business results and execution in meaningful associations'. Saks and Gruman (2014) conceptualizes worker commitment . Saks and Gruman (2014) describes employee engagement as the degree to which an individual is attentive and consumed in the presentation of his/her jobs. He perceived between two sorts of employee engagement work commitment and organizational commitment. Occupation commitment alludes to the degree to which an individual is really interested in the performance of his/her own individual employment job (pp: 600-619). Then, organizational engagement mirrors "the degree to which an individual is mentally present as an individual from an association". In extra, in the course of recent many years, the idea of authoritative responsibility has created incredible attention. Saks (2006) validated that the organizational commitment idea gets a lot of observational investigations where both contain a result and forerunner. The surge in interest and consideration on organizational commitment writing was according to the possibility that this idea is a huge piece of a worker's mental conditions since representatives, who experience

high organizational commitment, are assumed to show a lot of positive work environment conduct, for example, high job performance, and citizenship exercises, which will profit the association. Organizational commitment is characterized as "the general strength of a person's relationship with and inclusion in a specific association and can be described by a solid faith in and acknowledgment of the association's objectives and qualities, ability to apply significant exertion in the interest of the association and a powerful urge to keep up participation of the association"

Methodology

Research methodology includes research strategy, research design, research approach, target population and sample size, data collection methods and procedures as well as data analysis.

To study the impact of job control on employee engagement and organizational commitment in all public and private sectors of Pakistan, the data is collected data employees working in these organizations. Hence, target population for this study comprises employees working in public and private sectors of Pakistan.

The respondents of this research were 66 which included both male and female employees working in Pakistan. The respondents belong to various private and public sectors of Pakistan since we are trying to study impact of job control on employee engagement and organizational commitment in both sectors.

A lot of research on this topic is done through internet by using different web sites. My research paradigm is positivism and primary data will be collected for the analysis. Mono-method quantitative data collection method will be used to collect data as our research study is quantitative. Consequently, the data will be collected through a pre-structured questionnaire which will be a composite of different scales measuring job control, Employee engagement and organizational commitment.

4.3 Demographic

Demographic profiles of the respondents were collected which included gender of the respondent, age, years of experience (tenure), their employment level and their qualification along with soliciting responses of the respondents on the variables of interest. The total respondents were 66 out of which 21 were the male respondents and 45 female respondents. All the respondents were

the employees of public and private sectors of Pakistan. They belonged to the diversified age groups, qualification and years of experience.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is showing the inter-dependencies between job control and employee engagement. Table 3 (a, b, c)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.483[a]	.234	.222	.54097

a. Predictors: (Constant), JC

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.712	1	5.712	19.519	.000[b]
	Residual	18.729	64	.293		
	Total	24.441	65			

a. Dependent Variable: EE

b. Predictors: (Constant), JC

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.559	.316		8.098	.000
	JC	.331	.075	.483	4.418	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EE

This table provides the R =.483 and R2 = .234 values. The R value represents the simple correlation and is .483 (the "R" Column), which indicates a high degree of correlation. The R2 value (the "R Square" column) indicates how much of the total variation in the dependent variable, employee engagement can be explained by the independent variable, job control. In this case it is 23.4% can be explained, which is very large.

This table indicates that the regression model predicts the employee engagement significantly well. Here, $p < 0.05$, which is less than 0.05, and indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable.

The **Coefficients** table provides us with the necessary information to predict employee engagement from job control. Here the constant 2.599 and the JC has the .331 as coefficient.

The analysis of variance was conducted to see the difference in Job control and employee engagement on the basis of the data that has been analyzed and collected.

Similarly the analysis of variance has been conducted for the relationship of job and organizational commitment table 4 (a, b c)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.260[a]	.068	.053	.52676

a. Predictors: (Constant), JC

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.286	1	1.286	4.634	.035[b]
	Residual	17.759	64	.277		
	Total	19.044	65			

a. Dependent Variable: OC
b. Predictors: (Constant), JC

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.572	.308		11.607	.000
	JC	.157	.073	.260	2.153	.035

a. Dependent Variable: OC

This table provides the R = .260 and R^2 = .068 values. The R value represents the simple correlation and is .483 (the "R" Column), which indicates a high degree of correlation. The R2 value (the "R Square" column) indicates how much of the total variation in the dependent variable, organizational commitment can be explained by the independent variable, job control. In this case it is only 6.8% can be explained, which is very weak relationship among the variables.

This table indicates that the regression model predicts the employee engagement significantly well. Here, $p < 0.05$, which is less than 0.05, and indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable.

The Coefficients table provides us with the necessary information to predict organizational commitment from job control. Here the constant is 3.572 and the JC has the .157 as coefficient.

At the last the analysis of variance has been conducted for the employee engagement and organizational commitment and it has the following results.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.279[a]	.078	.063	.52384

a. Predictors: (Constant), EE

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.482	1	1.482	5.401	.023[b]
	Residual	17.562	64	.274		
	Total	19.044	65			

a. Dependent Variable: OC

b. Predictors: (Constant), EE

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.253	.421		7.732	.000
	EE	.246	.106	.279	2.324	.023

a. Dependent Variable: OC

This table provides the R =.279 and R^2 = .078 values. The R value represents the simple correlation and is .483 (the "R" Column), which indicates a low degree of correlation. The R^2 value (the "R Square" column) indicates how much of the total variation in the dependent variable, organizational commitment can be explained by the independent variable, employee engagement. In this case it is 7,8% can be explained, which is very less.

This table indicates that the regression model predicts the employee engagement significantly well. Here, $p < 0.05$, which is less than 0.05, and indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable.

The Coefficients table provides us with the necessary information to predict employee engagement from job control. Here the constant 3.253 and the EE has the .246 as coefficient.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Discussions

Organization's output may undergo due to employee participation intensity which is employee engagement, job control and commitment. Job control on employees is become a key apprehension for companies since the precedent few decades. (Bryner, 2006; Weaver, 2003). With job control having been at record statistics in the previous studies proves that economy is attempting to balance it out through utilizing several organizational tactics, it benefits any organization to utilize the aptitudes and capacities of its work power to be increasingly profitable with fewer resources. The non-excluded populace, specifically, has been hit hard by this absence of assets and high joblessness so people bear high job controls (Sum, Khatiwada, McLaughlin, & Palma, 2009). With hardly any alternatives for new course and the additional worry of accomplishing more with less, this is a populace that has battled. Which impacts excessively focused, job control and commitment of employees impacts furthermore on a organizational commitment.

Through this study the goal has been to identify how job control affects employee engagement and organizational commitment what mediating effect satisfaction with one's demographics has on a population of included employees. There is a gap in current research involving these variables and this population. By identifying the difference and relation of job control, employee engagement and commitment among these employees, it is hoped that programs can be implemented to reduce the negative effects of job control and employee engagement and increase the positive effects of commitment. In addition, by identifying the demographic variable and its relations, training programs can be implemented to strengthen the process.

After running an analysis of the data, tall of the proposed hypotheses from this study were supported, and one was partially supported. Additionally, several interesting findings were uncovered that could lead to further research. All findings of this study contribute to the existing literature on job control, employee engagement, organizational commitment with one's demographic raise some new questions. This contribution lies in that this study provides an exploration for the future horizons.

The supported hypotheses (1) the correlation of job control with employee engagement in a positive direction, (2) the correlation of job control and employee engagement in a negative

direction, It was found that job control have a weak positive relationship with engagement and it also has weak negative relationship with commitment. The result shows no significant difference between job control on employee engagement and organizational commitment. The results accepted the null hypothesis of the research and reject the alternative hypothesis.

Theories testing expository methodology despite the fact that our proposed model portrays connections estimated at the individual level. The above reasoning, with respect to the absence of communication and noteworthy distinction among job control and employee commitment, is supported up by the study of Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993). Meyer et al. Another conceivable purpose behind the absence of significance that there is an issue with the sample size as the past relative examination have the sample size of more than 300 hence, there is a likelihood that it has sketchy legitimacy for this investigation or with this populace.

Another possible issue could be the readers' interpretations of the measure. As the data was collected through online method so there is possibility that concern would be if the questions were confusing answers could be dependent on this perception.

The additional analysis of the research indicated that there is relationship between the demographic variable of the employee with employee engagement, employee commitment and job control. After the additional analysis it was seen that female are more engaged than the male however there are no major difference between male and female similarly there are no significant difference in gender with health of employees.

Conclusions

On the basis of research finding, it is concluded that there were no major significant differences between employee engagement, employee commitment and job control of the employee. The study demonstrates the existences of weak positive relationships between employee engagement and job control but there were no major differences between both variables. The significant differences of employee engagement and job control of weak negative relationship but there were no major difference between both variable. Results also indicate that there is a difference between the employee commitment, employee engagement and job control due to the difference of demographic variables such as gender, age, employment level and experience.

Limitations

While conducting this research we faced few problems which had effect on our results, the limitations that were observed are listed as follows:

• The findings of this study could not be generalized on larger population because our data is collected only from sample of 187 people; due to lack of time and finances data collected from a small number of populations could not be generalized to others.

• The research is conducted in specific population and cannot be generalized because the sample was taken only from the Pakistan.

• Time limitation and lack of resources presented difficulty in conducting the research. There is a lack of control of constraining variables because many factors cannot be controlled due to lack of number of participants such as time and environment.

The closed structure of the questionnaire was used to get more quantitative result, but the structure of the questionnaire is also a limitation, since the questions were close ended and the respondent did not have any other options except the ones that were provided to them.

References

Albrech, S. L. (2011). Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice. *Human Resource Management International Digest*.

Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1983). Organizational commitment: Individual and organizational influences. *Work and occupations, 10*(2), 123-146.

Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2015). Work engagement. *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*, 1-5.

Blau, G., & Ryan, J. (1997). On measuring work ethic: A neglected work commitment facet. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*(3), 435-448.

Bond, F. W., & Bunce, D. (2003). The role of acceptance and job control in mental health, job satisfaction, and work performance. *Journal of applied psychology, 88*(6), 1057.

Caldwell, D. F., Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1990). Building organizational commitment: A multifirm study. *Journal of occupational Psychology, 63*(3), 245-261.

Chalofsky, N., & Krishna, V. (2009). Meaningfulness, commitment, and engagement: The intersection of a deeper level of intrinsic motivation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*(2), 189-203.

Cooper, J. T., Stanley, L. J., Klein, H. J., & Tenhiälä, A. (2016). Profiles of commitment in standard and fixed-term employment arrangements: Implications for work outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 25*(1), 149-165.

Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., & Helkama, K. (2001). Organizational justice evaluations, job control, and occupational strain. *Journal of applied psychology, 86*(3), 418.

Fernet, C., Guay, F., & Senécal, C. (2004). Adjusting to job demands: The role of work self-determination and job control in predicting burnout. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*(1), 39-56.

Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human resource management review, 21*(2), 123-136.

Hahn, V. C., Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. (2011). Learning how to recover from job stress: effects of a recovery training program on recovery, recovery-related self-efficacy, and well-being. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 16*(2), 202.

Handa, M., & Gulati, A. (2014). Employee engagement. Journal of Management Research, 14(1), 57-67.

Handa, M., & Gulati, A. (2014). Employee engagement. *Journal of Management Research, 14*(1), 57-67.

Jackson, P. R., Wall, T. D., Martin, R., & Davids, K. (1993). New measures of job control, cognitive demand, and production responsibility. *Journal of applied psychology, 78*(5), 753.

Jefferson, R. K. (2020). *Role Clarity and Employee Engagement: A Quantitative Study of Student Affairs Professionals.* Capella University,

Kahn, W. A. (2010). The essence of engagement: Lessons from the field. *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice*, 20-30.

Kalimo, R., Tenkanen, L., Härmä, M., Poppius, E., & Heinsalmi, P. (2000). Job stress and sleep disorders: findings from the Helsinki Heart Study. *Stress Medicine, 16*(2), 65-75.

Karasek, R. (1990). Lower health risk with increased job control among white collar workers. *Journal of organizational behavior, 11*(3), 171-185.

Kanning, U. P., & Hill, A. (2013). Validation of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) in six languages. *Journal of business and media psychology*, *4*(2), 11-20.

Klein, H. J., Cooper, J. T., Molloy, J. C., & Swanson, J. A. (2014). The assessment of commitment: Advantages of a unidimensional, target-free approach. *Journal of applied psychology, 99*(2), 222.

Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work–family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(2), 347-367.

Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E., & Truss, K. (2008). Employee engagement: A literature review.

Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E., & Truss, K. (2008). Employee engagement: A literature review.

Lapoint, P. A., & Liprie-Spence, A. (2017). Employee Engagement: Generational Differences in the Workforce. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, *17*(5).

Liu, C, E Spector, P., & M Jex, S. (2005). The relation of job control with job strains: A comparison of multiple data sources. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78(3), 325-336.

Liu, C., E Spector, P., & M Jex, S. (2005). The relation of job control with job strains: A comparison of multiple data sources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*(3), 325-336.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. Industrial and organizational Psychology, 1(1), 3-30.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology, 1*(1), 3-30.

Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. International journal of business and management, 5(12), 89.

Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International journal of business and management, 5*(12), 89.

Marmot, M. G., Bosma, H., Hemingway, H., Brunner, E., & Stansfeld, S. (1997). Contribution of job control and other risk factors to social variations in coronary heart disease incidence. The lancet, 350(9073), 235-239.

Marmot, M. G., Bosma, H., Hemingway, H., Brunner, E., & Stansfeld, S. (1997). Contribution of job control and other risk factors to social variations in coronary heart disease incidence. *The lancet, 350*(9073), 235-239.

Meyer, J. P., & Gagne, M. (2008). Employee engagement from a self-determination theory perspective. *Industrial and organizational Psychology, 1*(1), 60-62.

Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Van Dick, R. (2006). Social identities and commitments at work: Toward an integrative model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 27*(5), 665-683.

Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: a conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of applied psychology, 89*(6), 991.

Moliner, C., Martinez-Tur, V., Ramos, J., Peiró, J. M., & Cropanzano, R. (2008). Organizational justice and extrarole customer service: The mediating role of well-being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 17*(3), 327-348.

Morris, J. H., & Steers, R. M. (1980). Structural influences on organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17(1), 50-57.

Morris, J. H., & Steers, R. M. (1980). Structural influences on organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17*(1), 50-57.

Mowday, R. T. (1998). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. Human resource management review, 8(4), 387-401.

Mowday, R. T. (1998). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review, 8*(4), 387-401.

Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2011). Affective organizational commitment and citizenship behavior: Linear and non-linear moderating effects of organizational tenure. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(2), 528-537.

Parker, S. K., & Sprigg, C. A. (1999). Minimizing strain and maximizing learning: the role of job demands, job control, and proactive personality. Journal of applied psychology, 84(6), 925.

Parker, S. K., & Sprigg, C. A. (1999). Minimizing strain and maximizing learning: the role of job demands, job control, and proactive personality. *Journal of applied psychology, 84*(6), 925.

Pavliscsak, H., Little, J. R., Poropatich, R. K., McVeigh, F. L., Tong, J., Tillman, J. S., . . . Fonda, S. J. (2016). Assessment of patient engagement with a mobile application among service members in transition. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 23(1), 110-118.

Pavliscsak, H., Little, J. R., Poropatich, R. K., McVeigh, F. L., Tong, J., Tillman, J. S., . . . Fonda, S. J. (2016). Assessment of patient engagement with a mobile application among service members in transition. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 23*(1), 110-118.

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of management review, 10(3), 465-476.

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of management review, 10*(3), 465-476.

Reinecke, L. (2009). Games at work: The recreational use of computer games during working hours. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*(4), 461-465.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of managerial psychology.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*.

Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? Human resource development quarterly, 25(2), 155-182.

Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? *Human resource development quarterly, 25*(2), 155-182.

Smith, C. S., Tisak, J., Hahn, S. E., & Schmieder, R. A. (1997). The measurement of job control. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 18*(3), 225-237.

Smith, C. S., Tisak, J., Hahn, S. E., & Schmieder, R. A. (1997). The measurement of job control. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 18*(3), 225-237.

Sonnentag, S. (2011). Research on work engagement is well and alive. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20*(1), 29-38.

Van Yperen, N. W., & Hagedoorn, M. (2003). Do high job demands increase intrinsic motivation or fatigue or both? The role of job control and job social support. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(3), 339-348.

WeiBo, Z., Kaur, S., & Jun, W. (2010). New development of organizational commitment: A critical review (1960-2009). African Journal of Business Management, 4(1), 012-020.

WeiBo, Z., Kaur, S., & Jun, W. (2010). New development of organizational commitment: A critical review (1960-2009). *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(1), 012-020.