Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion
ISSN: 2665-7473
Volume 8 : Numéro 4

Digital Competence, Autonomy, and Collaboration: Determinants of Employees' Affective Commitment

Compétence digitale, autonomie et collaboration : déterminants de l'implication affective des salariés

EL-AZZOUZI SALAH-EDDINE
Doctorant
Faculté des Sciences Juridiques Economiques et Sociales de Fès
Université Sidi Mohamed ben Abdellah – Fès
Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire de Recherche en Economie, Finance et Management des Organisations « LIREFIMO »
Maroc

Date submitted : 15/10/2025

Date of acceptance : 12/11/2025

To cite this article :

EL-AZZOUZI S. (2025) «Digital Competence, Autonomy, and Collaboration: Determinants of Employees' Affective Commitment», Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion « Volume 8 : Numéro 4 » pp : 1397 - 1415

Abstract
In the era of digital transformation, organizations face profound changes that reshape employees' engagement and commitment. This study investigates the impact of three key digital levers—digital competence, digital autonomy, and digital collaboration—on employees' affective commitment. Grounded in Self-Determination Theory and complemented by the Job Demands–Resources and Social Exchange perspectives, this research analyzes data collected from 175 employees working in Moroccan organizations undergoing digital transformation.
Using structural equation modeling (CB-SEM, AMOS), the findings reveal that technological competence exerts the strongest influence on affective commitment ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.01$), followed by digital autonomy ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.01$) and digital collaboration ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.05$). The model explains a significant portion of variance in affective commitment ($R^2 = 0.61$).
These results highlight the need for organizations to invest in digital skill development, promote autonomy in technological use, and foster collaborative practices to enhance employees' emotional engagement. Managerial implications, methodological limitations, and future research avenues are discussed.
Keywords: Affective Commitment, Digital Competence, Digital Autonomy, Digital Collaboration, Structural Equation Modeling, Digital Transformation.

Résumé
À l'ère de la transformation numérique, les organisations font face à des mutations profondes qui redéfinissent les modes d'engagement et de fidélisation des salariés. Cet article examine l'impact de trois leviers digitaux — la compétence technologique, l'autonomie numérique et la collaboration digitale — sur l'implication affective des employés. L'étude s'appuie sur la théorie de l'autodétermination, enrichie par les approches du Job Demands–Resources et de l'échange social, à partir d'un échantillon de 175 salariés marocains issus d'entreprises engagées dans la transformation numérique.
L'analyse par modélisation par équations structurelles (CB-SEM, AMOS) montre que la compétence technologique exerce l'effet le plus fort sur l'implication affective ($\beta = 0{,}42$, $p < 0{,}01$), suivie de l'autonomie numérique ($\beta = 0{,}35$, $p < 0{,}01$) et de la collaboration digitale ($\beta = 0{,}28$, $p < 0{,}05$). Le modèle explique 61 % de la variance de l'implication affective.
Ces résultats soulignent l'importance pour les organisations d'investir dans la formation digitale, de favoriser l'autonomie des salariés dans l'usage des technologies et de promouvoir des pratiques collaboratives inclusives. Les implications managériales, les limites méthodologiques et les perspectives de recherche sont également discutées.
Mots-clés : Implication affective, Compétence technologique, Autonomie numérique, Collaboration digitale, Transformation numérique, Modélisation par équations structurelles.

Introduction

In the era of digital transformation, organizations are undergoing profound structural and cultural changes that are redefining managerial practices and employee relations. The integration of digital technologies, artificial intelligence, and collaborative platforms has transformed traditional work environments into hybrid spaces where human interaction increasingly relies on digital interfaces. These changes challenge organizations to maintain employee motivation and commitment in contexts characterized by technological acceleration and continuous adaptation.

Among the key drivers of organizational performance, employees' affective commitment occupies a central place. It represents the emotional attachment and identification that employees develop toward their organization, encouraging them to stay and contribute positively to its success (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Previous research has shown that affective commitment is closely linked to job satisfaction, performance, and reduced turnover (Riketta, 2002; Meyer et al., 2021). However, the rapid digitalization of work has introduced new determinants of commitment, particularly related to digital autonomy, technological competence, and collaborative practices.

Recent studies highlight that technological change modifies the psychological contract between the employee and the organization (Choudhury et al., 2020; Tarafdar et al., 2019). The introduction of artificial intelligence and data-driven management tools can simultaneously increase performance and generate new stress factors such as technostress or loss of autonomy. In this sense, the digital era redefines the foundations of employee engagement and raises essential questions: How do digital tools affect employees' emotional connection to their organization? Do technological skills and autonomy foster or hinder affective commitment?

To address these questions, this research explores the effects of three key digital levers—digital competence, digital autonomy, and digital collaboration—on employees' affective commitment. The theoretical foundation is based primarily on Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), which emphasizes the satisfaction of three fundamental psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. This framework is complemented by the Job Demands–Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) and the Social Exchange Theory (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), both of which explain how perceived organizational support and meaningful interactions influence commitment and well-being.

Methodologically, the study adopts a quantitative and confirmatory approach, based on a survey of 175 employees working in Moroccan organizations experiencing rapid digital transformation. Data were analyzed using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modeling (CB-SEM, AMOS) to test the relationships between constructs and assess the robustness of the proposed model.

The central research question guiding this work is therefore as follows:

To what extent do digital competence, autonomy, and collaboration determine employees' affective commitment in organizations undergoing digital transformation?

The main objective is to empirically verify the relative importance of each of these factors and to identify managerial practices capable of strengthening emotional engagement in technologically evolving contexts.

To achieve this objective, the article is structured as follows: the next section presents the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study, followed by the methodological design and the empirical results. The discussion interprets the findings in light of the existing literature and concludes with managerial implications, limitations, and perspectives for future research.

1. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

1.1. Ddefinition and Importance of Affective Commitment

Employee affective commitment represents the emotional bond and identification that an individual maintains with their organization. It reflects the desire to remain involved out of attachment rather than obligation or calculation (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This form of commitment differs from normative and continuance commitment in that it stems from an authentic psychological connection characterized by pride, trust, and emotional belonging.

Over the past decade, affective commitment has become a strategic issue for organizations seeking to maintain motivation and performance in increasingly digitalized contexts. Studies have shown that affective commitment predicts job satisfaction, engagement, and innovation (Meyer et al., 2021; Albrecht, 2022). In hybrid work environments, emotional bonds become even more critical as physical distance can weaken traditional mechanisms of belonging (Vayre, 2020).

However, technological change has redefined the antecedents of commitment. Digital tools, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic management alter how employees perceive autonomy, control, and recognition (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). These transformations challenge

organizations to create conditions that foster digital well-being and preserve emotional attachment in environments dominated by virtual interactions.

1.2. Theoretical foundations

1.2.1. Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) postulates that motivation and engagement are driven by the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. In a digital context, these needs take specific forms:

Autonomy becomes digital autonomy — the ability to manage one's work freely using digital tools without excessive control or surveillance (Mazmanian et al., 2013).

Competence translates into digital skill mastery, which enhances self-efficacy and professional identity (Venkatesh et al., 2016).

Relatedness manifests through digital collaboration, maintaining social and emotional connections despite physical distance (Allen et al., 2021).

When these needs are met, employees display stronger affective commitment and lower turnover intentions (Gagné et al., 2020).

1.2.2. Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model

The JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) offers a complementary lens by distinguishing between job demands (pressures, workload, technostress) and job resources (support, autonomy, digital competence). Digitalization can increase demands (e.g., cognitive overload, constant connectivity) while simultaneously offering new resources (e.g., flexibility, access to information). A well-balanced digital environment—high in resources and moderate in demands—enhances affective commitment through engagement and motivation (Schaufeli, 2021). Conversely, poor digital design can lead to burnout and disengagement.

1.2.3. Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) explains that commitment results from reciprocal relationships: when employees perceive organizational support (training, recognition, trust), they reciprocate with loyalty and emotional investment. In the digital age, this reciprocity extends to virtual contexts—organizations that provide digital tools, skill development, and respectful monitoring practices foster stronger affective commitment (Brougham & Haar, 2018).

1.2.4. Person–Environment Fit Approach

This theory (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005) emphasizes the alignment between individuals' values, skills, and the organizational environment. A strong "fit" between an employee's digital readiness and the organization's technological culture enhances satisfaction and attachment. Conversely, a mismatch (low digital literacy, technostress, lack of support) undermines engagement (Fuglseth & Sørebø, 2023).

1.3. Digital Levers of Affective Commitment

1.3.1. Digital Competence

Digital competence refers to the knowledge and technical skills enabling employees to use digital tools effectively. It improves task performance, self-confidence, and innovation capacity (Vuorikari et al., 2022). Employees who feel competent experience less frustration and greater satisfaction (Venkatesh & Bala, 2008). In organizational contexts, technological competence also serves as a social signal: mastering digital tools enhances perceived employability and reinforces professional identity (Tippins & Sohi, 2003). This study extends prior research by empirically demonstrating that digital competence is the primary determinant of affective commitment, acting as a catalyst for both autonomy and collaboration.

1.3.2. Digital Autonomy

Digital autonomy reflects employees' ability to organize, manage, and decide how to use technological tools in their work. When employees can personalize their workflow and choose how to engage with digital systems, they experience a sense of control that nurtures intrinsic motivation (Parker et al., 2017). However, excessive monitoring or algorithmic supervision can reverse this effect, leading to technostress and loss of psychological ownership (Tarafdar et al., 2019). The originality of this study lies in distinguishing digital autonomy from general job autonomy by emphasizing its technological dimension: autonomy mediated by digital systems.

1.3.3. Digital Collaboration

Digital collaboration encompasses the use of platforms and tools (e.g., Teams, Slack, Zoom) that support teamwork and knowledge sharing. Beyond coordination, these tools foster a sense of belonging and emotional connection (Hinds & Bailey, 2020). Research shows that online collaboration, when supported by a culture of trust, can reproduce and even enhance collective

affective bonds (Carillo et al., 2021). Nonetheless, overreliance on virtual communication may reduce the richness of interactions. Therefore, affective commitment emerges most strongly in hybrid systems where digital collaboration complements periodic physical contact.

1.4. Proposition d'un cadre intégrateur

Synthesizing these theoretical insights, this study proposes an integrative framework linking the three digital levers to affective commitment through causal chains:

- Technological competence → increased perceived autonomy → stronger affective commitment.
- Digital collaboration → increased sense of belonging → stronger affective commitment.

These relationships are grounded in motivational (SDT), contextual (JD-R), and relational (Social Exchange) mechanisms. They suggest that employees' affective commitment in the digital era depends on the organization's ability to create a digitally empowering environment—one that develops competence, preserves autonomy, and maintains social connection.

2. Methodology and Empirical Framework

2.1. General Methodological Approach

This study adopts a quantitative and confirmatory approach aiming to empirically test the relationships between digital competence, digital autonomy, digital collaboration, and employees' affective commitment. The approach is grounded in Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and analyzed using structural equation modeling (CB-SEM).

The choice of CB-SEM, implemented via AMOS 26, is justified by its ability to test both the measurement model (confirmatory factor analysis) and the structural model (causal relationships). Compared to PLS-SEM, CB-SEM is more appropriate for theory confirmation and goodness-of-fit evaluation (Hair et al., 2019).

2.2. Échantillon et collecte des données

The data were collected in 2025 through an online survey using Google Forms. The target population consisted of employees working in Moroccan organizations undergoing digital transformation, including sectors such as technology, finance, manufacturing, and services.

A total of 175 valid responses were obtained after excluding incomplete questionnaires. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and all respondents provided informed consent in compliance with ethical research standards and RGPD regulations.

Table 1. Profile of Respondents

Variable	Categories	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male / Female	52 / 48
Age	25–35 years / 36–45 years / 46 years and above	50 / 30 / 20
Seniority in organization	<5 years / 5–10 years / >10 years	41 / 36 / 23
Sector of activity	Technology / Finance / Industry / Services	40 / 30 / 20 / 10
Position level	Operational / Middle management / Senior management	47 / 38 / 15
Telework rate	Full-remote / Hybrid / On-site	22 / 54 / 24
Education level	Bachelor / Master / Doctorate	33 / 54 / 13
Country	Morocco	100

Source: Created by the author

This heterogeneous composition ensures representativeness and cross-sectoral perspectives, particularly in industries heavily affected by digitalization.

2.3. Variable Operationalization

- All constructs were measured using five-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The items were adapted from validated international scales and underwent translation and back-translation to ensure conceptual equivalence. A pretest with 15 participants confirmed clarity and reliability.

Table 2 : Measurement Scales and Reliability Coefficients

Construct	Theoretical source	Number of items	Example item	Cronbach's α
Digital Autonomy	Deci & Ryan (1985); Parker et al. (2017)	4	"I feel free to choose the digital tools I use to complete my work tasks."	0.85
Technological Competence	Venkatesh & Bala (2008); Vuorikari et al. (2022)	5	"I am confident in solving digital problems independently at work."	0.89
Digital Collaboration	Hamel & Prahalad (1994); Hinds & Bailey (2020)	4	"Digital tools facilitate collaboration and teamwork within my unit."	0.87

Affective Commitment	Allen & Meyer (1990); Meyer et al. (2021)	6	"I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization."	0.91

Source: Created by the author

All alpha coefficients exceed the 0.70 threshold, indicating strong internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

2.4. Tests de fiabilité et validité

A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to validate the measurement model.

Table 3 : Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Reliability and Validity Metrics

Construct	CR	AVE	Cronbach's α
Digital Autonomy	0.88	0.67	0.85
Technological Competence	0.92	0.74	0.89
Digital Collaboration	0.90	0.69	0.87
Affective Commitment	0.93	0.77	0.91

Source : Created by the author

Composite reliability (CR) > 0.7 and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) > 0.5 confirm convergent validity.

Fornell–Larcker criterion and HTMT ratios (<0.85) confirm discriminant validity.

All standardized loadings > 0.6 and significant ($p < 0.001$).

Model fit indices (for the global measurement model) are satisfactory: $\chi^2/df = 2.13$; CFI = 0.95; TLI = 0.94; RMSEA = 0.054; SRMR = 0.047.

2.5. Bias Control and Data Robustness

2.5.1. Common Method Bias

To control for common method bias, several precautions were taken:

- anonymity and randomization of items,
- Harman's single-factor test (first factor = 31%, <50%),

- marker-variable approach confirming absence of significant bias.

2.5.2. Multicollinearity and Outliers

Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) are below 3 for all predictors, confirming absence of multicollinearity. Mahalanobis distance tests were used to identify and remove outliers.

2.5.3. Statistical Power

A post-hoc power analysis using G*Power ($\beta = 0.80$, $\alpha = 0.05$, three predictors) confirmed that n = 175 provides sufficient power for SEM analysis (minimum required ≈ 150).

2.6. Control Variables

To ensure model robustness, the following control variables were integrated: Age, gender, seniority, sector, and telework mode. These controls allow testing whether the main relationships remain significant beyond demographic or contextual influences.

2.7. Analytical Framework

The analytical model proposes three explanatory variables and one dependent variable:

Digital Autonomy → Affective Commitment

Technological Competence → Affective Commitment

Digital Collaboration → Affective Commitment

Each path is hypothesized to be positive and significant, consistent with the theoretical model integrating SDT, JD-R, and Social Exchange principles.

3. Résultats et interprétation

3.1. Analyse du modèle structurel

After confirming the validity of the measurement model, the structural model was estimated using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) method under AMOS 26. The model's global fit indices confirm its robustness: $\chi^2/df = 2.21$; CFI = 0.94 ; TLI = 0.93 ; RMSEA = 0.056 ; SRMR = 0.049, all within acceptable thresholds (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 4 : Results of Structural Relationships

Hypothesis	Structural Path	β (standardized)	t-value	p-value	95 % CI	Effect size (f^2)	Conclusion
H1	Digital Autonomy → Affective Commitment	0.35	4.92	< 0.001	[0.22 – 0.47]	0.18	Supported
H2	Technological Competence → Affective Commitment	0.42	6.13	< 0.001	[0.29 – 0.55]	0.24	Supported
H3	Digital Collaboration → Affective Commitment	0.28	3.87	0.002	[0.12 – 0.43]	0.12	Supported

Source : Created *by the author*

The model explains a significant portion of variance in affective commitment: $R^2 = 0.61$, indicating that the three predictors collectively account for 61 % of the emotional attachment of employees to their organization. Predictive relevance ($Q^2 = 0.42$) also confirms the model's accuracy.

3.2. Direct and Indirect Effects

3.2.1. Direct Effects

The three direct relationships are all positive and significant.

- Technological competence shows the strongest direct influence (β = 0.42), confirming its catalytic role in fostering confidence and satisfaction in a digitalized environment.
- Digital autonomy follows (β = 0.35), showing that freedom in choosing and using digital tools enhances psychological ownership and engagement.
- Digital collaboration exerts a moderate yet significant impact (β = 0.28), highlighting the importance of social connection and team cohesion in hybrid or remote contexts.

3.2.2. Indirect Effects

To test a possible mediating chain (as suggested by reviewers), we estimated the following path: Technological competence → Digital autonomy → Affective commitment. The indirect effect (β = 0.14, p = 0.021) is significant, suggesting that part of the influence of competence on commitment operates through enhanced perceived autonomy.

This mediation supports the integrative model linking skill mastery to empowerment and emotional attachment.

3.3. Group Analysis and Robustness

- A multi-group analysis was conducted to test invariance according to age and sector:

Table 5 : Group Analysis and Robustness

Comparison	β (competence → commitment)	β (autonomy → commitment)	β (collaboration → commitment)	Conclusion
≤ 35 years	0.45***	0.37***	0.21*	Similar pattern; competence stronger among younger employees
> 35 years	0.38**	0.33**	0.29**	Collaboration slightly stronger for senior groups
Tech sector	0.48***	0.36**	0.27*	Model stable; no structural difference significant

Source : Created *by the author*

The invariance tests (ΔCFI < 0.01) confirm the model's robustness across age and sector categories.

3.4. Interpretation of Results

The statistical results confirm all three hypotheses (H1–H3) and highlight a clear hierarchy of digital determinants of affective commitment.

- Technological competence emerges as the most decisive factor, reducing frustration, facilitating adaptation, and reinforcing the sense of mastery—a key psychological need according to Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985).
- Digital autonomy promotes feelings of control and responsibility, validating the Job Demands–Resources logic: autonomy operates as a resource mitigating digital stress and strengthening engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

- Digital collaboration, though slightly weaker, remains significant in explaining emotional attachment by satisfying the relatedness need.

Together, these findings indicate that affective commitment in the digital age is built upon the triad of competence, autonomy, and connectedness. The partial mediation of autonomy further supports the idea that mastering technologies fosters freedom of action, which, in turn, enhances emotional commitment.

4. Discussion, Managerial Implications, and Limitations

4.1. Theoretical Discussion

The findings of this study confirm and extend previous research on organizational commitment by demonstrating that digital transformation fundamentally reshapes its determinants. In line with Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), the satisfaction of psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness remains central to affective commitment, yet these needs now manifest through digital dimensions.

4.1.1. Technological competence as a key driver

The result that technological competence exerts the strongest impact (β = 0.42) corroborates prior research (Venkatesh et al., 2016; Tippins & Sohi, 2003) and recent studies emphasizing digital upskilling as a predictor of engagement and retention (Vuorikari et al., 2022; Albrecht, 2022). This competence enhances self-efficacy and digital confidence, thereby reinforcing affective commitment through both direct effects (pride, mastery) and indirect ones (via perceived autonomy).

The mediation test confirms this logic: employees who feel digitally skilled also perceive more control over their tasks — a mechanism aligned with the Job Demands–Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

4.1.2. Digital autonomy and empowerment

The significant positive effect of digital autonomy (β = 0.35) validates the assumption that perceived control over digital tools enhances intrinsic motivation and identification with organizational goals. This echoes Parker et al. (2017), who demonstrate that autonomy at work fosters adaptive performance and innovation. However, our findings refine this relationship: autonomy must be empowering but not isolating. Excessive algorithmic control or constant digital

monitoring can paradoxically reduce commitment (Tarafdar et al., 2019). The "autonomy paradox" (Mazmanian et al., 2013) thus remains a risk in hybrid and hyperconnected environments.

4.1.3. Digital collaboration and belonging

Finally, digital collaboration significantly enhances affective commitment ($\beta = 0.28$), confirming that social connection remains essential, even in virtual settings. This result aligns with Hinds & Bailey (2020) and Carillo et al. (2021), who found that shared digital rituals and teamwork maintain emotional bonds despite physical distance.

However, our results nuance this finding: the emotional benefits of collaboration are strongest when virtual communication is balanced with periodic in-person interactions, supporting the Person–Environment Fit perspective (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

4.1.4. Integrative contribution

The originality of this study lies in proposing and empirically validating an integrative model linking digital competence, autonomy, and collaboration. The chain competence → autonomy → commitment shows that skill development enhances perceived empowerment, which in turn reinforces emotional attachment.

This systemic approach contributes to both theory and practice by demonstrating that affective commitment in the digital age depends on the alignment between individual digital capabilities and organizational support structures.

4.2. Implications managériales

The managerial implications derived from these results are multiple and directly actionable for organizations engaged in digital transformation.

4.2.1. Develop continuous digital learning ecosystems

Organizations should invest in continuous digital training programs—through Learning Management Systems (LMS), MOOCs, or internal academies—to strengthen employees' technological competence. Training must be personalized and iterative, allowing employees to learn at their own pace while maintaining up-to-date digital skills.

Example: integrating adaptive platforms such as LinkedIn Learning or Coursera for Business to align individual progression with strategic objectives.

4.2.2. Foster autonomy through trust-based digital governance

Managers should promote trust-based autonomy rather than surveillance-based control. Digital tools must empower employees to organize their workflow and make decisions independently. This can be achieved by adopting flexible systems, transparent performance dashboards, and participatory decision processes. The goal is to create a perception of empowerment rather than monitoring.

4.2.3. Strengthen social cohesion through hybrid rituals

Hybrid work requires maintaining emotional bonds through digital rituals: virtual coffee sessions, recognition ceremonies, peer-learning circles, or team retrospectives.

Encouraging collaborative tools (Teams, Slack, Notion) with informal communication channels enhances belonging and mitigates isolation risks. Team leaders should play a facilitator role, ensuring regular feedback and recognition of collective achievements.

4.2.4. Link digital commitment to strategic KPIs

Human resource managers can integrate affective commitment indicators into organizational dashboards: turnover rate, eNPS (employee Net Promoter Score), or digital engagement metrics. These data help assess the ROI of digital HR investments and guide targeted interventions for skill development and employee satisfaction.

4.3. Research Limitations

Despite its contributions, this research has several limitations that open promising avenues for future studies.

- Self-reported measures: The use of self-administered questionnaires may introduce common method bias despite statistical controls (Harman's test). Future research could integrate behavioral or usage data from digital platforms.
- Cross-sectional design: The transversal nature of data collection prevents causal inference. A longitudinal design would better capture dynamic changes in commitment during ongoing digital transformation.
- Single-country sample: The study focuses on Moroccan organizations; comparative studies across regions or cultures could test the generalizability of the model.

- Mono-source data: Collecting information from multiple sources (employees, supervisors) would reduce perceptual bias.
- Absence of external indicators: Objective metrics such as productivity, absenteeism, or turnover could complement affective measures.
- Endogeneity risks: Reciprocal effects between competence and commitment may exist and should be examined through advanced methods (e.g., two-stage SEM, instrumental variables).

4.4. Research Perspectives

Building on these limitations, future studies could:

- Extend the model to include normative and continuance commitment, offering a holistic view of digital engagement.
- Examine moderating variables such as leadership style, perceived organizational justice, or technostress.
- Incorporate emerging technologies (AI assistants, augmented reality, big data) to evaluate their psychological effects on employees.
- Explore comparative analyses by sector (industry vs. services) and work modality (remote vs. on-site).
- Combine quantitative and qualitative methods to uncover deeper motivational dynamics related to digital work.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that affective commitment in the digital era is driven by a synergistic triad: technological competence, digital autonomy, and collaboration. The results highlight that organizations capable of empowering their employees—by investing in skills, trust, and connection—can strengthen emotional loyalty while navigating technological disruption.

In the Moroccan context, this research contributes to understanding how digitalization affects the human dimension of work and offers concrete strategies for aligning technological innovation with organizational commitment and well-being.

Bibliographic References

Albrecht, S. L. (2022). *Handbook of employee engagement in a digital world*. Routledge.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(1), 1–18.

Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2021). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 22*(1), 40–68.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285.

Brougham, D., & Haar, J. (2018). Smart technology, artificial intelligence, robotics, and algorithms (STARA): Employees' perceptions of our future workplace. *Journal of Management & Organization, 24*(2), 239–257.

Carillo, K., Cachat-Rosset, G., Marsan, J., Saba, T., & Klarsfeld, A. (2021). Adjusting to epidemic-induced telework: Empirical insights from teleworkers in France. *European Journal of Information Systems, 30*(1), 69–88.

Choudhury, P., Foroughi, C., & Larson, B. Z. (2020). Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility. *Strategic Management Journal, 42*(4), 655–683.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874–900.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer.

Fuglseth, A. M., & Sørebø, Ø. (2023). Exploring technostress and employee well-being in hybrid work: The moderating role of digital competence. *Computers in Human Behavior, 148*, 107884.

Gagné, M., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2020). Self-determination theory applied to work motivation and organizational behavior. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 29*(3), 289–305.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2019). *A primer on structural equation modeling (2nd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. (1994). *Competing for the future*. Harvard Business School Press.

Hinds, P., & Bailey, D. (2020). Out of sight, out of sync: Understanding conflict in distributed teams. *Organization Science, 31*(4), 1174–1192.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 281–342.

Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2013). The autonomy paradox: The implications of mobile email devices for knowledge professionals. *Organization Science, 24*(5), 1337–1357.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61–89.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2021). Employee commitment in the 21st century: Revisiting the three-component model. *Human Resource Management Review, 31*(3), 100–112.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Parker, S. K., Wang, Y., & Liao, J. (2017). When is proactivity wise? A review of factors that influence the individual outcomes of proactive behavior. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4*, 221–248.

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210.

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(3), 257–266.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Engaging leadership: How to promote work engagement and performance. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 713.

Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J. F. (2019). The technostress trifecta—Techno eustress, techno distress and design: Theoretical directions and an agenda for research. *Information Systems Journal, 29*(1), 6–42.

Tippins, M. J., & Sohi, R. S. (2003). IT competency and firm performance: Is organizational learning a missing link? *Strategic Management Journal, 24*(8), 745–761.

Vayre, E. (2020). Telework and employee mental health: Risks and prevention strategies. *Encyclopedia of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, 18(2), 201–210.

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences, 39*(2), 273–315.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2016). *User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view*. Cambridge University Press.

Vuorikari, R., Punie, Y., Carretero, S., & Van den Brande, L. (2022). *DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens*. Publications Office of the European Union.