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ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the influence of organizational factors on affective commitment, exploring the moderating role of information and communication technology (ICT) on their relationships. The study is based on empirical findings administered on 200 managerial personnel using the PLS-SEM. Team orientation, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and decentralization have a direct influence on affective commitment. The theoretical framework presented in this study focused on the integrated effect of organizational factors on affective commitment along with the moderating effect of ICT. ICT support moderates the relationship between team orientation and affective commitment. The findings would provide managers with an understanding of the factors influencing affective commitment in Bangladesh’s service organizations. The results indicate that ICT can be an effective tool to strengthen teamwork and employee commitment. Evidence from this study would help managers to formulate strategies accordingly and provide new knowledge to researchers to look further into this field.
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INTRODUCTION

As one of the major industrial categories, the service sector is noticeably different from the manufacturing sector due to its inseparable, intangible and perishable nature, which makes quality control more difficult. For example, the interaction between the service provider and customers is an important determinant of service quality. However, positive interaction requires clear communication through both verbal and nonverbal actions, which are often miscommunicated and misunderstood. Employees in service organizational environments may become demotivated, suffer from inertia, and perform poorly. This may lead to weak job commitments. The bulk of evidence from the existing studies in this field shows that organizational performance and employee commitment are intertwined...
concepts and employee commitment affects turnover, absenteeism, organizational citizenship behavior and overall performance (Testa, 2001). Managers today are continuously attempting to enhance employee commitment by focusing on the factors that may contribute to its development. The focus of our study is on the service sector in countries like Bangladesh, where service companies account for approximately half of the total Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Ministry of Finance, 2017). The empirical evidence of this study may be valuable to the service sector managers in developing a sustainable business in this emerging economy.

Several scholars argue for further advancement in the field by investigating possible relationships between employee commitment, organizational culture, structure, leadership style and information technology (Hong et al., 2016; Jackson et al., 2013; Jain, 2015; Jauhari et al., 2017; Lee & Choi, 2003; Loi et al., 2015; McKinnon et al., 2003; Stinglhamber et al., 2015). Organizational culture reflects values and philosophies that guide employee behavior by establishing rules and regulations. Employees need to be communicated through an appropriate structure that ensures an effective flow of information (Zheng et al., 2010). Leaders within these cultural and structural contexts exercise vested power to motivate employees following guidelines as set forth by the organization (Randeree & Chaudhry, 2012). Embedded with these factors, the use of information technology may help leaders communicate effectively (Hambley et al., 2007), enhance organizational culture (Lopez-Nicolas & Meroño-Cerdán, 2009) and channel information efficiently through the appropriate chain of command, thereby enhancing employee engagement and commitments (Van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004). Therefore, it is critical to look into not only how culture, leadership and structure affect employee commitment, but also how these relationships are influenced by certain ICT conditions that must be taken into consideration.

Cultural nuances may cause differences in the organizational environment, thereby producing different impacts on employee commitment. Although numerous studies have focused on the relationship between culture, structure, leadership, and commitment, the effect of ICT on these relationships remains largely unexplored. The 21st century will continue to show enormous changes in the field of ICT (Hride et al., 2021). Therefore, this study intends to identify the relevant dimensions of each organizational factor from dispersed literature, integrate them into one theoretical framework, and study their isolated effects on employee commitment. In addition, the moderating effect of ICT support on the proposed relationships between each dimension and employee commitment will also be investigated to obtain a broader understanding of the context of Bangladesh’s service organizations.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

This section reviews the relevant literature to propose a research model. Drawing on the existing literature, this study proposes that organizational factors (such as culture, leadership style, and structure) influence an employee’s affective commitment. This study also proposes that ICT support moderates the relationship between the proposed organizational factors and affective commitment.

**Affective Commitment**

Organizational commitment is often considered an important variable to understand employee work behavior. (Ahmed, & Jasimuddin, 2021; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Mowday et al., 1979). Meyer & Herscovitch (2001) analyzed a list of definitions and summed up commitment as a force that binds an individual to a specific course of action. Meyer & Allen (1991) classified various concepts of commitment into three general types: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Affective commitment refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to the organization. It is based on ‘desire’ mindset, which motivates employees to ‘want to stay’ with the organization (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Normative commitment is derived from ‘perceived obligation’ mindset, creating a sense of obligation towards the organization, making employees feel that they ‘ought to stay’ in the organization. Continuance commitment refers to the ‘perceived cost’ mind-set, which
is an understanding of the costs associated with leaving the organization. This mind-set encourages employees to stay committed to the current organization due to the cost involved in switching to a new workplace, creating a sense among employees that they ‘need to stay’ in the organization.

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) mentioned that there are specific factors, such as personal, job, and organizational characteristics, that can influence the development of the three commitment mindsets outlined above. Therefore, this study posits that organizational factors (such as culture, leadership, structure, and ICT support) will influence the development of such commitment mindsets, mainly affective organizational commitment. The changing workforce is now focusing on hiring more knowledge workers because of their importance in the competitive environment (Jayasingam et al., 2016). Keeping them loyal to the organization has become a challenging task due to the high demand for skilled workers and available employment opportunities. In this present scenario, employees may not feel ‘ought to’ (normative) or ‘need to’ (continuous) stay with their current organization (Jayasingam et al., 2016). Therefore, retaining employees would be easier if they developed a ‘desire’ mindset (affective commitment) instead. Furthermore, studies have shown that affective commitment is the best predictor of performance among the three dimensions of commitment and produces results with strong reliability and validity (Gyensare et al., 2016). Previous studies also stress the importance of studying affective commitment because employees who want to stay (affective commitment) are more likely to perform better than those who are obliged to stay (normative commitment) or those who need to stay (continuance commitment) (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Organizational Culture

In an organizational context, culture refers to the organization’s value system, which is shared by the members of the organization and validates its method of doing things. Despite various definitions, it is widely acknowledged that organizational culture has a significant impact on employee attitudes and work behavior (Williamson et al., 2009; Jasimuddin & Zhang, 2014; Saci, 2021). In the past, the importance and influence of organizational culture on employee commitment and performance have been mentioned by prominent writers such as Deal & Kennedy (1982) and Peters & Waterman (1982). Different dimensions of organizational culture and their relationships with different types of commitment were also reported in the subsequent time period by Clugston et al. (2000). Consistent with these findings, Messner (2013) also found cultural dimensions to be related to organizational commitment. In parallel to this, Rashid et al. (2003) specifically investigated the influence of cultural dimensions on affective commitment.

In the literature, various classifications of culture are available. O’Reilly et al. (1991) categorized cultural values into seven dimensions: respect for people, team orientation, innovation, stability, aggressiveness, attention to detail, and outcome orientation. Respect for people refers to how businesses view fairness, individual rights, and the level of tolerance for employee behavior (Windsor & Ashkanasy, 1996). Team orientation requires collaboration between employees and work units, which involves autonomy to make decisions and take responsibility for a given task. Innovative organizations take risks, respond to opportunities and nurture creativity among employees, which instills a sense of involvemnt. Stability refers to the consistency in an organizational environment, rules and regulations that affect job security. The aggressiveness dimension refers to the extent to which an organization takes necessary steps to bring changes within the work environment to innovate and adapt to new trends, become competitive, and achieve remarkable performance (McKinnon et al., 2003). In a highly competitive environment, such effort and attitude could create employee motivation and commitment, driving them towards achieving organizational goals. Therefore, based on the McKinnon et al. (2003) study, this study proposes that respect for people, team orientation, innovation, stability, and aggressiveness influence the affective commitment of employees. Based on these arguments, the following hypotheses can be proposed:

H1: Respect for people has a positive effect on affective commitment.
H2: Team orientation has a positive effect on affective commitment.
H3: Innovation has a positive effect on affective commitment.
H4: Stability has a positive effect on affective commitment.
H5: Aggressiveness has a positive effect on affective commitment.

Organizational Leadership

Leadership is defined as the process of influencing others to understand and agree with shared objectives and the process of facilitating their accomplishment (Yukl, 2010; Nakshabandi & Jasimuddin, 2018). There are various approaches to studying leadership behavior and commitment types. The extant literature suggests the possibility of studying leadership-commitment relationships using several combinations. Bass’s (1985) transformational-transactional leadership styles have been the most extensively used leadership styles. Hence, this study incorporates variables using these leadership styles and relationships with affective commitment are assumed (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016).

Transformational leaders inspire and motivate people to perform beyond expectations, exceed personal interests, and develop a collective sense of the working environment (Bass & Avolio, 1997). They encourage employees through emotional appeal and a compelling vision (Jackson et al., 2013). At the same time, they pay attention to developing skills and cater to the needs of individual employees. Transformational leaders encourage employees to establish positive emotional attachments to their workplaces, increase employee involvement, and foster a desire to develop a sense of identity. Employees, thus, gain a sense of belonging, become more affectively committed to their jobs, and remain loyal. Studies by Jackson et al. (2013), Lee (2005), and Mesu et al. (2015) show that transformational leadership positively relates to affective commitment. On the other hand, findings regarding the relationship between transactional leadership and organizational commitment suggest mixed results. For example, Lee (2005) indicates that transactional leadership is insignificantly related to organizational commitment. The fact is that the exchange process involved with this leadership style is not likely to produce passion and commitment among followers (Yukl, 2010). On the contrary, a study by Jackson et al. (2013) shows that two aspects of transactional leadership are positively related to affective commitment and, more specifically, the contingent reward aspect of transactional style influences affective commitment (Afshari & Gibson, 2016). This leads to the following hypotheses:

H6: Transformational leadership has a positive effect on affective commitment.
H7: Transactional leadership has a positive effect on affective commitment.

Organizational Structure

Social networking theory describes the organizational structure as a platform that governs communication patterns and interactions between employees (Islam et al., 2015). The organizational structure could be different depending on whether job definitions and procedural specifications govern activities in organizations (formal vs. informal) and whether decision making is concentrated at higher or lower levels of organization (centralized vs. decentralized). The fact that only a few studies mention the linkages between organizational structure and organizational commitment suggests this study assumes that organizational structure has an impact on employees’ commitment.

Empirical evidence suggests that with a more decentralized structure, organizational commitment tends to increase. This is attributed to the notion that centralization causes a non-participatory environment, which results in less communication, little involvement among participants, and low commitment (Damanpour, 1991). It is argued that high decision-making autonomy develops a greater sense of responsibility among employees because it involves personal involvement in decision making. According to Smeenk et al. (2006), the decentralized structure fosters a sense of responsibility, strengthens ties with the organization, and enhances self-worth, thus creating an emotional attachment with the workplace. This personal or emotional involvement creates ‘desire’ mind-set, which is the
basis for affective commitment. In this regard, several scholars (e.g., Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Morris & Steers, 1980; Smeenk et al., 2006) support a positive correlation between decentralized structure and organizational commitment.

The empirical evidence also supports the relationship between formalization and organizational commitment (Al-Qatawneh, 2014; Rahman et al., 2018). Formalization measures the degree to which an organization uses its rules and procedures to prescribe behavior (Liao et al., 2011). Contrary to high formalization, a less formal structure means fewer formal rules and regulations. Less formalization prompts frequent and quick communication among employees, which, in turn, creates more flexibility and openness. This study assumes that formalization might hinder the creation of a ‘desire’ mindset in employees, which is necessary to grow an emotional attachment with the organization. Therefore, this study hypothesizes:

H8: Decentralization has a positive effect on affective commitment.
H9: Formalization has a negative effect on affective commitment.

Information and Communication Technology Support

Information and communication technology (ICT) support can be referred to as the infrastructure of tools, systems, platforms, and automated solutions that smoothen the flow of information and enhance communication (Jasimuddin et al., 2012; Jasimuddin & Zhang, 2011). ICT support can enable rapid search, access, and retrieval of information and enhance collaboration and communication among organizational employees (Yeh et al., 2006; Jasimuddin et al., 2017; Morrar et al., 2019; Peng et al., 2020). A study by Van den Hooff & Weenenf (2004) shows that the computer-mediated communication process influences the affective commitment of employees. The reasons behind this relationship are attributed to stronger group orientation, enhanced collective behavior, and better communication that result from computer-mediated communications (Dimmick et al., 2000; Jasimuddin et al., 2015). When members of the organization are more connected through various communication platforms, it is easier for them to share the organization’s values.

Proper ICT support ensures timely access and knowledge exchange to facilitate with decision-making process (Ho et al., 2012; Jasimuddin et al., 2019; Zhang & Jasimuddin, 2012). It also encourages formal and informal interactions among people from different organizational hierarchies within and across organizations, which can help organizational leaders in communicating effectively with their subordinates. The presence of sufficient ICT support can also have an impact on organizational structure (Islam et al., 2017; Jasimuddin & Zhang, 2009; Jasimuddin, 2005). ICT-facilitated communication can smooth interactions between employees and speed up decision implementation (Abdou & Jasimuddin, 2020). Hence, this study assumes that ICT support moderates relationships between culture, leadership, structure, and affective commitment. Based on this premise, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H10: ICT support moderates the relationship between organizational factors and affective commitment
H10 a: ICT support moderates the relationship between respect for people and affective commitment.
H10 b: ICT support moderates the relationship between team orientation and affective commitment.
H10 c: ICT support moderates the relationship between innovation and affective commitment.
H10 d: ICT support moderates the relationship between stability and affective commitment.
H10 e: ICT support moderates the relationship between aggressiveness and affective commitment.
H10 f: ICT support moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and affective commitment.
H10 g: ICT support moderates the relationship between transactional leadership and affective commitment.
H10 h: ICT support moderates the relationship between decentralization and affective commitment.
H10: ICT support moderates the relationship between formalization and affective commitment.

Based on the literature review, this study examines the relationships between organizational factors (e.g., culture, leadership, and structure) and affective commitment along with the moderating effect of ICT support on the proposed relationships. Figure 1 shows the conceptual framework of this study.

Figure 1. The conceptual framework

METHODOLOGY

For this study, data was collected from 200 respondents by conducting a self-administered questionnaire survey. The Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) approach was followed to analyze data using the statistical software SmartPLS 3 (Ringle et al., 2015). Hair et al. (2017) show that PLS-SEM is suitable for examining structural relationships between complex variables compared to the covariance-based SEM approach or traditional regression analysis.

Case Setting

The reasons behind undertaking this research in this particular context are as follows:

- Bangladesh is an emerging economy with an average GDP growth of more than 6 percent over the last decade (Ministry of Finance, 2017).
- The literature does not show any evidence of studies in this venue relating to organizational factors and employee commitment, considering the possible moderating effect of ICT. An emphasis has been placed on conducting cross-cultural research for validation purposes (Yiing & Ahmad, 2009).
- In Hofstede’s cultural study, India and Pakistan were included but not Bangladesh (Abdullah et al., 2011). The findings could be used to compare the effects of cultural dimensions on employee commitment.
The service industry is a major contributor to its economy. It makes up 52.85 percent of its GDP and employs 36.8 percent of the people.

Sample

There were 152 listed service organizations on the Dhaka Stock Exchange as of July 2017. The participant organizations were chosen at random from an online directory listing of the Dhaka Stock Exchange (http://www.dsebd.org/byindustrylisting1.php). Respondents from each organization were then chosen using the judgmental method. Expert opinions and advice were followed in selecting respondents to closely match the population characteristics.

Measures

To ensure content validity, items of relevant instruments were adopted from past studies and modified for the current context. Measurement instruments for affective commitment and organizational culture were adopted from Meyer et al. (1993) and McKinnon et al. (2003) studies. Dimensions of organizational culture were measured using 18 items (respect for people, four items, team orientation, three items, innovation, five items, stability, three items, and aggressiveness, three items). Items for organizational leadership were adopted from the studies of Mesu et al. (2015) and Lo et al. (2010). Measuring organizational structure and ICT support involved items from Lee & Choi (2003) and Van den Hooff & Huysman (2009), respectively. All these items were considered reliable by all these studies.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The sample mainly included male respondents (91.5 percent) with postgraduate qualifications (88 percent). Most respondents (94 percent) were mid- and low-level managers with more than two years of experience in the current organization. The majority of the responses came from the financial sectors, i.e., banks, insurance, and financing (85 percent), fully locally owned businesses (90 percent), and business with more than 500 employees (82 percent).

PLS-SEM using the SmartPLS 3 application evaluates the measurement and structural models concurrently, therefore, running factor analysis to assess the convergent and discriminant validity and hypothesis testing at the same time (Ringle et al., 2005; Gefen et al., 2000). PLS-SEM helped evaluate the reliability and validity of the measurement model (Almuraqab et al., 2021; Jasimuddin et al., 2015).

The Results of the Measurement Model

The fact is that to test the measurement model, we assessed both convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity was supported after examining Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliabilities, average variance extracted (AVE), and item loadings, as shown in Table 1.
The Cronbach alpha should be greater than 0.7 to indicate strong reliability for a questionnaire content (Cuieford, 1965; Nunnally, 1978). In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha of each construct was greater than 0.7. The smallest at 0.729 indicates strong reliability for our questionnaire content. Discriminant validity for all the variables in the model was measured. Table 2 shows correlations between constructs and results of discriminant validity check using Fornell – Larcker criterion and Heterotrait–Monotrait ratio (HTMT).

Table 1. Construct reliability and validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INOV</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AF = Affective Commitment, RES = Respect for People, TEAM = Team Orientation, INOV = Innovation, STAB = Stability, AGR = Aggressiveness, TF = Transformational Leadership, TS = Transactional Leadership, DEC = Decentralization, FORM = Formalization, ICT = Information and communication technology

Table 2. Correlations and discriminant validity results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>ICT</th>
<th>INOV</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>STAB</th>
<th>TEAM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INOV</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Diagonal and bold values are the square roots of the AVEs
- Off-diagonal values are the correlations between the constructs. Above the diagonal values are the HTMT values.
As shown in Table 2, it is evident that the square root of AVEs on diagonal lines are greater than the correlations between the constructs in the model. HTMT values are also less than 0.90, which is smaller than the recommended threshold (Hair et al., 2017). Thus, discriminant validity for all the variables was achieved.

**The Results of Hypotheses Testing**

As previously mentioned, PLS-SEM analysis is performed to test the hypotheses in this paper, using the statistical software SmartPLS 3 version. Table 6 summarises the parameter estimates, significance levels, and hypotheses test results. The procedure allows us to investigate the relationships between organizational factors (e.g., culture, leadership, and structure) and affective commitment, along with the moderating effect of ICT on the proposed relationships.

Hypothesis 1 predicts that respect for people has a positive effect on affective commitment. Interestingly, the result presents a contradicting picture. The standardised coefficients of respect for people and affective commitment are $-0.199$, and the p-value is 0.042, indicating statistical insignificance. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is not supported.

Hypothesis 2 proposes that team orientation has a significant impact on affective commitment. The standardised coefficients of team orientation and affective commitment are 0.191, and the p-value is 0.043, indicating statistical significance. Thus, Hypothesis 2 is fully supported.

Hypothesis 3 suggests that there is a significant positive impact of innovation on affective commitment. The standardised coefficients of innovation and affective commitment are 0.004, and the p-value is 0.968, indicating statistical significance. Thus, Hypothesis 3 is not supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicts that stability has a positive effect on affective commitment. That is, there is a significant positive relationship between stability and affective commitment. The standardised coefficients of stability and affective commitment are 0.075, and the p-value is 0.289, which is not statistically significant. Thus, Hypothesis 4 is not supported.

Hypothesis 5 proposes that there is a positive impact of aggressiveness on affective commitment. The standardised coefficients of aggressiveness and affective commitment are 0.088, and the p-value is 0.239, indicating statistical insignificance. Thus, Hypothesis 5 is not supported.

Hypothesis 6 predicts that transformational leadership has a significant impact on affective commitment. The standardised coefficients of transformational leadership and affective commitment are 0.305, and the p-value is 0.000, indicating statistical significance. Thus, Hypothesis 6 is supported.

Hypothesis 7 suggests that transactional leadership positively influences affective commitment. The standardised coefficients of transactional leadership and affective commitment are 0.210, and the p-value is 0.011, both of which indicate statistically significant. The results indicate that there is a significant relationship between transactional leadership and affective commitment. Thus, Hypothesis 7 is fully supported.
Hypothesis 8 suggests that decentralization has a positive effect on affective commitment. The standardised coefficients of decentralization and affective commitment are 0.175, and the p-value is 0.005, indicating statistical significance. The results suggest that there is a significant effect of decentralization on affective commitment. Thus, Hypothesis 8 is fully supported.

Hypothesis 9 predicts that formalization has a significant impact on affective commitment. The standardised coefficients of formalization and affective commitment are -0.059, and the p-value is 0.584, indicating statistical insignificance. Thus, Hypothesis 9 is not supported.

Table 3 shows the results of the structural model. Testing for moderation effects involved using the two-stage approach of the interaction term because it is a better technique for finding statistical significance and the most versatile among others (Hair et al., 2017). The results of the moderation effect test are shown in Table 4. As shown in the table, the moderating effect of the ICT variable is only supported for H10-b while showing no statistical significance for others.

The direct effect between variables was tested using bootstrapping with 1000 re-samples before testing the moderation effect. Table 3 shows the results of path analysis for direct effects; only relationships between RES, TEAM, TF, TS DEC, and AF are supported. However, the relationship between RES and AF is significant, but it shows a negative influence. Therefore, the model only supported H2, H6, H7, and H8 while receiving no support for H1, H3, H4, H5, and H9.

Table 3. Structural model results and path analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>Q²</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: RES ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.199</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: TEAM ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: INOV ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: STAB ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: AGR ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: TF ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: TS ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: DEC ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: FORM ® AF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Path analysis (moderation effect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATH</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H10-a: ICT x RES ® AF</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10-b: ICT x TEAM ® AF</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10-c: ICT x INOV ® AF</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10-d: ICT x STAB ® AF</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10-e: ICT x AGR ® AF</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10-f: ICT x TF ® AF</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10-g: ICT x TS ® AF</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10-h: ICT x DEC ® AF</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10-i: ICT x FORM ® AF</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing for moderation effects involved using the two-stage approach of the interaction term because it is a better technique for finding statistical significance and the most versatile among others (Hair et al., 2017). The results of the moderation effect test are shown in Table 4. As shown in the table, the moderating effect of the ICT variable is only supported for H10-b while showing no statistical significance for others.

It is to be noted that the $R^2$ indicates the fraction of total variance in the dependent variable accounted for by those independent. Thus, the bigger the $R^2$, the greater the predictive power of the framework (Weinfurt, 1995). Overall, a substantial amount of the variance is explained by the dependent variable, affective commitment. The $R^2$ value is 0.379, which indicates that the predictor variables (e.g., RES, TEAM, INOV, STAB, AGR, TF, TS, DEC, FORM) explain 37.9% of the variance in the affective commitment variable. The $Q^2$ value is $>0$, which means that the model has predictive relevance. The standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR) is 0.07, which is less than the recommended maximum value of 0.08, indicating that the model fits the empirical data well.

**DISCUSSION**

This study extends the understanding of the relationship between organizational culture, leadership, structure and affective commitment along with the moderating effect of ICT support on the relationships. Its $R^2$ value of 0.578 indicates that a substantial proportion of variance of affective commitment, indeed, is predicted by those independent factors. Most specifically, the paper reveals that two cultural dimensions, namely, respect for people and team orientation, have significant effects on affective commitment. While team orientation positively influences affective commitment, respect for people showed a negative effect. This outcome is partially consistent with the study of McKinnon et al. (2003).

The results indicate that team activity plays a crucial role in developing employees’ affective commitment towards their organization which is quite expected in a country like Bangladesh. It should be highlighted that Bangladesh society is largely collective, with people placing a high value on group cohesiveness and emotional attachment to one another. The negative relationship between respect and commitment, on the other hand, is not quite expected, given that McKinnon et al. (2003) discovered a positive association between respect and affective commitment. It could indicate that people value teamwork positively and remain committed to working despite not being treated with proper respect by their group members. Employees may do this to enhance their self-image, relieve anxiety, and gain acceptance from co-workers who elicit disrespectful behavior (Sleebos et al., 2006).

The cost of leaving the employment (Meyer & Allen, 1991), could also play a role in the context of the Bangladeshi service sector.

In this study, both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors have been found to significantly influence affective commitment. These results thus confirm that the leader’s attitude towards employees has an impact on their commitment levels (Jackson et al., 2013). Though a few studies revealed that transactional leadership had a negative impact on affective commitment, others found that it has a positive advantage. The findings from this study confirm that, in its study context, both motivational and exchange relationship approaches can lead to the development of a ‘desire’ mindset, in other words, affective commitment in the organization. In this context, a flexible approach, rather than viewing these two approaches as two opposite extremes, may be a favorable alternative for organizational leaders. Leaders may positively influence employee commitment levels that cater to both intrinsic and extrinsic (monetary and non-monetary) interests. When employees are educated but lack the required skills and experience economic hardship – a typical context in the current study; the influence of both leadership styles on organizational commitment may not be cause for concern, as there are exceptions to the universality of the leadership models (Bass, 1996).
Decentralization in the current study significantly influenced affective commitment while formalization did not, which is quite consistent with previous studies (e.g., Smeenk et al., 2006). Employees in the service sector of the Bangladeshi economy value autonomous decision making and nurture the notion of developing a sense of responsibility, self-worth, emotional attachment, and commitment by identifying themselves with the organizations that they work for.

A significant moderating effect of ICT is only found between team orientation and affective commitment. Other relationships between identified dimensions of culture, leadership style and affective commitment are not moderated by the presence of ICT support. This could mean that ICT employees feel compelled to use the ICT platform more frequently when working in groups. This is quite expected in a collaborative culture where teamwork involves information sharing, frequent interaction and learning from one another (Gelbard & Carmeli, 2009). In general, Bangladeshis face difficulty in using ICT systems as they are not fluent in English language, resulting in limited exposure to the system and inadequate knowledge and skills required for successful adoption (Khan et al., 2012). Therefore, it is not surprising to discover that the current ICT system has a limited moderating effect. However, it is interesting to note that people have different perspectives on technology when it comes to working as a group.

The findings of this study could assist managers in formulating appropriate strategies to enhance employee commitment in their service organizations. The key lessons that are learned from this research are as follows:

- Only team orientation showed a significant positive effect on commitment among the different cultural dimensions that are used in this study. This emphasizes the value of team-based activity in the context of Bangladeshi service organizations.
- Affective commitment is significantly influenced by both transformational and transactional leadership. Only one approach adopted by the leader may be ineffective and inadequate.
- Decentralization enhances organizational commitment, whereas formalization did not show any significant effect. Employees in the context of the country may feel more motivated to work efficiently when they are encouraged to practice autonomy in decision-making while adhering to the guidelines established by the organizations.
- ICT support moderated the relationship between team orientation and commitment; this suggests that technology facilitates group cohesion and managers may not have to deal with employee resistance to accepting the ICT platform to work collectively and achieve group objectives.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This investigation focused on the integrated influence of organizational factors on employee affective commitment and the moderating effect of ICT on the identified relationships in the context of service organizations based in Bangladesh. The findings demonstrate that affective commitment is directly influenced by team orientation, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and decentralization, while ICT moderates the relationship between team orientation and affective commitment. However, the paper is not free from limitations that warrant future research. Data was collected from a single country (Bangladesh), and it is recommended that further research be done in similar cultures to compare and verify the results. The current model does not consider the impact of employee personal characteristics on the organizational factors and affective commitment relationships. Future studies can treat this variable as a moderating factor to uncover new insights. Because this study is mainly based on data acquired from financial organizations, generalizing the results across other industries should be done with caution. Future research may shed light on other organizations from different industries. While interaction effects were investigated as part of the moderation analysis, in the future, researchers may opt for multi-group analysis for further comparisons.
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