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Abstract

Employee Psychological Well-Being (PWB) is a pertinent factor that impacts organizational effectiveness. There remained ample evidence of the various antecedents that impacted employees’ PWB. One core concept of maintaining a relationship with PWB is an employee’s organizational commitment. However, little was known about how an employee can further promote their PWB through voice behavior. Noting the importance of PWB, it was pertinent that a particular stream of research addressed the gap and examined the extent to which the three types of employee organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) correlated with the two types of employee’s voice behavior (e.g., self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior) causing differing levels of employee’s PWB. The lack of understanding regarding the vital organizational dynamic commenced the current study. The data analysis provides valuable insight to closing the gap within the literature and assists managers when aiming to implement feasible strategies that better assist employees with enhancing their voice patterns to support a healthy working environment that further leads to increased levels of PWB.
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Section 1: Foundation of the Study

Background of the Study

The enigmas that inundate the quest for individual well-being have been regarded as a topic of interest to academics and the general public for an extended time (Wright & Cropanzano, 2001). Numerous studies have determined the antecedents of the concept. Additionally, an employee's well-being is a crucial factor that impacts organizations' ongoing survival and future development worldwide (Spreitzer & Porath, 2012). For example, Ryff (1989) concluded that an individual with good mental health maintains healthy functionality levels. Psychological Well-Being (PWB) is utilized in the literature to define an employee's comprehensive well-being in an organization (Zheng et al., 2015). Moreover, PWB gained immense attention throughout various disciplines (Huang, 2017). PWB directly affects employee's work on an individual level as well as daily organizational functioning (Žižek et al., 2015).

Prior research centers on the notion that employees' well-being is the passive recipient of factors that affect their PWB. For example, leadership styles (Kelloway et al., 2012), employee engagement (Robertson & Cooper, 2010), and management behavior (Gilbreath & Benson, 2004) are all noted within the literature as being vital management concerns impacting an employee's working environment. It is noteworthy that working environments largely contribute to an employee's PWB (Chung-Yan, 2010). Another core concept with ample evidence presented in the literature as impacting an employee's PWB is organizational commitment (Gallie et al., 2017; Clausen et al., 2015; Vecina & Chacón, 2013; Harris & Cameron, 2005). However, the impact of organizational commitment on voice behavior remained lacking within the literature. It
is noted that organizational commitment is a concept that affects employee responses (Si & Li, 2012).

Furthermore, employees who witness higher levels of commitment to their organization are more apt to witness improvements within their working environment, consequently increasing the likelihood of an employee's engagement in voice behavior versus remaining silent, risking the infringement of a potential decline in their working environment (Withey & Cooper, 1989). It is important to note that while management plays a crucial role in providing a working environment that shapes an employee's PWB, employees, especially those who have a higher level of commitment, are more likely to express feedback that positively modifies their work environment (Withey & Cooper, 1989) and consequently, has positive psychological well-being. However, little was known about how an employee can further promote their PWB through voice behavior. Noting the importance of PWB, it was pertinent that a particular stream of research addressed the gap and examined the extent to which the three types of employee organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) correlated with the two types of employee's voice behavior (e.g., self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior) which consequently resulted in differing levels of employees PWB. From a general perspective, the differing levels of PWB consequently resulted in a lack of understating regarding this vital organizational dynamic.

**Problem Statement**

The general problem addressed is the lack of analysis regarding the relationship between organizational commitment and an employee's PWB resulting in inconclusive findings on the relationship between organizational commitment and PWB. Schulz et al. (2017) noted that organizational commitment maintains a significant relationship with well-being. Contrastingly,
another study noted organizational commitment as having differing impacts on well-being (Kam et al., 2016). Despite the contrasting perspectives, little research effort was executed to reconcile these differing views through integrating and analyzing an employee's voice behavior. An essential element of PWB is one's perceived ability to express and use their voice (Conway et al., 2016). In other words, employee voice behavior is a critical mechanism that solidifies and provides a conclusive relationship between organizational commitment and PWB. Hence, the existing inconclusive findings of the organizational commitment and PWB relationship were explained by increasing the general understanding of the role of an employee's voice in the organizational commitment and PWB relationship. The specific problem addressed was the lack of analysis regarding the relationship between organizational commitment (e.g., normative, affective, and continuance commitment) and an employee's PWB, which resulted in the existing inconclusive findings of the relationship between organizational commitment (e.g., normative, affective, and continuance commitment) and employee's PWB among service workers in the Permian Basin region of West Texas.

**Purpose Statement**

This quantitative study aimed to add to the body of knowledge by examining and generating a greater understanding of the relationship between an employee's organizational commitment and an employee's voice behavior and determining the correlation between an employee's voice behavior with an employee's PWB. The more significant problem of the study was examined through the utilization of previously developed questionnaires aimed at measuring an employee's organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and an employee's PWB. At the same time, new scales were developed to measure an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused voice
behavior) at service industries located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. More specifically, the purpose of this quantitative study was twofold. First, the relationship between an employee's organizational commitment, normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment and an employee's utilization of self-and other-focused voice behavior was examined. Second, the study examined the relationship between an employee's self- and other-focused voice behavior and an employee's PWB. By analyzing the relationship between the three types of organizational commitment and the two types of employee voice behavior, the researcher determined whether a correlative relationship existed between an employee's organizational commitment and the utilization of an employee's self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior.

This determination enables future managers to understand the engagement patterns regarding self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior based on an employee's organizational commitment. Said differently, the researcher aimed to determine whether a correlative relationship existed between the three forms of organizational commitment and an employee's voice behavior concerning the two forms of voice behavior analyzed in the study. For example, was an employee who experienced a particular organizational commitment utilizing one of the noted voice behaviors? Furthermore, the researcher determined whether a correlation existed between an employee's PWB and an employee's self-and other-focused voice behavior.

**Research Question**

The research questions are derived directly from the purpose of the study. More specifically, each research question determined the extent to which a significant correlation existed between one variable and another variable. These specific research questions measured
the degree of association with one another and served as the essential platform for determining whether a statistically significant correlation resided between variables.

RQ1. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee's normative commitment and employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior?

RQ2. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee's affective commitment and employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior?

RQ3. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee's continuance commitment and employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior?

RQ4. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between employee's self-focused voice behavior on an employee's PWB?

RQ5. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between employee's other-focused voice behavior on an employee's PWB?

**Hypotheses**

The formulated hypotheses were designed to answer each proposed research question previously mentioned. The first three hypotheses (e.g., Ho1, H_{A1}, Ho2, H_{A2}, Ho3, and H_{A3}) answered the first three research questions. The last two hypotheses (e.g., Ho4, H_{A4}, Ho5, and H_{A5}) answered research questions four and five.

H_{O1}: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee's normative commitment and self-focused and other-focused voice behavior.

H_{A1}: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee's normative commitment and an employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior.

H_{O2}: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee's affective commitment and an employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior.
HA2: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee's affective commitment and an employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior.

HO3: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee's continuance commitment and an employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior.

HA3: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee's continuance commitment and an employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior.

HO4: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee's self-focused voice behavior and an employee's PWB.

HA4: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee's self-focused voice behavior and an employee's PWB.

HO5: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee's other-focused voice behavior and an employee's PWB.

HA5: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee's other-focused voice behavior and an employee's PWB.

**Nature of the Study**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) noted that selecting an appropriate research method is not intrinsically tied to one kind of method over another. However, the decision as to which method to utilize resides in the purpose of the research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Furthermore, a research method is an assistance mechanism used to aid the researcher with the identification of validated strengths, therein accomplishing the previously noted primary purpose of the study (Morgan, 2014). The primary purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between an employee's organizational commitment with an employee's voice behavior and how, subsequently, this
correlated with an employee's voice behaviors and an employee's PWB of employees within service industries located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas.

**Discussion of a Fixed Design**

A fixed design was chosen for this research project. Ultimately this translates into the notion that prior to the execution of the data collection, the mechanisms and theoretical framework were previously established. Quantitative research is a viable approach to testing theories objectively and examining relationships among variables (Creswell, 2014). Moreover, the purpose of this study centered on determining the extent to which a correlation existed between noted variables. The instruments used to answer the research questions and fulfill the study's purpose were determined prior to the attainment of data from the intended sample.

The reason for choosing a fixed research design was that quantitative research is generally an approach used to examine theories. In contrast, a mixed-methods approach focuses on collecting quantitative and qualitative data and further integrating the two forms (Creswell, 2014). The instruments used for measuring the dimensions of organizational commitment (normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and PWB were previously developed. Moreover, making these instruments as fixed elements with no proposed changes. The dimensions of an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused) did not have a measurement scale. However, the researcher developed the needed scale and further utilized the scale study.

**Discussion of Method**

The researcher utilized a quantitative method to examine the relationships between variables. Specifically, the researcher used this method to determine the extent to which a significant correlation existed between an employee's organizational commitment (normative
commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused) was examined. Following this notion, the researcher used this method to determine the extent to which a significant correlation existed between an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused) and an employee's PWB. A quantitative method was chosen because it allowed the researcher to establish the correlation between the noted relationships that existed between variables (Creswell, 2014).

A qualitative study was eliminated because this type of study focuses on theory development and individual interpretation and remains subjective by nature (2014). A quantitative study tests a specific theory maintains numbers as the essential element of analysis and is objective by nature (Creswell, 2014). A qualitative study focused on interpreting experiences and interactions versus utilizing numerical data as the primary mechanism of establishing conclusions (McCusker & Gunaydin, 2015). The utilization of numerical data obtained from the sample population will aid in determining the extent to which a significant correlation existed between each variable. A quantitative method is noted within the literature as referring to a standardized set of questionnaires administered to individuals where the individuals are identified through different forms of sampling (Dudwick et al., 2006).

More specifically, the study utilized a non-experimental quantitative method. This selection of a non-experimental quantitative design was most appropriate because the researcher utilized a survey methodology approach to gather data from voluntary participants. The data further assisted with determining to what extent each of the research's variables correlated with one another (Creswell, 2014).
Summary of the Nature of Study

The significance of the study was discussed in the previous portion. The researcher provided a clear indication of how the study reduced the gaps within the literature. Furthermore, the Biblical integration and relationship to cognate were discussed. The noted areas provide valuable insight regarding the significant impact the study may have in an organizational setting.

Theoretical Framework

The theories chosen to form the fundamental theoretical framework for this quantitative study are the Social Exchange Theory and the Conservation of Resource Theory. In the next portion, each theory is conceptually summarized and applied to the key variables analyzed within the study.

Social Exchange Theory

The fundamental premise of the Social Exchange Theory (SET) is the notion of relationships developing over time (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). These relationships are based on the fundamental rules of exchange (Blau, 1964). One of the dominant rules within an exchange is the rule of reciprocity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Gouldner, 1960; Thomas et al., 2012). Stated, the rule of reciprocity notes that an individual who feels as though he or she is being respected and treated relatively will reciprocate the same amount of respect and fairness in return (Thomas et al., 2012).

SET, Organizational Commitment, and Voice Behavior

Social exchange theorists have stated that employees who witness organizational satisfaction and are emotionally committed to their organization witness increased motivation levels and provide constructive feedback regarding potential changes or adaptations (Thomas et al., 2012). This type of engagement is a means for an employee committed to their organization
to demonstrate reciprocity. The demonstration of reciprocity originates from the organizational relationship between the employee and the organization. With regards to organizational commitment, this concept, as previously noted, represents and embodies employees who are committed to their organization (Chun et al., 2013). Specifically, this relationship centers on the exchange between the two parties in which respect has initially been displayed and then reciprocated. Said differently, employees exhibit voice behavior aiming to reciprocate for the favorable treatment they have received through their employment relations (Burris et al., 2008; Choi, 2007; Fuller et al., 2006; Thomas et al., 2012).

At a glance, an employee's voice behavior is heavily noted as having a direct relationship with an employee's positive attitude toward his or her job as well as a positive reflection of the organization in which they represent (Spencer, 1986; Thomas et al., 2012; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Generally speaking, voice behavior maintains the capabilities of vastly influencing the success of an organization. This type of influence remains essential, especially during times of constant change and evolution, for it is voice behavior that will facilitate and foster necessary change and innovation (Crant et al., 2011; Huang et al., 2005; Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998). Said differently, voice behavior is a prominent behavior that remains important and valued within organizations due to the notion that competitive environment ideas, input, and suggestions cannot merely originate from top management alone (Detert & Burris, 2007).

Voice behavior is regarded in the literature as an extra role behavior that remains positive and engaged discretionarily (Organ et al., 2006). Given the importance of voice behavior and its impacts on an organization, it has become essential that researchers further investigate the antecedents of voice behavior. Organizational commitment is a robust predictor of voice behavior that remains dominant within the literature. Specifically, it is noted that organizational
commitment has a positive impact on employee voice behavior (Ekrot et al., 2016; Fuller et al., 2006; Withey & Cooper, 1989). For example, Fuller et al. (2006) stated that individuals who tend to execute voice behavior within an organizational setting are those who consistently support organizational goals. Therefore, are those who divest energy in expressing constructive ideas geared towards overcoming negative criticism that may hinder or prevent the accomplishment of these organizational goals.

The demonstration of reciprocity originates from the organizational relationship between the employee and the organization. Specifically, this relationship is based upon the exchange between the two parties in which respect has initially been displayed and then reciprocated. Said differently, employees exhibit voice behavior aiming to reciprocate for the favorable treatment they have received through their employment relations (Burris, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008; Choi, 2007; Fuller et al., 2006; Thomas et al., 2012). Thomas et al. (2012) note that the SET theory primarily suggests when employees engage in voice behavior that, the use of their voice is other-directed. Conceptually speaking, this represents the concept of one individual engaging in a good deed for another individual on the premises that they receive favorable treatment from the other party at a future time (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Van Dyne and LePine (1998) conceptually define employee voice as a proactive behavior that verbally expresses and provide feedback to improve versus criticism.

**Conservation of Resource Theory**

Hobfoll's (1989) Conservation of Resource (COR) theory's central focal point is centered upon the tenet that individuals are motivated to protect their resources and acquire new resources. Within the literature, the term resources conceptually refer to states, conditions, objects, or various other entities that individuals assign value to (e.g., time, emotional energy and
physical energy, etc.) (Hobfoll, 1989). Furthermore, the COR theory aims to explain the nature of stress and the coping mechanisms individuals develop as reactionary tools when confronted with stress (Hobfoll, 1989). Thomas et al. (2012) note that COR theory assumes that individuals are hedonistic by nature and are motivated to acquire and protect their resources. Said differently, individuals become motivated by creating new situations that further promote favorable outcomes and tend to stay clear of situations that could lead to depletion or loss of resources.

**COR, Voice Behavior, and Psychological Well-Being**

Regarding the COR theory, there are vast amounts of studies about various disciplines within management that aim to apply the tenet of resource loss and analyze its impacts. A large portion of the research has applied the tenet within organizational settings that maintain high-stress levels. The empirical studies note that the loss of resources within an organizational setting commence employee burnout (Schaufeli et al., 2009), increased levels of depression and anxiety (Tremblay, & Messervey, 2011), loss of a sense of purpose (Baranik et al., 2019), and decreased job performance (Halbesleben et al., 2013).

On the contrast, this tenet has an embedded motivational element (Halbesleben et al., 2014). Specifically, this tent suggests that individuals will actively engage in behaviors aimed at the direct avoidance of resource loss (Hobfoll, 1989). This is notably tied to the notion that resource loss negativity impacts an individual's well-being. In support of this notion, Whitman, Halbesleben, and Homles (2014) found that employees who are subjected to reduced resources in a situation characterized by abusive supervision are more likely to engage in avoidance tactics to eliminate further resource loss that is a direct consequence of continual interaction with an abusive supervisor.
Voice serves as a vital tool for all employees within the workplace. Essentially, for an employee to share thoughts, ideas, and concerns, they must make themselves heard among others. This ultimately would require an employee to increase the time and effort needed to articulate, defend, and answer any concerns from the execution of the employee's voice behavior (Luria et al., 2009). The two fundamental tenets embedded within the COR theory present two contrasting predictions regarding the utilization of voice behavior (Thomas et al., 2012).

The primary tenet of resource loss Hobfoll (1989) argues that an employee with high-stress levels becomes less likely to utilize voice behavior. This notion is primarily tied to the general assumption that the utilization of voice consumes resources, which in this sense, an employee is aiming to avoid. Moreover, within the literature, it is noted that employees who were willing to take the initiative experienced higher personal costs (e.g., role overload, job stress, and work-to-family conflict) (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). In contrast, the resource investment tenet within the COR theory proposes that individuals aim to eliminate resource loss as a result of resource loss and recourse acquisition (HobFoll, 1997).

Furthermore, one can argue that an employee may use more voice as a means of investment. This investment would serve the individual in the future by enabling them to acquire new resources. Moreover, individuals may be willing to invest more resources into a situation that requires an increase in voice if the initial investment could consequently lead to additional resources to alleviate a problem (Thomas et al., 2012). For example, an employee who oversees a stocking department might need more part-time assistance to eliminate the high cost associated with overtime. For the employee to acquire the needed assistance, he or she will need to increase voice behavior. This voice behavior will represent expressing the concern to a supervisor. This notion is all in the aspiration of acquiring new resources. However, the acquisition will fall
behind with the initial investment of increased voice behavior commenced by the original employee within the situation.

The evolution and complexity presented in various working environments have caused the concept of well-being to become increasingly important (Park et al., 2017). PWB is conceptually defined as an individual's efforts geared toward pursuing perfection that is representational of acknowledging one's true potential (Ryff, 1995). Said differently, PWB translates into the notion of an individual who experiences increased levels of positive emotions, further witnessing increased satisfaction levels from a general perspective (Park et al., 2017). It is noted within the literature that PWB is associated with positive results within an organizational setting, such as increased work performance among employees (Maziriri et al., 2019). Additionally, Wright and Cropanzano (2000) determined that several overall significant benefits derive from PWB, which include increased cognitive functioning and health, consequently leading to optimal happy functioning of society. Noting the organizational benefits and the benefits PWB renders on society, it becomes pertinent to understand better the concepts that lead to increased levels of PWB.

**Theory Presentation Summary**

Essentially, all the discussed variables included in this quantitative study maintain the capabilities of positively impacting organizational outcomes. Noting the importance of the variables, further analysis of the variables' impact upon one another becomes a priority. The SET theory provides the vital framework needed to understand better how employees may choose to execute or their voice behavior. Additionally, the COR presents two tenants within the theory that aim to justify using voice behavior. Moreover, the theory addresses the motivational aspects tied to voice utilization.
Definition of Key Terms

The following terms are defined relative to their use within the research.

Affective Organizational Commitment: Refers to individuals who choose to continue into a future tense with the organization because the organization's values, goals, and initiatives are closely related to the employee's personal views (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015).

Continuance Organizational Commitment: Refers to individuals who remain at an organization because leaving is considerably too high, and the cost of vacating the organization provides nothing to gain (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015).

Normative Organizational Commitment: Refers to individuals with a sense of obligation to continue with a particular organization because he or she feels as though they are expected to remain or have devoted too much time to the organization to leave (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015).

Organizational Commitment: Organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct that has been a dominant topic within the management literature for an extended time (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Luchak & Gellatly, 2007).

Other-Focused Voice Behavior: Represents an employee's proactive attempts to convey opinions about changing others' and the organization's conditions (Chou & Barron, 2016).

Psychological Well-Being: An essential employee variable directly linked to employee-oriented outcomes, which encompass a wide range of mental and physical health issues (Robertson & Cooper, 2010). The study will aim to include the hedonic and eudemonic approaches to PWB. Hedonic reflects upon well-being with the experience of positive feelings with the integration of overall life satisfaction (Robertson & Cooper, 2010). At the same time,
the eudemonic approach reflects upon well-being with the integration of the importance of the purpose in well-being (Roberston & Cooper, 2010).

Self-Focused Voice Behavior: Represents an employee's proactive attempts to convey opinions about changing his or her conditions (Chou & Barron, 2016).

Voice Behavior: Employee voice behavior, conceptually speaking, refers to an employee's informal discretionary behavior that is categorized as an upward communication mechanism geared towards creating awareness regarding ideas, solutions, or areas of concern within an organization (Duan, Li, Xu, & Wu, 2017; Morrison, 2014; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

Assumptions, Limitations, Delimitations

Assumptions aim to reflect the entities upon which the researcher will rely in their study that remains accurate to the best of their knowledge without verification. Moreover, limitations are the uncontrollable factors that potentially may impact the levels of validity within the research. In comparison, delimitations refer to the factors that fall within the researcher's scope of control, which the researcher may further limit to control the scope boundaries of the research. This current body of research remains bounded by various assumptions, limitations, and delimitations.

Assumptions

Several assumptions guided this study. First, it was assumed that each participant who completed a survey did so truthfully and honestly. It is noted within the literature that although researchers remain hopeful that all participants will complete a survey with thoughtful and truthful responses, that does not always happen (Desimone et al., 2015). One way noted within the literature to overcome the potential of a participant’s untruthful or unthoughtful responses is to ensure and reiterate anonymity and confidentiality (Simon, 2011). Specifically, the researcher
articulated that both anonymity and confidentiality were not only of the utmost importance, but the preservation of both elements was a core priority of the study. Upon reviewing the literature, there were several obvious ways to overcome this area of concern. Specifically, the researcher provided a paragraph to all participants prior to engaging in the execution of the survey that participation is voluntary and they may withdraw from the study at any time with no ramifications. Additionally, the researcher followed suggestions implemented by Wouters et al. (2014), where the researcher explained several core aspects of anonymity. The noted paragraph previously mentioned additionally included: 1) the gathering of data was 100% anonymous, 2) the name of any participant was never disclosed, and 3) all survey information was kept confidential by the researcher.

Second, it was assumed that the number of valid responses utilized is large enough to ensure a valid study. Self-reported survey data remains a prevalent and viable mechanism to collect data from a specified sample. This was primarily due to the potential to obtain many responses while not making large monetary investments and eliminating significant time commitments (Schwarz, 1999). The sample for the study focused on oil and gas service workers in the Permian Basin region of west Texas. This region includes the Texas cities of Midland, Odessa, and San Angelo. According to the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association (TIPRO), in 2019, 87,603 individuals were employed directly by the oil and gas industry within the Permian Basin Region. The sample size for this study was determined at a 95% confidence interval level and a sampling error of .05, which conclusively rendered 383 responses from oil and gas service workers within the Permian Basin region of west Texas.

Third, the researcher assumed that the study would not subject any participants to an increased risk. Said differently, every individual encounters various levels of risk within their
regular daily routine. By agreeing to participate in this study voluntarily, the researcher assumed the participation would not increase an individual's level of risk. Specifically, the researcher assumed this study would not further subject any participant to additional increased risk than they may have encountered within their regular daily routine. Upon reviewing the information published by the *Institutional Review Board Guidebook*, it was apparent that while participants are completing the survey, there is a probability they may encounter various feelings while thinking or responding to their behavior. The research did not increase the minimal risk associated with an individual's everyday living. Minimal risk is conceptually referred to as the amount of risk that is no greater than what an individual may encounter in his or her everyday activities (National Research Council, 2013). Moreover, within the guidebook, it is additionally noted that most of the psychological risks remained minimal. In order to mitigate the potential increased exposure to any form of psychological risk the participant may encounter, the researcher followed the procedure and allowed Liberty University's Internal Review Board (IRB) to confront the possibility of any increased exposure to psychological risk.

**Limitations**

Limitations within this study existed and are acknowledged within this section. First, one core limitation was the self-selection portion in which the research utilized to obtain sample data is not considered an accurate probability sample. The benefit of a self-selection survey administration is that the mechanism remains cost-effective and provides fast responses (Bethlehem, 2010). However, this remained a limitation within the study because the researcher had no control over the self-selection process (Bethlehem, 2010). Hence, the researcher did not control who decided to self-select themselves and participate in the survey. Noting the time
considerations and larger sample size required to render conclusive results, the self-selection mechanism was most feasible.

Moreover, the probability sample was not considered random. The primary sample for the study focused on service industry workers located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. This sample represents the entire target population of service workers in West Texas. However, because the researcher utilized self-selection as the primary means for data obtainment, the likelihood that one participant has the same or equal chance of being selected is not equally distributed. Said differently, Jackson (2012) notes that a random sample regards a sample where each member of a noted population has an equal likelihood of being chosen to participate in the study. One way to overcome this noted limitation was to extend the need for future research regarding a future study that adopts a survey approach for data obtainment that does not follow self-selection. One possible approach would be to distribute surveys through the mail physically.

Second, as noted, the data used in the study's analysis portion was limited to those service industry workers in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. There were no further restrictions placed on a particular service industry in which a worker must be employed to participate in this study. It is important to note that this study did not limit participation to one particular organization. Hence, willing participants could participate as long as they worked in the service industry located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. Thus, the findings from this research provided a limitation concerning generalizability. Specifically, the results do not apply to workers outside of the service industry or the entire population of service workers. This limitation provides the opportunity for future research. An example would be using the same model, theoretical framework, and instrument to survey a different sample.
Third, the cross-sectional design aimed to utilize data derived from individuals of various ages within the same time frame (Jackson, 2012. A cross-sectional design cannot be utilized to produce or demonstrate causal interferences (LePine et al., 2005). Furthermore, self-reported data could lead to various forms of method biases. For example, this could potentially translate into the notion that individuals could have responded in a biased manner based merely on their current perception of the organization. It is important to note that biased responses can be linked to various motivational factors that the participant aimed to satisfy. In addition to answering questions based on the current organizational perceptions, participants might have sought to answer the questionnaire in a socially appropriate manner. In most social research, it has long been an assumption that participants will respond with a genuine answer that reflects their behavior in a congruent way with their attitudes. However, the evidence for this statement can be regarded as weak (Foddy, 1993). Hence, this is an assumption that the researcher sought to overcome.

This study maintained the assumption that respondents accurately answered questions that provided the utmost congruency between behavior and attitudes. However, some participants may have responded with an answer they feel is socially desirable. Social desirability refers to a response provided by a participant that is deemed to be socially appropriate versus the genuine attitude or behavior the individual maintains (Lavrakas, 2008). This is typically used as an avoidance mechanism exercised with the intent of eliminating or experiencing unwanted negative evaluations (Lavrakas, 2008). Consequently, this leads to the production of socially desirable responses.

Moreover, this notion directly references the participant's tendency to respond to questions that make them feel good. One way to overcome this biased response is to ensure all
respondents' anonymity (Grover & Vriens, 2006). This type of assurance was more prevalent when the social distance between the interviewer and the respondent was minor (Grover & Vriens, 2006). Hence, within a small social distance, the interviewer may be able to determine each participant's responses.

Lastly, the study did not consider the overall organizational climate. Specifically, the various organizational climates might have presented increased opportunities for voice behavior to be present. However, it is essential to note that the organizational climate maintains the capabilities of influencing organizational commitment (Berberoglu, 2018; Koloor, 2018) and PWB (Worthington, 2012). For example, some industries may present more significant opportunities for career growth. Ultimately, this would transpire in various organizational commitments being exhibited by employees.

Moreover, if organizational culture is centered upon active employee participation, employees are more likely to experience an increased level of PWB. This is tied to the notion that employee participation positively influences an employee's PWB (Loon et al., 2018, 2019). Much like the other noted limitations, this limitation presented opportunities for future research directions, allowing the current study to be extended and additional variables to be integrated. For example, the organizational climate might be considered a possible moderating variable.

Delimitations

The delimitations of this study included time, location, and population. With time being limited for this study, the researcher could not conduct the study over a more extended period or multiple time frames. The study also only included responses from a sample bound to the Permian Basin region of West Texas. The study did not include responses from other geographic regions. This would ultimately present the opportunity for a future longitudinal study with the
analysis variables remaining constant, whereas the location and population would be subject to change. Said differently, future research avenues can execute a study that integrates the same analysis variables but may consider a different geographic location instead of the Permian Basin region of West Texas and include participants from a different industry. All of these variables provide clear future research directions.

More specifically, the study was regarded as utilizing a non-experimental quantitative method. This selection of a non-experimental quantitative design is most appropriate because of the need for the administration of a sample population to obtain the needed data to examine further the variables' impact on one another (Creswell, 2014).

**Significance of the Study**

This particular study reduced the gaps within current management literature. Additionally, the study served as a vital aid in advancing the knowledge surrounding the dimensions of voice behavior. Specifically, this study addressed the gap in the literature that pertains to the correlation between an employee's organizational commitment, in the forms of normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment, and an employee's utilization of self-and other-focused voice behavior was determined. Following the outcome of this correlation, the study reduced the gaps within the literature that did not effectively address the extent to which an employee's self-and other-focused voice behavior impacted his or her PWB.

Past research focused on employees being the passive recipient of factors that affect their PWB. Noting this finding and exploring the factors that impact an employee's PWB provided the conclusion that organizational commitment remains a dominant factor impacting an employee's PWB (Gallie et al., 2017; Clausen et al., 2015; Vecina & Chacón, 2013; Harris & Cameron,
2005). This area presents a noteworthy future that needs to explore further. However, the impact of organizational commitment on voice behavior remained lacking within the literature.

The Biblical implications of this research are related to serving others within a professional setting and further ensuring an employee's PWB. Moreover, this specific topic is relevant to the strategic management field for several reasons, including that many managers rely upon employees to utilize voice behavior to ensure effective and efficient communication. This type of communication is beneficial on an individual level and a collective level to the organization. The exchange of information, concerns, ideas, or thoughts between managers and employees enables relationships to be commenced and maintained. The elimination of communication presents vast areas of concern that can significantly impact an employee's PWB. Moreover, the study's findings enable future managers to understand the engagement patterns regarding self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior based on an employee's organizational commitment

**Reduction of Gaps**

As previously noted, PWB remains one of the most crucial factors that determine employee outcomes such as turnover intention (Brunetto et al., 2013; Harris & Cameron, 2005), job satisfaction (Brunetto et al., 2013; Proudfoot et al., 2009), and workplace engagement (Parker et al., 2012). Many studies have been conducted on organizational commitment in normative commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and voice behavior. For example, it is noted within the literature that employees with high levels of affective organizational commitment are more likely to engage in proactive behaviors through the utilization of behaviors like employee voice (Chen & Aryee, 2007; Ekrot et al., 2016). It is important to note that although the relationship between organizational commitment and employee voice is fully
supported within the literature, these studies only focused on various types of voice (e.g., acquiescent, defensive, prosocial, etc.). Noting this infringement, it was pertinent to the execution and analysis of the study that the researcher developed the needed scale. Developing the needed scale to measure self-focused and other-focused voice behavior narrowed the scope of the research. This notion allowed the extent to which employee self- and other-focused voice behavior correlated with an employee's psychological well-being to be determined. Consequently, the conclusions allow managers to minimize turnover intentions, increase job satisfaction, and commence workplace engagement, increasing organizational effectiveness.

**Implications for Biblical Integration**

Proverbs 16:3 states, "Commit your work to the Lord, and your plans will be established" (Women’s Devotional Bible, New International Version, 2012, Proverbs 16:3). Aiming and striving to ensure the establishment of plans derives from the notion and ability to commence cultivation. The term cultivation can apply to a wide variety of entities. However, cultivation in the sense of work can be described as striving to make something better. As individuals, we cultivate the areas we choose to commit to directly within our lives. This additionally includes cultivation within an organizational setting. For cultivation to occur, commitment and dedication overtime must be present. This would include but is not limited to committing and dedicating oneself to their organization.

Moreover, ensuring something is made better over time includes sharing thoughts, ideas, and concerns. These entities derive from the notion of being able to diagnose and determine the proper course of action. Following this thought pattern, determining the course of action that is most beneficial directly influences an individual's well-being, which was the focus of the study.

**Relationship to Cognate**
Managers are tasked with the duty of ensuring organizational effectiveness. At the same time, employee PWB is heavily noted in the literature as a vital factor determining employee effectiveness. Conceptually speaking, employee effectiveness impacts whether or not an employee is able and capable of performing their tasks. The inability to properly execute and complete the task will bestow adverse impacts on a manager's primary goal of ensuring organizational effectiveness. Noting this infringement, it becomes pertinent that managers create working environments that commence, facilitate, and maintain high levels of employee effectiveness. One way to accomplish this task is to create environments where employees can openly share thoughts, ideas, and concerns with managers. This type of exchange is dispersed through voice behavior and is linked to positive organizational outcomes (Rasheed et al., 2017). Moreover, those employees with higher levels of commitment are more likely to express their feedback that positively modifies their work environment (Withey & Cooper, 1989) and, consequently, have positive psychological well-being.

However, little was known about how an employee can further promote their PWB through voice behavior. The importance of PWB has been previously mentioned. The next course of action was to establish a specific stream of research that was aimed at addressing the existent gap in determining the extent to which the three types of employee organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) correlated with the two types of employee's voice behavior (e.g., self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior) which resulted in differing levels of employees PWB. Through this establishment, managers now have the vital knowledge necessary to create environments that support the needed employee actions that promote PWB through voice behavior.

A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature


**Organizational Commitment**

There is a multitude of definitions that aim to define organizational commitment. For example, organizational commitment refers to the level of identification and individual involvement an individual has in their organization (Chun et al., 2013; Mowday et al., 1982). Conceptually speaking, organizational commitment refers to an individual's psychological state that, in return, commences the individual to feel bonded to the organization in which he or she serves (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Moreover, organizational commitment has been elucidated as one's attachment to their organization (Iqbal et al., 2014). Adding to this definition, commitment is a term that relates directly to the mental and emotional states of individuals that further drive how an individual identifies with their organization, ultimately determining an individual's engagement and value they perceive as being a member of the associated organization (Marique & Stinglhamber, 2011). The organizational commitment remains a dominant area of concern for organizations due to the favorable outcomes which bond produces. For example, some of the essential outcomes associated with organizational commitment are turnover reduction (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), increased levels of job satisfaction (Currivan, 2000), employee effectiveness, and job satisfaction (Salman et al., 2014). Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed a model of organizational commitment that embodied three distinct components (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment).

An employee experiencing normative organizational commitment possess a sense of obligation to continue with a particular organization because he or she feels as though they are expected to remain or has devoted too much time to the organization to leave (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015). Employees experiencing affective organizational commitment choose to continue into a future tense with the organization because
the organization's values, goals, and initiatives are closely related to the employee's personal views (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015). Lastly, employees who experience continuance organizational commitment remain at an organization because the cost of leaving is considered too high, and the cost of vacating the organization provides nothing to gain (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015).

**Normative Commitment**

Normative commitment has been previously conceptualized and present within the organizational commitment portion of the literature review. However, it is crucial to analyze this commitment form with further scrutiny and analysis. Within the literature, normative commitment is consequently presented when an individual intrinsically presents a moral duty to repay the organization in which he or she is employed. Moral responsibility is presented within an individual when they seek to serve their organization as a repayment mechanism explicitly aimed at the benefits the individual has previously received from the organization (Yucel et al., 2014). This form of commitment is believed to develop when a psychological contract is commenced and executed between an organization and an employee (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Yucel et al., 2014).

Employees who experience high levels of normative commitment perceive they should remain at an organization out of a moral duty to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Moreover, the contingency of rewards or punishments within an organization as a more specific mechanism of generating reciprocity within an employee may be utilized to develop further an employee's normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This might include an employee displaying reciprocity to an organization that is currently struggling merely based on the notion that the organization had previously granted special favors or provisions to that specific
employee (Lee et al., 2017). By the same token, top management perceives normative commitment as a commitment based upon a moral command or indebtedness to the organization based on the consensus of employees' associated investment versus the organization's investment (Meyer et al., 2006).

In support of this idea, Yucel et al. (2014) conducted multiple regression analyses to test two hypotheses inquiring whether transformational leadership had a curvilinear relationship to top executives' commitment. The study's sample consisted of top-level executives of 120 randomly chosen firms within Turkey. This particular piece of research is exceptionally noteworthy due mainly to the gap between transformational leadership and different forms of commitment. This gap resided within the understanding that previous research merely sought to determine the relationship between the two variables by providing predictions based on a linear relationship. This study aimed to determine the curvilinear relationship between the noted leadership form and normative commitment. The analyses determined that the presented evidence does support a direct curvilinear relationship between transformational leadership and normative commitment.

Specifically, the researchers concluded that top executives are more likely to experience emotional attachment and individually identify organizational issues as their issues when a top executive executes transformational leadership. Ultimately, this further supports the idea that employees will develop higher levels of normative commitment and increased reciprocity when subjected to high levels of transformational leadership. Said differently, transformational leadership is noted as being advantageous and producing favorable outcomes for those who are exposed to this type of leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), translating into the potential scenario of a leader bestowing benefits to an employee in a noted setting, which lead to the development
of that employee commencing levels of indebtedness to that leader and the organization in which the leader represents.

**Affective Commitment**

Affective commitment refers to an individual's direct attachment to an organization that is commenced and further developed, an outcome associated with the individual's identification with the organization's goals and culture (Ribeiro et al., 2019, 2020). Employees who experience affective commitment take a genuine interest in their organization and aim to protect the interest of their organization (Odoardi et al., 2019). Affective commitment derives from individuals directly connecting their identity, values, and other essential personality characteristics with their organization (Liu et al., 2020). Moreover, those individuals who display an affective commitment to their organization are willing to engage in extra-role behavior beyond their in-role duties. This is primarily due to caring for their organization and striving to divest the necessary help to ensure that all organizational goals are met and exceeded (Odoardi et al., 2019). Moreover, it is heavily noted in the literature that affective commitment can lead to positive emotions and attitudes towards the organization in which an individual is employed (Liu et al., 2020).

Ahlers et al. (2017) note that affective commitment is directly associated with feelings regarding the relationship with an exchange partner. These feelings may include, but are not limited to, emotional attachment (Somers, 2010), loyalty and belongingness (Allen & Meyer, 1990), positive feelings (Meyer et al., 2004), and reciprocity (Anderson & Weitz, 1992). This translates into the notion that affectively committed individuals are more likely to favor specific individuals more than others in a noted exchange making affectively committed individuals more likely to engage in the execution of decisions (Ahlers et al., 2017; Allen & Meyer, 1991;
More specifically, this implies that an individual who feels affective commitment towards a particular party is more apt to produce decisions based upon their influential association.

Noting the importance of affective commitment, a vast amount of research has focused on determining the cross-sectional effects of the dimension and the associated antecedents (Beck & Wilson, 2001; Kam et al., 2016). Within the literature, affective commitment maintains the most significant correlation to the broad dimensions of employee performance (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer et al., 2002). For example, Ribeiro et al. (2018) executed a study that focused on the impact affective commitment has on positive job outcomes such as job performance and job satisfaction.

The study utilized the responses from 212 Portuguese workers employed at small and medium-sized companies. The authors used a bootstrapping method to enrich the data analysis. This is primarily attributed to the positive benefits associated with using bootstrapping in correlational studies (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). The 212 participants that comprised the sample audience completed a survey. The survey incorporated four items from previously developed scales to measure affective commitment. These scales were created in a study executed by Rego and Cunha (2008b) and a study completed by Rego et al. (2007). Upon completing the items associated with affective commitment, the authors noted a Cronbach's alpha of .85. Conceptually speaking, the study concluded that affective commitment does impact an individual's performance.

**Continuance Commitment**

Continuance commitment conceptually refers to an employees' assessment of their working environment and the potential cost they might encounter upon leaving the organization.
Moreover, this type of commitment directly pertains to the cost endured upon leaving an organization and the limited work alternatives the employee could encounter (Heffner & Rentsch, 2001; Tekingündüz et al., 2017; Wasti, 2002). This type of commitment differs from the other two dimensions in nature. For example, an employee who experiences intense affective commitment remains at an organization based on their desire to stay. At the same time, an employee who experiences a strong level of continuance commitment remains at an organization based merely upon their need to remain. The need to remain derives from an employee's perception that leaving the organization presents an influx of cost. They are inadvertently forcing the employee to remain because the cost outweighs the benefits.

Organizational Commitment Outcomes

When reviewing the literature regarding organizational outcomes and the three distinct dimensions of organizational commitment, most of the studies analyzed two, if not all three, dimensions. Said differently, a large portion of the literature aimed to compare and contrast the various dimensions of organizational commitment and the dimension's impact on a multitude of organizational concepts. Noting this within the following section of the literature review, the three dimensions of organizational commitment will be included in each organizational outcome. For example, the first organizational outcome that is addressed in the literature review is employee retention. Within this section, all three forms of organizational commitment will be discussed.

This will allow the information to remain transparent, conceptual, and read quickly. Additionally, this will allow comparing and contrasting one dimension's impact and or relationship with a specific organizational outcome to be presented and interrupted. This type of organization is due to Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational
commitment was formed on the consensus that all three dimensions (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment), when observed, presented similarities and differences. Furthermore, Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed that employees simultaneously experience the three forms of dimensions based on the employee's mindset.

There are various outcomes associated with the three forms of organizational commitment. It is important to note that these multiple outcomes validated through different types of research designs offer immense benefits to the organization. One of the most notable organizational outcomes associated with commitment, in general, is increased levels of employee retention (Becker, Randall, & Riegel, 1995). Conclusively supporting literature that aimed to measure the impact of organizational commitment and employee turnover noted that organizational commitment has a negative effect on employee turnover (Loi et al., 2006; Meyer et al., 2002). It is important to note that employee retention is a fundamental key to an organization's longevity and survival within a specific industry (Gong et al., 2009). In support of this organizational outcome, Quratulain et al. (2018) executed a research study utilizing data from one Public Sector University located in southern Pakistan.

The identification of the University belonging to a public sector is significant because the Higher Education Commission (HEC) in Pakistan recognizes a portion of institutions as being degree-awarding. Moreover, the Pakistan government recognizes these institutions as contributing post-secondary educational efforts geared towards helping improve the social-economic status of the country (Hussain & Malik, 2014). Questionnaires were then distributed to 450 faculty representatives. Conclusively the analysis rendered that faculty who experienced affective commitment negatively correlated to their turnover intentions. Said differently, employees who displayed affective commitment had no intentions of leaving their organization.
Perreira et al. (2018) executed a research study to determine affective commitment and employee turnover retention in the healthcare triad. This particular sample was chosen due to turnover being a problematic area that significantly contributes to the global shortage of qualified nurses (Perreira et al., 2018). Moreover, this is a concern for society, negatively impacting the quality of care and healthcare outcomes. Noting the importance of this particular topic, the study’s primary objective was to establish a fundamental understanding of the relationships between affective commitment and turnover within the healthcare industry. In the context of this particular piece of research, the central focal point was determining whether affective commitment mediated the relationship between organizational justice and turnover intention. The method of research was a survey approach. The survey was developed and administered to frontline nurses who worked in Ontario, Canada. The survey approach was adopted to test a hypothetical model that the research developed from previously analyzing the readily available literature. Mediation effects were investigated by executing a one-step regression analysis in which the authors used SPSS. A bootstrapping process was then used to determine whether mediation occurred in the final model developed.

This exciting aspect regarding bootstrapping is the technique's ability to determine the mediator's effect sizes. The results determined that the effect size of the mediation variable was reasonably large (e.g., $k^2 = -0.24$). This translates into the notion that affective commitment accounts for 24% of the variance presented within the responses from the sample.

Employee retention, as noted, is a dominant organizational outcome sought in every industry. Anitha and Begum (2016) note that employee retention has become a severe concern for corporate organizations. Specifically, from a corporate perspective, an employee who remains dedicated to their organization is well versed in organizational policies, regulations, and
guidelines and is better equipped to make effective adjustments (Anitha & Begum, 2016).

Adding to this notion, employees who remain at an organization display increased levels of loyalty to their management superiors (Antha & Begum, 2016). Recognizing the importance associated with retaining employees, Anitha and Begum sought to determine whether a proposed framework depicting the three types of organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) can be measured to determine to know at what level an employee can be retained within an organization.

Said differently, the study's primary objective is to describe various aspects of how to retain employees while measuring organizational culture and organizational commitment. The sample population included employees from an automobile manufacturing company in Coimbatore, India. A regression analysis was used to determine the strength of the impact of organizational culture and the three dimensions of organizational commitment on employee retention. Conclusively, the results rendered displayed normative commitment \( r = 0.516 \) affective commitment \( r = 0.710 \), and continuance commitment \( r = 0.670 \) all remain highly correlated to employee retention.

**Employee Voice Behavior**

Voice behavior is conceptually referred to as an employee's efforts to express construct ideas, pertinent information, and personal opinions regarding the organizational change (Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003). Le Pine and Van Dyne (2001) defined voice as a construct of change-oriented behavior, which is displayed to improve a noted situation. Voice is noted in literature as a unique construct that focuses on verbal expression (e.g., directed up, directed down, or direct horizontally) manifested explicitly by an individual. Withey and Cooper (1989) specify that voice behavior includes openly expressing a problem or concern to a supervisor and
further providing economically feasible suggestions on how to resolve the presented issue or concern. The underpinnings of voice behavior regard the importance of the behavior presenting benefits and risks to the individual engaging in voice behavior. This is primarily because voice behavior's primary intention is to generate change (Aryee et al., 2017).

Furthermore, an individual’s motivation to engage in voice behavior must entail assessing the risk and benefits associated with a particular instance. Said differently, an individual must weigh the risk and benefits of utilizing their voice behavior prior to engagement. If an individual chooses to execute their voice behavior, this ultimately transpires to the notion that the individual determined through their assessment that the benefits outweighed the risk of association.

The exciting aspect of voice behavior is the increasing importance of behavior has been noted continuously over time (Aryee et al., 2017). The concept of voice has become a crucial organizational dynamic that ensures an organization can adapt and survive over time within a particular industry (Aryee et al., 2017; Crant, 2000; Griffin et al., 2007; Parker & Collins, 2010). Voice behavior's principal intent is geared towards creating a change that is commenced under the assumption of generating a positive change. Generally speaking, voice behavior is noted as a being related to the prevention of crises (Schwartz & Wald, 2003), improving organizational functioning, increasing the quality of management decisions (Zhang et al., 2015), and improving organizational innovation (Rasheed et al., 2017). Noting the vast amount of positive association that results from employee voice behavior, a large portion of research has been dedicated to determining its antecedents (Aryee et al., 2017; Detert & Burris, 2007; Subhakaran & Dyaram, 2018; Tangirala et al., 2013; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

The back history of voice behavior can be traced back to the work of Hirschman in 1970. This original work brought forth the acknowledgment of voice behavior and its importance
regarding organizational functioning. Specifically, Hirschman (1970) noted that an employee would speak up to articulate concerns or express helpful intentions with the aspirations of commencing organizational change. Whereas individuals who do not utilize their voice merely ineffectively live in environments where they do not aim to challenge the status quo. However, an immense amount of time elapsed before the importance of voice behavior became a relevant topic within the management discipline. To verify this acknowledgment, Maynes and Podsakoff (2014) note that between 1970 and 1994, there were less than 15 articles regarding voice behavior published in management journals. Manuscripts have increased a drastic ten times since 1994, consequently leading to the publication of over 200 manuscripts. The lack of scholarly interest led to the ineffective mechanism of measurement regarding the construct (Rusbult et al., 1988) and a presentation of inconsistent findings within the literature (Withey & Cooper, 1989).

Following the dramatic increase in interest regarding voice behavior, literature emerged regarding the construct. Much of the research was dedicated to determining the contextual factors facilitating voice behavior. For example, Yao et al. (2019) executed a study that's purpose was to investigate the overall impact of narcissistic leadership on employee voice behavior. The perspective of this study focused on voice behavior from the standpoint of job stress and trust in leaders in China. A survey approach was administered to 437 employees to determine their narcissistic leadership during three distinct periods. Time one focused merely on measuring narcissistic leadership and the establishment of whether this type of leadership was apparent. The research focused on measuring job stress and trust in leaders in time two.

Time three provided the assessment of voice behavior among employees. Results conclusively rendered a relationship between narcissistic leadership and employee voice behavior. Another contextual factor that impacts voice behavior is voice climate. Voice climate
impacts voice behavior because the climate in which an employee operates further impacts whether the employee engages in voice behavior (Aryee et al., 2017; Klaas et al., 2012; Morrison, 2011). Voice context has been a topic of interest among voice scholars. Much of the research has focused on providing rational perspectives of how management can eliminate employee opinion withholdings (Hsiung & Tsai, 2017) (e.g., Donaghey et al., 2011; Liang et al., 2012; Morrison et al., 2011). The detection of environmental cues and the assessment of the social context, enables employees to determine the benefits and risks associated with utilizing their voice or remaining silent (Hsiung & Tsai, 2017). Expressly, numerous studies have conclusively noted that a supportive social climate inadvertently reduces employees' fears and anxieties associated with voice behavior which in return facilities the execution of voice (e.g., Chiaburu et al., 2013; Dongkyu & Vandenbergh, 2020; Frazier & Bowler, 2015).

Although the presented contextual factors provide valuable insight regarding employee voice behavior, these factors do not consider that employees within favorable organizational climates in conjunction with supportive leadership may still choose to remain silent. This finding has pushed research to explore motivational and individual/personality factors that impact the execution of voice behavior (e.g., Chen, 2017; Ibrahim et al., 2020; Nikolaou et al., 2008). For example, Elsaied (2019) conducted a study centered on determining the impact of a proactive personality on voice behavior. The study used data from 268 employees. Out of the 268 employees, 56 were immediate supervisors. The sample audience consisted of employees who worked for three different Egyptian companies whose core offerings were footwear and headgear. The sample audiences provided data for the study on separate questionnaires administered on various occasions. The findings conclusively determined that proactive personality had a positive and significant impact on voice behavior.
**Self-and Other-Focused Voice Behavior**

Within each of the two problems to be addressed within this study, there is an emphasis on self-and other-focused voice behavior. It is important to note within the literature review that currently, these two dimensions of voice behavior do not hold formal definitions. Additionally, neither dimension currently has a mechanism to measure and differentiate between the two. This, ultimately, will further add to the importance of this body of analysis.

Specifically, as previously noted, one portion of the study remains dedicated to new scales developed to measure an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused voice behavior). This will include solidifying a formal definition of both self-and other focused voice behavior. Within the literature review, the information definitions will be discussed. Within the literature, several articles aim to address self-focused behavior. Specifically, when an individual aims to pursue their happiness, this can be regarded as a self-focused behavior (Nelson et al., 2016). When comparing self-focused behavior and other-focused behavior, the main differentiator centers upon who is subjected to the end outcome. For example, when an individual focuses on others outside of their focus, this would result in the other party observing the end outcome. For example, a simple act centered upon oneself could resemble buying a cup of coffee to be enjoyed. When individuals focus on others, they will buy a cup of coffee for another individual to enjoy versus themselves. The same fundamental concept can be applied to voice behavior.

As previously noted, an employee's voice behavior regards their efforts towards expressing ideas, important information, and any personal opinions that can be used to commence a positive organizational change (Aryee et al., 2017; Van Dyne et al., 2003). Taking this exact definition and applying it to the context of self-focused behavior would result in an
individual utilizing their voice to obtain the end outcome. Ultimately, this further transpires to
the notion that the individual would use their voice to ensure that the end outcome was bestowed
upon them versus another individual. Moreover, other-focused voice behavior would be regarded
as an individual using their voice to confer the end outcome on another party.

Creating an informal definition regarding other-focused behavior has proven to have
increased challenges. This is primarily due to the scope of other focused voice behavior
expanded upon within the literature. For example, Ho (2012) aimed to conceptualize
counterproductive work behaviors by categorizing them into specific behaviors that are noted for
hindering task performance. The study used responses from 136 respondents and 125 employees
from two separate organizations to determine particular forms of interpersonal counterproductive
work behaviors.

The authors acknowledge that interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors can be
separated into two distinct categories (e.g., task-focused and person-focused). Task-focused is
noted as targeting another employee's performance. Examples include the refusal to render help
or provide needed resources a fellow employee might need to complete a task. At the same time,
person-focused is more geared toward targeting an employee, often threatening an employee's
physical or psychological well-being (Ho, 2012). This is just one example of the potential other-
focused behavior elaborated upon within the management literature.

Noting this challenge, it becomes essential to establish a definition consistent with the
scope of research that is to be executed within the study. As noted, self-focused behavior within
the context of this study will regard an individual's efforts to pursue his or her happiness. This
can be viewed as a self-focused behavior (Nelson et al., 2016). Combining self-focused behavior
and voice commenced the informal definitions of self-focused voice behavior, which is noted as
an individual using their voice of self-focused to attain an outcome that is direct at themselves. This would include sharing resources to produce a viable outcome that would further assist individual attainment.

To remain apparent self-focused voice behavior is the execution of voice behavior with the aspirations of the outcome solely benefiting the individual who executed the original voice behavior. To further maintains levels of consistency and acknowledge the lack of research regarding other-focused voice behavior, this type of voice will be conceptually defined as an individual executing voice behavior with the aspiration of the outcome being beneficial to others. This would include an individual other-focused voice behavior to attain an outcome that is not directed at themselves.

Organizational Commitment and Voice Behavior

Until this point in the literature review, several factors that support and hinder the execution of voice behavior have been discussed. In addition, the outcomes associated with voice behavior have been elaborated upon. However, some scholars argue that additional research is needed to contribute to the ongoing body of knowledge regarding the antecedents of voice behavior (Avery & Quiñones, 2002). One dominant behavioral outcome that impacts an employee's voice behavior is organizational commitment (Nisar et al., 2020). Examining the current relationship between organizational commitment and voice behavior is pertinent to addressing the general problem presented.

Regarding organizational commitment, there is a fair amount of literature that is readily available aiming to depict the relationship between commitment and voice behavior. As noted, voice behavior entails the direct effort to provide positive, constructive change or articulate a specific position that would benefit the organization. Much of what is mentioned in voice is the
aspect of the positive undertones, and the engagement is executed based on providing and or creating a better organizational setting. Moreover, commitment is often a topic of interest for human resource professionals. This is primarily attributed to the need to retain talented, dedicated employees. For example, Farndale et al. (2011) aimed to determine the impact of organizational commitment from a general perspective on employee voice behavior using a sample that represented both public and private sector employees. These employees ranged from part-time to full time with the largest categories of workers represented by professional technical workers between the ages of 40 and 49. The study tested a range of hypotheses focusing on employee voice behavior and organizational commitment.

Quantitative data was collected using a questionnaire distributed by the Change Management Consortium (CMC). The CMC encompasses several practitioners and academics located in the United Kingdom (Farndale et al., 2011). The sample population included 2,291 respondents. The questionnaires utilized within the study were based on preexisting scales. Mowday et al.’s (19782 scale were used to measure employee commitment. Moreover, employee voice was measured by a scale derived from the employee survey. The hypotheses were tested using descriptive statistics and correlations between variables. The authors indicated that results accurately displayed a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and employee voice.

The general definition of organizational commitment has been previously articulated. Building upon the fundamental concept of organizational commitment, it is essential that organizational commitment is a force that binds an individual to an organization and an individual to a course of action (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Moreover, the three distinct components of organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment,
and continuance commitment) provide the needed bases or motives that an employee will utilize when determining their behavior within and towards their organization (Lapointe et al., 2018). Observing and noting the importance of each component's impact on employee voice behavior, it is no surprise that there are many studies within the management discipline.

For example, Nisar et al. (2020) conducted a study that collected data on a two-wave increment that covered two months. The exact size consisted of public sector employees and their immediate supervisors. Specifically, the study drew on the conversation of resource theory and sought to investigate the direct impact of organizational commitment on voice behavior. The study tested four hypotheses. Organizational commitment was measured using the scale previously developed by Mowday et al. (1982). Voice behavior was measured using the five-item scale developed by Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998).

Conclusively the coefficients or correlation provided direct support for the formulated hypotheses. More specifically, the study determined that the relationship between organizational commitment and voice behavior is significant. The study accurately concluded that those employees who displayed more significant amounts of organizational commitment were more likely to engage in extra-role behaviors (e.g., voice behavior).

In Ekrot et al.'s (2016) study, the authors launched a study that focused on closing the gap in the literature regarding voice behavior and project management. Moreover, the study further determined whether affective organizational commitment moderates the relationship between idea encouragement and project managers' voice behavior. The study focused on past research that concluded that employees with a high affective commitment to their organization are more likely to exhibit extra effort (Becker & Kernan, 2003; Blakely et al., 2003; Loi et al.,
In further support of this idea, Allen and Meyer (1990) note that employees with greater involvement and commitment to an organization are more likely to commit to the success of the organization, as well as the tendency of those employees to exhibit extra effort. Aiming to test the validity of past research and expand the current body of knowledge, the study applied a two-level model design. Level one included the dependent and moderator variables of analysis, and level two included the independent variables categorized on the organization or business unit level. The final sample for the study included 154 firms with data on 618 project managers.

The firms originated from a diverse industry set, including but not limited to automotive, electronics, and finance. Hierarchical regression was used to test the proposed effects between variables. The result rendered an interaction effect between affective organizational commitment and voice behavior.

Many studies have aimed to analyze one dimension over another regarding organizational commitment. Often in the literature, this has inadvertently allowed one dimension to be explored or analyzed more heavily than the others. For example, Lapointe and Vandenbrghe (2005) conducted a study that sought to determine the impact of the relationship between servant leadership, organizational commitment, voice behavior, and antisocial behaviors. The study specifically examined affective commitment and normative commitment. Affective commitment was the only dimension of organizational behavior discussed its relationship with employee voice behavior. Normative commitment's relationship to antisocial behaviors was analyzed versus voice behavior. However, the authors utilized affective commitment as the dimension of
choice and developed two hypotheses regarding affective commitment and its relationship with voice behavior.

One hypothesis focused on determining affective commitment's relationship with employee voice behavior. Specifically, the authors hypothesized that affective commitment is positively related to employee voice behavior. The second hypothesis proposed that affective commitment mediated a positive relationship between servant leadership and employee voice behaviors. The authors gathered data from employees working for customer service departments within five Canadian companies to test these hypotheses. Questionnaires were administered to various departments.

The questionnaires surveyed employees about servant leadership and organizational commitment. To measure employee voice behavior and antisocial behaviors, surveys were administered to department managers. All surveys were distributed via hard copies and handed out at physical locations. Organizational commitment components were measured by using Bentein et al.'s (2005) questionnaire. Affective commitment was measured using a scale that was comprised of six items. While voice behaviors were measured using a six-item frequency scale previously developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). The authors executed a series of confirmatory factor analyses to ensure that the scale incorporated distinctness between variables.

The data was then analyzed using LISREL 8.80. Following the determination that all variables remained distinguishable among one another, the study utilized descriptive statistics and intercorrelations to test the internal consistency. The hypotheses were tested using random coefficient modeling (Lapointe & Vandenberghe, 2005; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). Results determined that affective commitment was a significant positive predictor of employee voice behaviors.
Further elaborating upon the previous statement regarding the popularity of affective commitment within the literature, one specific study aimed to address this notion and close the gap within the literature by utilizing continuance commitment. Boichuk and Mengue (2013) clearly articulated the need to analyze continuance commitment within a noted setting and the gap in the literature about employee voice behavior and job dissatisfaction. Specifically, the study addressed how retailers can stimulate dissatisfied employees to react about their dissatisfaction in what is noted as a constructive manner (Boichuk & Mengue, 2013). A primary reason for investigating this area of concentration is tied to the amount of voice literature dedicated to identifying the proximal influence of voice behavior (Boichuk & Mengue, 2013; Liang, Farh, & Farh, 2012; Venkataramani & Tangirala, 2010).

The sample of the study was retailing employees. This sample was chosen primarily because retailing employees who experience high levels of continuance commitment are likely to remain at their organization due to the individual's organizational-specific investments (Boichuk & Mengue, 2013).

In addition, retailing employees remain because of their organizational-specific investments and the lack of viable job alternatives about employment. Said differently, retailing employees who have continuance commitment levels remain at their organization typically due to the lack of possible alternative jobs to switch to. These individuals view their organizations as providing value to their lives. The interesting aspect of this study is the acknowledgment of continuance commitment being the dominant dimension within the retailing industry and noting that employees are likely to maintain levels of dissatisfaction because of this dimension.

Moreover, due to the lack of alternatives presented within the retailing industry, these employees are less likely to remain silent about their dissatisfaction (Boichuk & Mengue, 2013).
Although the authors utilized two different studies, the second study is the primary source of analysis for voice behavior and continuance commitment.

Study two used 150 responses from participants. However, this study did not adopt a typical questionnaire approach in which a sample provided answers to a series of questions aimed at determining the intensity and interconnectivity between variables. This study provided respondents with a series of previously developed scenarios. Within each of these scenarios' respondents were exposed to four different job conditions. Essentially, individuals were exposed to four different job conditions and then were requested to provide a reaction regards these job conditions. Statical, 41% of the respondents represented females, and the average age was 33 years old.

Results determined that the study contributed significantly to employee engagement literature by solidifying a relationship between the exit-voice framework (Boichuk & Mengue, 2013; Hirschman, 1970). The study is significant because it established the consensus that supervisors remain helpful by nature and dedicated to assisting with work-related problems. Furthermore, the paper sheds new light on continuance commitment and voice behavior and assists with fostering environments in which employees can exhibit voice within a retailing setting (Boichuk & Mengue, 2013).

Within this section of the literature review, there have been many studies discussed. Much of these studies aim to create baseline knowledge for the reader regarding establishing and solidifying a relationship between voice behavior and the three dimensions of organizational justice. The theoretical premise for supporting the relationship between employee voice behavior and the three dimensions of organizational justice will be explored and elaborated upon in the next portion of the literature review.
Summary of Section 1

Within section 1, the researcher provided the fundamental platform for the study. Specifically, the researcher outlined the following: the identified research problem, the problem statement, the purpose of the study, nature of the study, research questions, hypotheses, theoretical framework, definitions of key terms, assumptions, limitations, delimitations, reduction of gaps, implications for Biblical integration, relationship to the field of study, and a review of the professional and academic literature. Within this section, the instruments that were developed and utilized to analyze the relationship between an employee's organizational commitment and an employee's voice behavior, as well as the instruments that were utilized to analyze the relationship between an employee's voice behavior and an employee's PWB among service workers in the Permian Basin region of West Texas were discussed. Within section 2, the researcher provides pertinent details that address the research design and methodology implemented within the study. Furthermore, within section 2, the researcher included details relating to the sample population, data collection, data analysis, and the study's reliability and validity.

Section 2: The Project

This research project was intended to contribute to and extend the body of knowledge by examining and generating a greater understanding of the relationship between an employee's organizational commitment and an employee's voice behavior and determine the correlation between an employee's voice behavior with an employee's PWB. Furthermore, this research project aimed to address the gap in the literature that pertains to the lack of analysis regarding the relationship between organizational commitment and an employee's PWB, which resulted in the existing inconclusive findings on the relationship between organizational commitment and PWB.
In order to fulfill these intentions, a quantitative research method and a correlational design were utilized to determine to what extent a significant correlation existed between variables.

Section 2 is dedicated to effectively communicating how the study was completed and the methodology used in the study. Specifically, the section begins with a reiteration of the purpose statement. Within this portion, the researcher further provided the fundamental premises regarding the reason for executing the proposed study. Moreover, this section will address the researcher's role and four other core areas.

First, information regarding the research participants was provided. Second, the researcher outlined the pertinent details regarding the research method, design, and the study's population and sample. Third, the data collection procedure and the data analysis are discussed. Lastly, section 2 will conclude with a conceptual discussion regarding the process to be implemented to determine overall reliability and validity.

**Purpose Statement**

This quantitative study aims to add to the body of knowledge by examining and generating a greater understanding of the relationship between an employee's organizational commitment and an employee's voice behavior and determine the correlation between an employee's voice behavior with an employee's PWB. The more significant problem examined through the utilization of previously developed questionnaires aimed to measure an employee's organizational commitment (normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and an employee's PWB. At the same time, new scales were developed to measure an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused voice behavior) at service industries located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. More specifically, the purpose of this quantitative study was twofold. First, the relationship between an employee's organizational
commitment, normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment, and an employee's utilization of self- and other-focused voice behavior was examined.

Second, the study will examine the relationship between an employee's self- and other-focused voice behavior and an employee's PWB. By analyzing the relationship between the three types of organizational commitment and the two types of employee voice behavior, the researcher was able to determine whether a correlative relationship exists between an employee's organizational commitment and the utilization of an employee's self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior. This determination enables future managers to understand engagement patterns regarding self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior based on an employee's organizational commitment. Said differently, the researcher sought to determine whether a correlative relationship exists between the three forms of organizational commitment and an employee's voice behavior regarding the two forms of voice behavior being analyzed in the study. For example, was an employee who experienced a particular organizational commitment utilizing one of the noted voice behaviors? Furthermore, the researcher determined whether a correlation existed between an employee's psychological well-being and an employee's self- and other-focused voice behavior.

**Role of the Researcher**

This study utilized primary data to investigate the research problem, answer the research questions, and test the developed hypotheses. Specifically, the study used data from a cross-sectional survey research approach to test the proposed research model quantitatively. Participants were administered an online self-reported questionnaire. Morgan (2014) noted that surveys are best suited when a researcher aims to execute a study based upon deductive hypothesis testing.
Moreover, the researcher made no personal contact with any participants. All participation remained voluntary and anonymous. The sample data for this study was derived from service workers’ responses in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. Moreover, a participant had to have worked within the service industry for a one-year minimum. Self-reporting is noted in the literature as a direct screening method that commonly appears in questions seeking to draw attention and or thoughtfulness (DeSimone et al., 2015). Service workers reported the minimum service qualifier in self-reporting. This allowed qualified participants to engage in voluntary participation based on whether they met the minimum service qualifier within the study. Once participants met the requirements necessary, they were asked to complete a questionnaire.

As mentioned within the design discussion, questionnaires are the preference for gathering input from a sample due to the notion that surveys are best suited when a researcher aims to execute a study based upon deductive hypothesis testing (Morgan, 2014). Moreover, the proposed scales intended to measure the three forms of organizational commitment and the scale used to measure PWB were previously developed in prior studies. However, previously, there was no developed scale to measure the proposed dimensions of voice behavior (self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior). Noting the infringement, it was pertinent to the execution and analysis of the study that the researcher developed the needed scale.

The researcher is an inaugural part of the study. The researcher was responsible for initiating communication via e-mail to service organizations within the Permian Basin Region of West Texas. The open communication attempt disclosed the efforts needed by any voluntary participants. Once the organization confirmed voluntary participation via e-mail stating that they were willing to participate in the noted study, the researcher assumed informed consent to send
the noted questionnaire. Additionally, the researcher clearly articulated a willingness to answer any questions before the administering of the questionnaire as well as following the completion of the study. Further adding to the importance of the researcher, the role was additionally responsible for adequately distributing questionnaires to willing participants, coding the responses, and interpreting the findings.

**Research Methodology**

Choosing the appropriate research method and design is a pertinent task a researcher must address. The overall selection of the research method and design dramatically impacts the results. Moreover, the researcher maintains the risk of rendering false results if the selection is incorrect. Noting the importance of the decision, the following section will aim to adequately convey the appropriateness of the chosen research method and design. The fundamental purpose of this quantitative correlation study was centered on generating a greater understanding of the relationship between an employee's organizational commitment and an employee's voice behavior and further determining the correlation between an employee's voice behavior with an employee's PWB. Therefore, the following information will place a heightened emphasis on effectively validating the chosen methodology over the other potential methodology options.

**Discussion of a Fixed Design**

A fixed design was chosen for this research project. Ultimately, this translates into the notion that prior to the execution of the data collection, the mechanism and the theoretical framework were previously established. Quantitative research is a viable approach to testing theories objectively and examining relationships among variables (Creswell, 2014). Moreover, the purpose of this study centers upon determining the extent to which a correlation exists between noted variables. The instruments that will be used to answer the research questions and
fulfill the purpose of the study were determined prior to the attainment of data from the intended sample.

Choosing a fixed research design resides in the notion that quantitative research is generally an approach to examining theories. In contrast, a mixed-methods approach focuses on collecting quantitative and qualitative data and further integrating the two forms (Creswell, 2014). The instruments that are to be used for measuring the dimensions of organizational commitment (normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and PWB have been previously developed. Moreover, making these instruments as fixed elements with no proposed changes. The dimensions of an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused voice behavior) did not have a measurement scale. However, the researcher developed the needed scale and further utilized it in the study. The developed scale will remain fixed and is not subject to change.

Discussion of Method

The researcher utilized a quantitative method to examine the relationships between variables. Specifically, the researcher used this method to determine the extent to which a significant correlation exists between an employee's organizational commitment (normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused) which was examined. Following this notion, the researcher used this method to determine the extent to which a significant correlation existed between an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused) and an employee's PWB, which was examined. A quantitative method was chosen because it allowed the researcher to establish the correlation between the noted relationships between variables (Creswell, 2014).
A qualitative study was eliminated due mainly to the notion that this type of study focuses on theory development and individual interpretation and remains subjective by nature (Creswell, 2014). A quantitative study tests a specific theory, maintains numbers as the essential element of analysis and is objective by nature (Creswell, 2014). A qualitative study will also focus on interpreting experiences and interactions versus utilizing numerical data as the primary mechanism of establishing conclusions (McCusker & Gunaydin, 2015). The utilization of numerical data obtained from the sample population will aid in determining the extent to which a significant correlation exists between each variable. A quantitative method is noted within the literature as referring to a standardized set of questionnaires administered to individuals where the individuals are identified through different forms of sampling (Dudwick et al., 2006).

More specifically, the study was regarded as utilizing a non-experimental quantitative method. This selection of a non-experimental quantitative design was most appropriate because the research used a survey methodology approach to gather data from voluntary participants. The data further assisted with determining to what extent each of the research's variables correlates with one another (Creswell, 2014).

Participants

The Permian Basin region is home to many oil and gas reserves (Permian Basin, 2021). The reserves within this geographic region maintain high daily production levels, enabling the United States to become the highest oil and gas producer worldwide (Permian Basin, 2021). The sample for the proposed study focused on service employees in the oil and gas industry located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. This region includes the Texas cities of Midland, Odessa, and San Angelo. According to the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association (TIPRO), in 2019, 87,603 individuals were employed directly by the oil and gas
industry within the Permian Basin Region. However, support positions for oil and gas operations equaled 54,507 employees, according to the TIPRO report. The 54,507 support positions pertained to employees working within operations (maintenance and repair positions) were used to determine the needed sample size. If a service worker wanted to voluntarily participate in the research project, they must have met the specific criteria established. The specific criteria for potential research participants are:

1. a service employee in the oil and gas industry located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas (Odessa, Midland, San Angelo);
2. a minimum of 18 years old;
3. be of either gender;
4. have worked as an employee in the oil and gas industry located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas (Odessa, Midland, San Angelo) for a minimum of one year;
5. be able to read and write English;
6. willing to voluntarily participate in the noted study during the collection time frame.

**Population and Sampling**

**Discussion of Population**

The Permian Basin region of West Texas is noted for oil and gas production. Specifically, oil and natural gas employment within the Permian Basin totaled 87,603 employees, according to Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association (TIPRO). Moreover, the TIPRO report disclosed that the oil and gas industry within the Permian Basin had noted extreme increases in employment for the past decade. The westernmost portions that comprise the Permian Basin are noted as Odessa (Ector County, Midland (Midland County), and San Angelo, Texas (Tom Green County). Ector and Midland County noted the highest increase in employment within the oil and gas industry (Permian Basin, 2021). Between the years 2009-and 2019, any other county increased almost 43,000 jobs in 2009 (Permian Basin, 2021). The TIPRO
report also released that the dominant occupation within the region from January to July of 2019 was oil and gas maintenance and repair workers. Noting the dominant industry and the potential capabilities of obtaining raw data from the oil and gas worker population, the researcher found the noted industry and occupation (service workers) to be the most viable for producing valid and reliable results. The total population provided by TIPRO's report noted that 87,603 individuals were employed in the oil and gas industry within the Permian Basin region. However, support positions for oil and gas operations equaled 54,507 employees, according to the TIPRO report.

**Discussion of Sampling**

One concern the researcher had regarding sampling was choosing the correct participants for the study to ensure the results were meaningful (Jackson, 2012). Moreover, the researcher aimed to ensure that the entire population's sample provided an accurate representation (Jackson, 2012). A primary concern was to ensure the proposed sample population for this study was accurately represented. The representative sample allowed the researcher to generalize and make inferences about the entire population based on the sample population. The researcher used purposive sampling. Purposive sampling refers to a sampling technique executed on the premise that the researcher has a specific purpose for the study.

Additionally, the researcher set specific criteria that determined whether an individual is qualified to participate in the data collection. Once the individual self-reported that they met the noted criteria, the researcher allowed the individual to provide their input. Purposive sampling is noted as a technique used to assist the researcher in obtaining quick responses and gaining the opinions of the targeted audience. The unit of analysis of this study was service employees in the oil and gas industry located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas, and the use of a cross-
sectional survey approach is considered appropriate because it provides quick, inexpensive, efficient, and accurate means of assessing information about the population (Zikmund, 2003). A fundamental characteristic of a random sample is that each individual who qualifies to participate has an equal chance of being selected. The researcher, as noted, obtained a list of all oil and gas organizations that provided support services to the West Texas region of the Permian Basin (Odessa, Midland, and San Angelo, Texas) and sent an open invitation for participation. All organizations have an equal opportunity for being selected as long as the organization provides support services (maintenance, repairs, etc.).

Additionally, all support service employees could complete a questionnaire as long as they met the baseline criteria for participation. It is crucial to address the concern of self-selection bias. Self-selection bias is noted within the literature as being impacted by the familiarity with the subject matter, an individual's ability to recall information, and an individual's completeness of memory regarding the subject matter (Sieck & Yates, 2001; Whitman & Woodward, 2012). However, self-selection bias concerns the researcher Whitman and Woodward (2012) note that the researcher has no control over this process.

Participants were provided an online self-reported questionnaire. Morgan (2014) noted that surveys are best suited when a researcher aims to execute a study based upon deductive hypothesis testing. Additionally, surveying populations' primary strength is regarded within the objectivity presented, primarily tied to the ease of use (Morgan, 2014). This study used a random sampling approach to identify employees within service industries located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. Before sending the electronic invitation for voluntary participation, the researcher contacted the chamber of commerce within each region that comprises the Permian Basin in West Texas and requested a list of all oil and gas service organizations within the noted
region. Following the attainment of the list, the researcher sent an electronic invitation for voluntary participation to the organizations providing services within the oil and gas industry. The list of oil and gas service providers within the Permian Basin region of West Texas will serve as the sampling frame for the proposed research study. Moreover, it is essential to note that the voluntary participation for those who accept the invitation remained open to those who have worked at an oil and gas service organization for one year.

**Summary of Population and Sampling**

Within this portion of section 2, the researcher further elaborated upon the specific details of the population and sampling proposed for use within the study. Within the provided portion of section 2, the researcher discussed the study's population, the pertinent details of the sampling method, the desired sample, and the sample size. This information is to serve distinct purposes. Firstly, the researcher aimed to provide a validation mechanism to ensure the proposed sample population for this study is accurately represented and calculated. Secondly, within this portion of section 2, the researcher aimed to ensure that the selected sample adequately and effectively provides a representation of service employees located in the Permian Basin region of West Texas.

**Data Collection and Organization**

Within this portion of section 2, the researcher provides further information regarding the data collection plan and the instruments used within the study. The data collection plan is an integral part of the research. Specifically, within the noted portion, the researcher outlines the proper steps that will be executed to ensure the needed data is obtained and secure. Moreover, this portion will provide further information regarding the instruments used to measure the variables within the study.
Data Collection Plan

The questionnaire participants responded to consisted of two sections; in the first section of the questionnaire used in the study, measurement items were intended to measure organizational commitment, voice behavior, and PWB. The second part of the survey was designed to solicit respondents' demographic information, including age, gender, tenure with the organization, and tenure in the profession. These variables were used as control variables in this study because previous studies have demonstrated their impact on organizational commitment and voice behavior (Pei et al., 2018; Ng & Feldman, 2015; Wang et al., 2014; Avery et al., 2011; Claes & Van De Ven, 2008). Before continuing with the details regarding the distribution of the survey, it is essential to reiterate that the scales intended to measure the three forms of organizational commitment, and the scale used to measure PWB was previously developed in prior studies. However, there was no developed scale to measure the proposed dimensions of voice behavior (self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior). Moreover, it was pertinent to the execution and analysis of this proposed study that the researcher developed the needed scale.

Before distributing the survey, the instrument was submitted for approval by Liberty University's Research Ethics Office to ensure the federal regulations and University policies involving human subjects are followed. Additionally, before distributing the survey, the researcher completed a Liberty University IRB application ensuring all application considerations on the checklist were addressed and awaiting approval. Before answering the survey items, participants were informed regarding the research purposes, the contact information of the researcher, and confidentiality. Following approval from Liberty University's Research Ethics Office, the researcher administered questionnaires. Employees were given two
weeks to submit responses electronically. An email reminder was sent to those who had not accepted the invitation for participation seven days after the original invitation.

The researcher ensured that the privacy of all participants was protected. Specifically, an electronic file that contains all the raw data obtained from participants was stored on a personal laptop. This laptop is password protected. Additionally, the electronic file was backed up on a thumb drive that is password protected and stored in a lockbox behind a locked door. As previously noted, there was no personal information obtained from any participatory individuals. The only information obtained other than the responses to each of the noted questions on the questionnaire was demographic information. Protecting the identity of all participants is essential. One way the researcher protected the identity of each participant is by not collecting any identifiable information. Additionally, all responses were saved on the researcher's laptop or the backup thumb drive.

Protecting the identity of each participant is a crucial consideration during the data collection process (Creswell, 2014). Furthermore, no data was exchanged unless requested by the researcher's chair and or committee members. If the need for exchanging the raw data should arise, the researcher will send all information through a secure network. Upon completion of the study, the researcher properly destroyed all raw data.

As noted throughout Section 1 and Section 2, a central contribution of this proposed research was developing the scale used to measure the dimensions of employee voice behavior. A lack of research regarding the dimensions of an employee's voice behavior has consequently presented a gap within the business literature. Furthermore, the conclusions rendered from the study’s findings allowed the researcher to make a meaningful contribution. Specifically, the contribution resided in the notion that the research conclusions will reduce the gaps within the
literature that do not address the extent to which an employee's self-and other-focused voice behavior correlates with his or her PWB. Moreover, further within Section 2, the researcher outlined the specific steps used to develop a scale to measure the dimensions of employee voice behavior. Next, the researcher outlined the specific steps implemented to develop the needed scale. However, it is essential to note that the scale remained incomplete until the researcher conducted an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and determined its reliability. The remainder of the needed process was completed by distributing the proposed scale within a pilot setting.

**Scale Development**

To further validate the growth of scale development, many recent texts have created a compilation of popular organizational behavior scales (Bearden & Netemeyer, 1998; Robinson et al., 1991). The growing interest and exploitation of scale development are tied to the evolution and development of theories (Bearden & Netemeyer, 1998). There has been a steady emergence of attention placed on further understanding the complex nature of employee voice behavior (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). The increased attention is attributed to the notion that employee voice behavior is crucial to organizational success (Huang et al., 2005). Increased attention and past efforts dedicated to analyzing employee voice behavior have inadequately addressed the complexity associated with the variable and the multiple dimensions that the variable possesses (Rusbult et al., 1988; Withey & Cooper, 1989). In efforts to address the insufficiency of the scales intended to measure an employee's voice behavior, a steady stream of research aims to conceptualize and classify the various forms of employee voice behavior (Chou & Barron, 2016). The stream of research will serve as a vital tool to develop the needed scale.

To generate an initial pool of items used to measure the two proposed dimensions of employee voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused voice behavior), the researcher
reviewed previous literature regarding employee voice behavior. Past research efforts have been
directed toward conceptualizing and classifying the various forms of employee voice behavior.
For example, Chiaburu et al. (2013) determined that employee voice behavior can be categorized
into two distinct categories (defensive and prosocial voice behavior). Whereas Liang et al.
(2012) determined that employee voice can be exhibited in two distinct forms (promotive and
prohibitive employee voice behavior). In efforts to extend Chiaburu et al. (2013) and Liang et
al.'s (2012) findings, Maynes and Podsakoff (2014) further extended both works and determined
that employee voice can be classified into four distinct categories (supportive, constructive,
defensive, and destructive employee voice behavior). In addition to reviewing the previous
literature, the researcher used 20 service workers' responses in the Permian Basin region of West
Texas. The responses generated from interview sessions enabled the researcher to uncover self-
focused and other-focused voice behavior characteristics. The interview was then transcribed,
analyzed, and converted into measurable items.

Following the initial interviews, the researcher developed a set of statements. These
statements were screened. The researcher eliminated redundant, faulty, and ambiguous items
presented during the interview during the screening process. (Yi & Gong, 2013). After
eliminating any of the unfit statements, the researcher created categories for each statement. The
primary purpose of creating categories regarded the efforts to classify those statements into
likely categories of representation. Once the categories were established, the researcher asked the
second set of individuals to read each of the statements regarding self-focused and other focused
voice behavior and place them in one of the previously developed categories or deem the
statement as not applicable (Saran et al., 2015).
The researcher then went through each individual's response regarding the request for categorizing the statements. The researcher identified patterns of repetition among the individual's efforts of categorizing the statements. Once the statements have been placed in the appropriate category, the researcher purified the measurement tool (Saran et al., 2015). After identifying patterns of repetition and categorizing the statements previously provided, the researcher developed a set of 24 questions total. It is important to note that both self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior each had 12 questions total. These questions were based upon the previously identified repetition patterns. Next, the researcher distributed the set of questions to 10 industry professionals. These professionals included associate professors of management, various attorneys, healthcare workers, and executive directors.

The noted group was asked to provide feedback on the 24 total questions. Noting the feedback and any changes, the researcher then revised the questions. A copy of the proposed questions to the date is provided in Appendix B. However, it is essential to note that the scale remains incomplete until the researcher conducts an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and determines its reliability. The remainder of the needed process was completed by distributing the proposed scale within a pilot setting. The next phase to finalize the scale was to launch a pilot test. Following the pilot test, the researcher tested for reliability and validity within the scale. Revisions to the scale continued on a needed basis until the scale met internal consistency standards. Specifically, the number rendered upon the conclusion of the calculation must be above .70 for the researcher to determine whether there is strong enough evidence to render internal consistency.

Organizational Commitment and Employee Voice Behavior
Following the outline of the noted research questions and the developed hypotheses that aim to answer each research question, the researcher outlined the included variables. As noted in the portion of Section 2 regarded as "Hypotheses Testing," the first three hypotheses (H_01, H_A1, H_02, H_A2, H_03, and H_A3) answered the first three research questions. First, within hypotheses H_01 and H_A1, the variables to be measured are employees' normative commitment and an employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior. Second, within H_02 and H_A2, the variables measured are employee's affective commitment and an employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior. Third, within hypotheses H_03 and H_A3, the variables measured are employee's continuance commitment and an employee's self-focused and other-focused voice behavior. Additionally, each proposed hypothesis does not have an identified independent and dependent variable. The purpose of the research was to determine to what extent a significant correlation existed between the proposed variables versus determining the impact. A full copy of the TCM questionnaire and consent to use the scale is included in Appendix A. Additionally, a full copy of the developed scale intended to measure the dimensions of employee voice behavior is included in Appendix B.

It is important to note that each question will contain a seven-point Likert scale. A seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 which indicates a strongly disagree response to 7 indicating a strong agree response. Numerical values representing a participants’ response of a 1 to 3 were considered low and 5 to 7 were considered high. The scale that was used to measure an employee’s normative commitment is the TCM scale that was previously developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). The questions without the Likert-scale that will be used to measure an employee’s normative commitment as suggested by Allen and Meyer (1990) and answer R1 are:

1. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
2. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.
3. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.
4. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
5. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.
6. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one's organization.
7. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.
8. I do not think that wanting to be a 'company man' or 'company woman' is sensible anymore.

A copy of the Dimension Voice Behavior questionnaire is included in Appendix B. The questions that will be used to measure an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior and answer R1 are:

**Self-Focused**

1. I usually speak up to my supervisor regarding new ideas I have that pertain directly to me.
2. I usually speak up to my supervisor regarding issues that I have that pertain directly to me.
3. I usually speak up regarding opportunities that benefit me.
4. I usually only speak up when organizational rules have been violated if the violation impacts me.
5. I tend to only voice concerns that directly impact me.
6. I am only concerned with using my voice if it directly impacts me.
7. I usually communicate my opinions to my supervisor only if the issue pertains to me.
8. I usually get involved in issues at work that directly impact me.
9. I usually communicate opportunities to others within the organization that relate to me.

**Other-Focused**

1. I usually speak up to my supervisor regarding new ideas I have that pertain to others.
2. I usually speak up to my supervisor regarding issues that I have that pertain to others.
3. I usually express concern to my supervisor regarding other employees.
4. I usually get involved in organizational issues that do not pertain to me.
5. I usually speak up for those around me.
6. I openly communicate opportunities to others within the organization that do not relate to me.
7. I usually speak up when organizational rules have been violated but the outcome has not impacted me.
8. I tend to speak up for others within an organizational setting.
9. I am only concerned with using my voice if it pertains to others within the organization.
10. I usually communicate my opinions to my supervisor even if the issues have nothing to do me.
11. I will speak on behalf of others, but will not speak on my behalf.
12. I get involved in issues at work that do not impact me.

The scale that will be used to measure an employee’s affective commitment is the TCM scale that was previously developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). The questions without the Likert-scale that will be used to measure an employee’s affective commitment as suggested by Allen and Meyer (1990) and answer R2 are:

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
3. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
5. I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.
6. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

The questions that will be used to measure an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior and answer R2 are the same questions that were previously mentioned. Said differently, the questions used to measure the two different dimensions of voice behavior will be the same questions utilized in RQ1.

The scale that will be used to measure an employee’s continuance commitment is the TCM scale that was previously developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). The questions without the
Likert-scale that will be used to measure an employee’s continuance commitment as suggested by Meyer and Allen (1991) and answer R3 are:

1. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.
2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
3. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
4. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now.
5. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
6. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
7. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
8. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice - another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

The questions that will be used to measure an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior and answer R3 are the same questions that were previously mentioned. Said differently, the questions used to measure the two different dimensions of voice behavior will be the same questions utilized in RQ2.

The representative sample of questions that will be used to measure an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior and answer R2 are the same questions that were previously mentioned. Said differently, the questions used to measure the two different dimensions of voice behavior will be the same questions utilized in RQ1.

The representative sample of questions without the Likert-scale that will be used to measure an employee’s normative commitment as suggested by Meyer and Allen (1991) and answer R3 are:

1. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.
2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
3. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
4. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now.
5. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
6. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
7. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
8. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice - another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

The representative sample of questions that were used to measure an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior and answer R3 are the same questions that were previously mentioned. Said differently, the questions used to measure the two different dimensions of voice behavior were the same questions utilized in RQ2.

Employee Voice Behavior and PWB

Following the outline of the noted research questions and the developed hypotheses that aim to answer each research question, the researcher outlined the included variables. As noted in the portion of Section 2 regarded as "Hypotheses Testing," the last two hypotheses (H_0^4, H_A^4, H_0^5, & H_A^5) answered research questions four and five. Hypotheses H_0^4 and H_A^4 the variables measured are the employee's self-focused voice behavior and an employee's PWB. In comparison, in hypotheses H_0^5 and H_A^5, the variables measured are the employee's other-focused voice behavior and an employee's PWB. Additionally, each proposed hypothesis did not have an identified independent and dependent variable. The purpose of the research was to determine to what extent a significant correlation existed between the proposed variables versus determining the impact of one variable on another. A full copy of the PWB questionnaire and consent to use the scale is included in Appendix C. Additionally, a full copy of the developed
scale intended to measure the dimensions of employee voice behavior is included in Appendix B.

It is important to note that each question contained a seven-point Likert scale. A seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 indicated a strongly disagree response to 7, indicating a strongly agree response. Numerical values representing a participants' response of a 1 to 3 were considered low, and 5 to 7 were considered high.

A copy of the Dimension Voice Behavior questionnaire is included in Appendix B. The representative sample of questions used to measure an employee's self-focused voice behavior and answer R4 are the same questions that were previously mentioned. Said differently, the questions used to measure the two different dimensions of voice behavior were the same questions utilized in RQ3.

The researcher used the 42 question PWB scaled developed by Ryff (1989). A copy of the PWB questionnaire is included in Appendix C. The questions that used to measure an employee’s PWB suggested by Ryff (1989) and answer R4 are:

1. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people.
2. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.
3. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons.
4. Most people see me as loving and affectionate.
5. I live life one day at a time and don’t really think about the future.
6. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.
7. My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing.
8. The demands of everyday life often get me down.
9. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.
10. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.
11. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.
12. In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.
13. I tend to worry about what other people think of me.
14. I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me.
15. When I think about it, I haven’t really improved much as a person over the years.
16. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns.
17. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.
18. I feel like many of the people I know have gotten more out of life than I have.
19. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.
20. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.
21. I have a sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.
22. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.
23. I don’t have a good sense of what it is I’m trying to accomplish in life.
24. I like most aspects of my personality.
25. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.
26. I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.
27. I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things.
28. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.
29. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.
30. In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.
31. It’s difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters.
32. I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me.
33. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
34. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.
35. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.
36. My attitude about myself is probably not as positive as most people feel about themselves.
37. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.
38. I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking.
39. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.
40. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.
41. I sometimes feel as if I’ve done all there is to do in life.
42. When I compare myself to friends and acquaintances, it makes me feel good about who I am.

A copy of the Dimension Voice Behavior questionnaire is included in Appendix B. The questions that will be used to measure an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior and answer R4 are the same questions that were previously mentioned. Said differently, the questions used to measure the two different dimensions of voice behavior will be the same questions utilized in RQ1 through RQ3.

A copy of the PWB questionnaire is included in Appendix C. A copy of the Dimension Voice Behavior questionnaire is included in Appendix B. The questions that will be used to measure an employee’s self-focused voice behavior and answer R4 are the same questions that were previously mentioned. Said differently, the questions used to measure the two different dimensions of voice behavior will be the same questions utilized in RQ4.

Summary of Data Collection & Organization

In this portion of Section 2, the researcher discussed the data collection plan and the surveys. Both of the noted entities are vital components that require a basic work plan before the data collection stage of the research. Additionally, the researcher reiterated the role and importance of Liberty University's Research Ethics Office and ensuring participants' privacy.

Data Analysis

Within this portion of Section 2, the researcher addressed three core areas of the research’s data analysis. First, the researcher provided crucial details about the variables measured within the study. Additionally, a table is provided to aid in conceptualizing each variable and includes the variable's details. Second, the researcher reviewed the importance of descriptive statistics and addressed the descriptive statistics used in this study. Third, the
essential details and considerations regarding the systematic process of testing each proposed hypothesis are discussed.

**The Variables**

The following variables are to be used in the research.

**Affective Organizational Commitment**: Refers to individuals who choose to continue into a future tense with the organization because the organization's values, goals, and initiatives are closely related to the employee's personal views (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015).

**Continuance Organizational Commitment**: Refers to individuals who remain at an organization because the cost of leaving is considered too high, and the cost of vacating the organization provides nothing to gain (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015).

**Normative Organizational Commitment**: Refers to individuals with a sense of obligation to continue with a particular organization because he or she feels as though they are expected to remain or have devoted too much time to the organization to leave (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Posey et al., 2015).

**Organizational Commitment**: Organizational commitment is a multiple dimensional construct that has been a dominant topic within the management literature for an extended time (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Luchak & Gellatly, 2007).

**Other-Focused Voice Behavior**: Represents an employee's proactive attempts to convey opinions about changing others' and/or the organization's conditions (Chou & Barron, 2016).

**Psychological Well-Being**: An essential employee variable directly linked to employee-oriented outcomes and encompasses a wide range of mental and physical health issues
The study will aim to include the hedonic and eudemonic approaches to PWB. Hedonic reflects upon well-being with the experience of positive feelings with the integration of overall life satisfaction (Robertson & Cooper, 2010). In comparison, the eudemonic approach reflects upon well-being with integrating the importance of the purpose in well-being (Robertson & Cooper, 2010).

**Self-Focused Voice Behavior:** Represents an employee's proactive attempts to convey opinions about changing his or her conditions (Chou & Barron, 2016).

**Voice Behavior:** Employee voice behavior, conceptually speaking, refers to an employee's informal discretionary behavior that is categorized as an upward communication mechanism geared towards creating awareness regarding ideas, solutions, or areas of concern within an organization (Duan, Li, Xu, & Wu, 2017; Morrison, 2014; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998).

Within Table 1, the researcher conceptualizes each variable, the operational definition of each variable, the variable type, the classification of the data type, and the range of the scales to be used. Table 1 is displayed below.

**Table 1. Variable Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Variable Type</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Connection to an organization on the basis of strongly associating with organization’s values, goals, and initiatives are closely related with the employee’s personal views (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1997; Posey, Roberts, &amp; Lowry, 2015).</td>
<td>The purpose of the research is to determine to what extent a significant correlation exists between the two proposed variables.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>The researcher will utilize a seven-point Likert scale. Utilizing the scale allows the researcher to gauge participants' responses. The scale will have a range from 1 indicates a strongly disagree reply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to a 7, indicating a strongly agree response. Numerical values representing a participants' response of a 1 to 3 will be considered, a response of a 4 will be neutral, and 5 to 7 will be regarded as high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
<th>Same as above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection to an organization on the basis of leaving is considerably too high and the cost vacating the organization provide nothing to gain (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1991; Meyer &amp; Allen, 1997; Posey, Roberts, &amp; Lowry, 2015).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the research is to determine to what extent a significant correlation exists between the two proposed variables.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
<th>Same as above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection to an organization on the basis of an individual feeling as though they are expected to remain or have devoted too much time to the organization to leave (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1991; Meyer &amp; Allen, 1997; Posey, Roberts, &amp; Lowry, 2015).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the research is to determine to what extent a significant correlation exists between the two proposed variables.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Other-Focused Voice behavior</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
<th>Same as above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents an employee’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the research is to</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were utilized within this study. Specifically, descriptive statistics analysis provides an overview of the raw data and indicates any apparent patterns that the data set might possess (O'Dwyer & Bernauer, 2014). Descriptive statistics are often referred to as exploratory data analysis within the literature (Andreasen & McDonald, 2021). The data serves to assist with understanding the distribution and or the shape of the data (Andreasen & McDonald, 2021). To visualize the bivariate quantitative analysis data, the researcher was interested in whether the two variables being analyzed maintain a linear relationship with one another. This display provided additional insight into whether the changes in one variable
enabled the researcher to make predictions or a change in the other analyzed variables. The researcher used descriptive statistics to check for errors within the dataset. Specifically, one error in the researcher looked for was missing data. Identifying missing data enabled the data to be investigated, and a determination as to the appropriate action was implemented. A -1.00 and 1.00 served as guiding points that render the distribution normal within the presented data set (Morgan et al., 2013a).

**Inferential Statistics**

After determining the data's skewness, the next decision to be made pertained to whether a parametric or non-parametric analysis would be utilized. Non-parametric testing is ideal for data sets established by ranks or counts (Gibbons Fielden & Gibbons, 1993). This particular research utilized developed measurements that utilize Likert scales. The items contained with the Likert scales are treated as ordinal values. Furthermore, using a non-parametric test is feasible (Gibbons Fielden & Gibbons, 1993). Whether to use inferential statistics resided in the notion that the researcher's efforts were based upon making inferences about the population based on the sample population (Klugh, 1970).

**Hypotheses and Research Question Overview**

Please note the first three research questions are listed below:

RQ1. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee’s normative commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior?

RQ2. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee’s affective commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior?

RQ3. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee’s continuance commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior?
The first three hypotheses (H₀₁, Hₐ₁, H₀₂, Hₐ₂, H₀₃, and Hₐ₃) answered the first three research questions. The last two hypotheses (H₀₄, Hₐ₄, H₀₅, & Hₐ₅) answered research questions four and five. Specifically, the first three hypotheses (H₀₁, Hₐ₁, H₀₂, Hₐ₂, H₀₃, and Hₐ₃) aimed to determine to what extent a significant correlation existed between an employee’s organizational commitment (normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and an employee’s voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused voice behavior). The research adopted a survey methodology to gather data from sample population.

The first three hypotheses (H₀₁, Hₐ₁, H₀₂, Hₐ₂, H₀₃, and Hₐ₃) answered the first three research questions. The hypotheses that aimed to answer the previously noted research questions are:

H₀₁: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s normative commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

Hₐ₁: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s normative commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

H₀₂: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s affective commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

Hₐ₂: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s affective commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

H₀₃: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s continuance commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

Hₐ₃: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s continuance commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

The remaining two research questions are listed below:
RQ4. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between employee’s self-focused voice behavior on an employee’s PWB?

RQ5. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between employee’s other-focused voice behavior on an employee’s PWB?

The last two hypotheses (H04, H_A4, H05, & H_A5) will answer research questions four and five. The hypotheses that aim to answer the previously noted research questions are:

H04: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s self-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

H_A4: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s self-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

H05: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s other-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

H_A5: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s other-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

Hypotheses Testing Details

The type of test that was proposed for this research project is correlational. Creswell (2014) noted that correlational designs aim to measure how two or more variables are related to one another. The first three hypotheses H01, H_A1, H02, H_A2, H03, and H_A3) answered the first three research questions. The last two hypotheses (H04, H_A4, H05, & H_A5) answered research questions four and five. Specifically, the first three hypotheses (H01, H_A1, H02, H_A2, H03, and H_A3) aimed to determine to what extent a significant correlation existed between an employee's organizational commitment (normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and an employee's voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused voice behavior).
The research adopted a survey methodology to gather data from voluntary participants. However, before data collection can be obtained from the sample from service workers' responses in the Permian Basin region of West Texas, the researcher developed the scale that will be utilized to measure the two dimensions of employee voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused). Past studies never accounted for the dimensions of voice behavior. Although the relationship between organizational commitment and employee voice is fully supported within the literature, these studies only focused on various types of voice (acquiescent, defensive, prosocial, etc.). The research will focus on the dimensions of voice rather than the voice types.

**Summary of Data Analysis**

The data analysis portion of the research conceptually presented the variables included within the study. Furthermore, the importance and outcomes of the descriptive and inferential statistics were addressed. Furthermore, lastly, the researcher discussed the hypotheses testing utilized and the outcomes for each of the previously devised hypotheses.

**Reliability and Validity**

Ensuring accuracy within the scales the researcher utilized to measure voluntary participants' responses was essential. Within this portion of Section 2, the researcher discusses the details regarding the future efforts of ensuring validity and reliability within the instruments proposed for use. Specifically, the researcher outlines the steps and procedures used to establish the validity and reliability of the measured utilized within this portion.

**Reliability**

As noted, the subscales that will be utilized for measuring PWB are a shortened version of the original 84-question survey. This usage of the subscales was highly attributed to the intercorrelation among variables presented in the original 42-item survey. Previous studies
concluded that each of the three components included in the TCM scale was independent but remained interrelated (Wilson et al., 2016). Moreover, the three components on the TCM scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) have been valid and reliable measures for measuring organizational commitment (Wilson et al., 2016). All of the three dimensions as previously noted within the instruments portion of section 2. These findings remain consistent with past studies that have utilized the scales to measure organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Noor & Noor, 2006; Wilson et al., 2016).

**Validity**

Meyer and Allen's (1990) three-component organizational commitment model contains three eight-item sub-scales. Internal consistency was obtained by previous studies that utilized the developed scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990). In specific terms, the internal consistency of the subscale aimed at measuring Affective Commitment (AC) presented a range from .74 to .89, Continuance Commitment (CC) presented a range from .69 to .84, and Normative Commitment (NC) presented a range from .69 to .79. The three subscales that pertain directly to the three dimensions of organizational commitment were noted as loading on different orthogonal factors, further allowing the distinct dimension to be categorized independently of one another (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Please refer to Appendix A for the obtained copyright agreement. Refer to Appendix B for a copy of the Allen and Meyer (1990) 24-item scale that is to be used to measure an employee's organizational commitment (normative, affective, and continuance commitment). Ryff's (1989) scale was created to measure an employee's PWB. This 42-item standardized measure contains various questions that relate to an individual's autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016; Ryff, 1989). Upon further review of the proposed PWB measurement
scale, several vital areas originated within the literature. Erkutlu and Chafra (2016) noted that Ryff's (1989) original scale was organized into a series of subscales.

Specifically, the subscales presented high levels of inter-correlation among the presented variables. The noted finding was presented in various studies (Akram Ahmad & Obeid Al-Shbiel, 2019; Joo et al., 2017; Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016; Joo et al., 2016; Arnold et al., 2007; Schwartz et al., 2005). This, consequently, led researchers to combine the subscales into an overall measure. Combining the subscales into a core measurement further led to a higher Cronbach's Alpha. The researcher aimed to increase the original average presented in Ryff's (1989) measurement of .81 (Akram Ahmad & Obeid Al-Shbiel, 2019) to a higher average, which will inadvertently increase internal consistency within the scale (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). Following the combination of the subscales, the modified questionnaire was measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1, which indicated a strongly agree response, to 7, which indicated a strongly disagree response. The copyright form to use the scale and the scale are included in Appendix B.

Several previous studies have utilized the PWB scale. The scale has undergone several revisions. Specifically, the original scale started with 120 questions. The scale has been revised into several different versions. This research project will use the 42-item PWB scale. The scale measures an individual's autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016; Ryff, 1989). Moreover, the sub-components on the PWB scale developed by Ryff (1989) have been noted as being valid and reliable measures for measuring an individual's PWB (Shryock & Meeks, 2018).

Regarding the developed scale intended to measure the dimensions of an employee's voice behavior, the researcher established validity prior to utilizing the scale fully. The
remainder of the needed process was completed by distributing the proposed scale within a pilot setting. The next phase to finalize the scale was to launch a pilot test. Following the pilot test, the researcher tested for reliability and validity within the scale. Revisions to the scale were continued on a needed basis until the scale met internal consistency standards. Specifically, the number rendered upon the conclusion of the calculation must be above .70 for the researcher to determine there was strong enough evidence to render internal consistency.

Summary of Section 2

Within Section 2, the researcher covered vital aspects of the proposed study. Specifically, the researcher discussed the research methodology in detail, the population and sampling, the data analysis, and the reliability and validity contained with the measurements. All of the noted areas are essential to ensure the analysis of collected data produces quality output that can be used in future studies.

Section 3: Application to Professional Practice and Implications for Change

Overview of the Study

All statistical tests and analyses were executed using SPSS Predictive Software version 24.0 for Windows. The research survey, including the informed consent, selection criteria, the Total Commitment Model (TCM) survey, Dimensions of Voice Behavior survey, and the Psychological Well-Being (PWB) survey, were sent to a list of oil and gas maintenance workers within the West Texas region of the Permian Basin. As discussed in the proposal, the researcher obtained a list of all oil and gas organizations that provide support service to the West Texas region of the Permian Basin and sent an open invitation for participation.

Presentation of Findings

Descriptive Statistics
Within the descriptive portion, the researcher begins to summarize the raw data. Generating the central tendency and the spread of the data are recommended (Weisberg, 1992). Table 1 presents the basic descriptive statistics. Specifically, Table 1 includes the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation for each variable. The minimum and maximum correlate with the Likert scale used within the study. The researcher will utilize a seven-point Likert scale. Utilizing the scale allows the researcher to gauge participants' responses. The scale ranged from 1, indicating a strongly disagree reply, to a 7 indicating a strongly agree response. Numerical values representing a participants' response of less than 4 are considered low, a response of a 4 will be neutral, and greater than 4 will be regarded as high. The mean provides the numerical value associated with each variable, computed by summatiing all scores and dividing by the total number of responses (Salkind, 2004), as seen in Table 1. Each question was designed to measure a specific variable and was summed and divided by 385 to obtain the mean. An important takeaway from the produced means is that the research study's variables produced responses that are regarded as high. The standard deviation enabled the researcher to analyze the apparent variance within the noted data. The standard deviation remains useful because the number produced remains independent or separate from the mean and provides a measure for the spread of the data (Andreasen & McDonald, 2021).

Table 2. Descriptive Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.4205</td>
<td>1.20854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7136</td>
<td>1.02483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFV</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1829</td>
<td>1.07675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFV</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.2279</td>
<td>1.09164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWB</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1810</td>
<td>.77606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability and Validity

A key component the researcher sought to integrate into the study was high levels of reliability and validity. Reliability and validity are critical components impacting the study's significance. Reliability pertains to the part of a measurement that results in any permanent effects that can be witnessed from one sample population to another (Netemeyer et al., 2003). Said differently, a scale's reliability pertains to the presented stability, which can be witnessed over time. Validity refers to how the set measures each of the presented variables within a study (Hair et al., 1998). The fundamental difference between reliability and validity is that reliability relates to consistency, whereas validity relates to accuracy (Hair et al., 1998). However, reliability and validity are essential mechanisms a researcher must confirm to ensure meaningful and justified results.

The Total Commitment Model (TCM) and the Psychological Well-Being (PWB) data collection tools have been tested previously for discriminate validity. The TCM scale developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) has been noted as a valid and reliable measure for measuring organizational commitment (Wilson et al., 2016). The PWB shortened 42-item survey measures an individual's autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016; Ryff, 1989). The sub-components of the PWB scale developed by Ryff (1989) have been noted as valid and reliable measures for measuring an individual's PWB (Shryock & Meeks, 2018).

In order to effectively determine whether the utilized scales were reliable, the researcher conducted a Cronbach Alpha reliability test. The TCM scale contains three dimensions. These dimensions are Normative Commitment (NC), Affective Commitment (AC), and Continuance Commitment (CC). Conclusively the reliability test of the three dimensions resulted in Cronbach
coefficient alphas of .705, .740, and .768 for NC, AC, and CC. Testing the PWB scale resulted in a Cronbach coefficient of .921. All of the rendered Cronbach coefficients were deemed acceptable. The Cronbach coefficients were all above .70, proving each scale presented strong enough evidence to render internal consistency.

The Dimension Voice Behavior scale contained two dimensions. Self-Focused Voice (SFV) Behavior and Other-Focused Voice (OFV) Behavior were the two dimensions of the scale. As noted in the proposal, the development of a new scale required a more rigorous approach when compared to the TCM and PWB scales that were previously developed. The researcher executed the scale within a pilot setting following the scale development. The purpose of the pilot setting was to allow the researcher to determine the loading factor of each question. Said differently, the researcher needed to determine whether the developed questions accurately measured the intended variables of SFV and OFV. In order to determine the reliability, the researcher conducted a preliminary analysis of the raw data obtained during the scale development phase. Within the next portion of the presentation of findings, the researcher will discuss the factorial analysis and how factorial analysis was needed before the researcher could determine the reliability and validity of SFV and OFV. Following the noted factorial analysis overview, a summary of all noted Cronbach Alphas will be provided in Table 2.

**Factorial Analysis**

Before providing a detailed explanation of the executed factorial analysis it is pertinent the importance of scale development as it pertains to the current study is briefly elaborated upon. The process of scale development has witnessed a significant influx within the strategic management discipline and has noted growth for an extended time (Clark & Watson, 1995). A general assumption regarding the influx is the need for researchers to develop reliable and
validated measurements to assist managers in decision-making and information processing. Additionally, scale development aids in theory testing (Netemeyer et al., 2003). As industries begin to evolve and patterns of behavior begin to shift, researchers will often develop new theories to assist with predicting or interpreting human behavior, attitudes, and perceptions. Further validating the growth of scale development, many recent texts have created a compilation of popular organizational behavior scales (Bearden & Netemeyer, 1998; Robinson et al., 1991). The growing interest and exploitation of scale development are tied to the evolution and development of theories (Bearden & Netemeyer, 1998).

Noting the importance of scale development, the researcher wanted to ensure the developed scale produced the highest levels of reliability and validity. The researcher's previous steps to develop the DVB scale are fully disclosed within the research proposal portion. However, a portion of the scale development process needed to be executed before determining each scale's reliability. Hence, the raw data previously obtained from the pilot study needed to be further analyzed. The analysis pertains to accurately concluding whether the developed scale for SFV and OFV was a viable mechanism to measure the dimension of an employee's voice behavior. Thus, the researcher executed a factorial analysis before calculating SFV and OFV Cronbach Alpha scores.

Broadly speaking, factor analysis is regarded as a statistical method that a researcher utilizes to gather a greater understanding of measured variables by determining common factors that are used to represent patterns of correlations (Fabrigar et al., 1999). There are two types of factor analysis that researchers commonly use, which are known as confirmatory and exploratory approaches (Hayton et al., 2004). Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) are two viable approaches that allow the researcher to observe the amount of
variance between latent variables (Hayton et al., 2004). EFA is noted as being an appropriate factorial analysis approach for scale development (Hurley et al., 1997). EFA is intended to assist the researcher in the determining of the number factors to retain. Said differently, EFA allows the researcher to determine the dimensionality of each construct being measured within a question and then determine the number of items that being to the noted factor (Netemeyer et al., 2003). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was available within SPSS Predictive Software version 24.0 for Windows. The KMO test provided the researcher with the factor loading information.

Questions that rendered a KMO value of less than .5 were removed (Hair et al., 1995; Shamsudin et al., 2019; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Williams et al., 2010). However, none of the presented questions for either SFV or OFV rendered a KMO score below .5. Following the KMO test the researcher was not able to determine the reliability SFV and OFV. The Cronbach Alpha for SFV and OFV was .767 and .867. Both Cronbach Alphas were deemed acceptable noting the .7 standard. Table 2 displayed below summarizes the reliability test for each of the noted variables within the study.

Table 3. Realiability Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Instrument Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCM-NC</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCM-AC</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM-CC</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVB-SFV</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVB-OFV</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWB</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normality
Conceptually, normal distribution refers to the distribution of data that is symmetrical in nature and the distribution is conveyed by z-tables (Kerr et al., 2002). Visually normal distribution is regarded as data maintains a single peak and displays a fair distinctive shape (Bennett, Briggs, & Triola, 2014). Following the importing of data into SPSS Predictive Software version 24.0 for Windows the researcher tested for normality within the presented data. The important aspect tied to testing data for normality in the analysis will guide the researcher to test the noted hypotheses using a parametric or non-parametric test. Parametric test was designed to test data that is normally distributed whereas non-parametric test does not assume normality and can be utilized when data is not normally distributed (Morgan et al., 2013a). In this particular study if the data is normally distributed the researcher will utilize the Pearson correlation coefficient (Pearson’s r) and Spearman’s correlation coefficient (Spearman’s rho) for data that is not normally distributed (Morgan et al., 2013a). To test the normality of each variable of the data the researcher utilized a histogram, skewness and kurtosis, and a Q-Q Plot. Within the following portions the findings that relate to each variable are visually displayed and interpreted.

**Normative Commitment (NC) Normality Overview**

Figure 1 presents the frequency histogram of NC scores.
At first glance the data appears normal. Further normality test is needed to determine the exact skewness. The two main test for testing normality are graphical and numerical (Mishra et al, 2019). The graphical representation appears normally distributed. However, further testing for normality to ensure numerical representation is included within the study.

Table 4 displays the skewness and kurtosis of NC scores.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skewness and Kurtosis of TCM-NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The skewness of .057 is not a significant amount of skewness. Therefore, the researcher considered a normal distribution. A general guideline for researchers to follow is if the skewness value is between -1 and +1 the data is considered to be normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). Whereas, if the skewness value is greater than +1 or lower than -1 the data is to be considered not normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). The kurtosis of -.541 is regarded as an excess kurtosis <3, translating into what is known as a more flat distribution (Salkind, 2004). George and Mallery (2010) note that kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable and provide indication of a normal distribution. The kurtosis of -.541 provides indication that the data is normally distributed.

Kurtosis is a term used to describe the level of dispersion among presented scores within a data set (Jackson, 2012). It is important to note that kurtosis allows a researcher to determine whether the presented data is heavy-tailed or light tailed (DeCarlo, 1997). Negative kurtosis allows the researcher to determine the data is light-tailed in direct comparison to normal distribution (DeCarlo 1997). Where, a positive kurtosis allows the researcher to determine the data is heavy-tailed in direct comparison to normal distribution (DeCarlo 1997). When a distribution has a negative kurtosis, this is regarded as platykurtic (Mariappan, 2019). A platykurtic visually displays a smaller peak around the mean and has smaller thin like tails (Mariappan, 2019).

The researcher did not utilize a z-score calculation when analyzing the skewness or kurtosis. This is tied to the notion that the sample size is over 300. The literature recommends using histograms and the skewness and kurtosis values without considering the z-values as viable mechanisms to determine whether normality has been violated (Endod, 2013). Consequently, the
researcher concluded that the assumption of normality to be violated therefore, the non-parametric Spearman’s correlation coefficient (Spearman’s rho) was utilized to test the null hypothesis HO1 (Gibbons Fielden & Gibbons, 1993). It is essential to note Spearman’s rho and the Pearson correlation coefficient (Pearson’s r).

Figure 2 presents the Q-Q plot of NC scores.

![Normal Q-Q Plot of NC_SUM](image)

When examining a Q-Q plot Norušis (2000) notes that when the points representing the observed data cluster around the straight-line data can be considered normally distributed. The observed values for NC appear to cluster around the straight-line. The results displayed in the Q-Q plot further support the notion that the data is normally distributed.

**Affective Commitment (AC) Normality Overview**

Figure 3 presents the frequency histogram of AC scores.
Upon initial inspection of the frequency histogram the data appears normal. The two main test for testing normality are graphical and numerical (Mishra et al., 2019). The graphical representation appears normally distributed. However, further testing for normality to ensure numerical representation is included within the study. Specifically, the skewness and kurtosis of the data were calculated. The skewness and kurtosis calculations can be viewed in Table 4.

Table 5 displays the skewness and kurtosis of AC scores.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skewness and Kurtosis of AC</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>385</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The skewness of -.176 is not a significant amount of skewness. Therefore, the researcher considered a normal distribution. A general guideline for researchers to follow is if the skewness value is between -1 and +1 the data is considered to be normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). Whereas, if the skewness value is greater than +1 or lower than -1 the data is to be considered not normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). The kurtosis of -.507 is regarded as an excess kurtosis <3, translating into what is known as a more flat distribution (Salkind, 2004). George and Mallery (2010) note that kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable and provide indication of a normal distribution. The kurtosis of -.507 provides indication that the data is normally distributed.

Figure 4 presents the Q-Q plot of AC scores.

![Normal Q-Q Plot of AC_SUM](image)

When examining a Q-Q plot Norušus (2000) notes that when the points representing the observed data cluster around the straight-line data can be considered normally distributed. The
observed values for AC appear to cluster around the straight-line. The results displayed in the Q-Q plot further support the notion that the data is normally distributed.

Figure 5 presents the frequency histogram of CC scores.

![Histogram](image)

Upon initial inspection of the frequency histogram the data appears normal. The two main test for testing normality are graphical and numerical (Mishra et al, 2019). The graphical representation appears normally distributed. Further normality test is needed to determine the exact skewness.

Table 6 displays the skewness and kurtosis of CC scores.

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skewness and Kurtosis of TCM-CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skewness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The skewness of -.186 is not a significant amount of skewness. Therefore, the researcher considered a normal distribution. A general guideline for researchers to follow is if the skewness value is between -1 and +1 the data is considered to be normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). Whereas, if the skewness value is greater than +1 or lower than -1 the data is to be considered not normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). The kurtosis of -.024 is regarded as an excess kurtosis <3, translating into what is known as a more flat distribution (Salkind, 2004). George and Mallery (2010) note that kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable and provide indication of a normal distribution. The kurtosis of -.024 provides indication that the data is normally distributed.

Figure 6 presents the Q-Q- plot of CC scores.
When examining a Q-Q plot Norušius (2000) notes that when the points representing the observed data cluster around the straight-line data can be considered normally distributed. The observed values for CC appear to cluster around the straight-line. The results displayed in the Q-Q plot further support the notion that the data is normally distributed.

**Self-Focused Voice (SFV) Normality Overview**

Figure 7 presents the frequency histogram of SFV scores.

![Histogram of SFV scores](image)

Upon initial inspection of the frequency histogram the data appears normal. The two main test for testing normality are graphical and numerical (Mishra et al, 2019). The graphical representation appears normally distributed. Further normality test is needed to determine the exact skewness.
Table 7 displays the skewness and kurtosis of SFV scores.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skewness and Kurtosis of SFV</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The skewness of -0.828 is not a significant amount of skewness. Therefore, the researcher considered a normal distribution. A general guideline for researchers to follow is if the skewness value is between -1 and +1 the data is considered to be normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). Whereas, if the skewness value is greater than +1 or lower than -1 the data is to be considered not normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). The kurtosis of 1.248 is regarded as an excess kurtosis <3, translating into what is known as a more flat distribution (Salkind, 2004). George and Mallery (2010) note that kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable and provide indication of a normal distribution. The kurtosis of 1.248 provides indication that the data is normally distributed.

Figure 8 presents the Q-Q- plot of SFV scores.
When examining a Q-Q plot Norušus (2000) notes that when the points representing the observed data cluster around the straight-line data can be considered normally distributed. The observed values for SFV appear to cluster around the straight-line. The results displayed in the Q-Q plot further support the notion that the data is normally distributed.

*Other-Focused Voice (OFV) Normality Overview*

Figure 9 presents the frequency histogram of OFV scores.
Upon initial inspection of the frequency histogram the data does not appear normal. There appears to be some outliers presented within the data set. The two main tests for testing normality are graphical and numerical (Mishra et al, 2019). Further testing for normality to ensure numerical representation is included within the study.

Table 8 displays the skewness and kurtosis of OFV scores.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skewness and Kurtosis of OFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The skewness of -.488 is not a significant amount of skewness. Therefore, the researcher considered a normal distribution. A general guideline for researchers to follow is if the skewness value is between -1 and +1 the data is considered to be normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). Whereas, if the skewness value is greater than +1 or lower than -1 the data is to be considered not normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). The kurtosis of .356 is regarded as an excess kurtosis <3, translating into what is known as a more flat distribution (Salkind, 2004). George and Mallery (2010) note that kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable and provide indication of a normal distribution. The kurtosis of .356 provides indication that the data is normally distributed.

Figure 10 presents the Q-Q- plot of OFV scores.

When examining a Q-Q plot Norušius (2000) notes that when the points representing the observed data cluster around the straight-line data can be considered normally distributed. The observed values for OFV appear to cluster around the straight-line. The results displayed in the
Q-Q plot further support the notion that the data is normally distributed. It is important to note that there are some observed values that deviate from the straight-line. However, noting the previous skewness and kurtosis calculation along with the histogram, the researcher determined the data to be normally distributed.

**Psychological Well-Being (PWB) Normality Overview**

Figure 11 presents the frequency histogram of PWB scores.

![Histogram](image)

Upon initial inspection of the frequency histogram the data does not appear normal. There appears to be some outliers presented within the data set. The two main test for testing normality are graphical and numerical (Mishra et al, 2019). The graphical representation appears normally distributed. However, further testing for normality to ensure numerical representation is included within the study.
Table 9 displays the skewness and kurtosis of PWB scores.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skewness and Kurtosis of PWB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The skewness of -.054 is not a significant amount of skewness. Therefore, the researcher considered a normal distribution. A general guideline for researchers to follow is if the skewness value is between -1 and +1 the data is considered to be normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). Whereas, if the skewness value is greater than +1 or lower than -1 the data is to be considered not normally distributed (Hair et al., 2022). Based upon the information provided, the researcher determined the distribution of data to be non-normal and slightly skewed to the left (Kerr et al., 2002). The kurtosis of 1.091 is regarded as an excess kurtosis <3, translating into what is known as a more flat distribution (Salkind, 2004). George and Mallery (2010) note that kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable and provide indication of a normal distribution. The kurtosis of 1.091 provides indication that the data is normally distributed.

Figure 12 presents the Q-Q- plot of PWB scores.
When examining a Q-Q plot Norušus (2000) notes that when the points representing the observed data cluster around the straight-line data can be considered normally distributed. The observed values for PWB appear to cluster around the straight-line. The results displayed in the Q-Q plot further support the notion that the data is normally distributed. It is important to note that there are some observed values that deviate from the straight-line. However, noting the previous skewness and kurtosis calculation along with the histogram the researcher determined the data to be normally distributed.

A conceptual presentation of the skewness and kurtosis for each variable is presented within Table 9. Furthermore, the researcher indicated based upon the results whether the non-parametric equivalent testing mechanism was deemed necessary.

Table 10 displays the skewness and kurtosis of each variable.
Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Non-parametric testing needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.507</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFV</td>
<td>-.828</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFV</td>
<td>-.488</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWB</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-1.091</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type I and II Errors

Type I errors occur in research studies when the null hypothesis is wrongly rejected (Bennett et al., 2014). Where type II errors occur in research studies when the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis when the hypothesis is false (Bennett et al., 2014). P-values have been are to help control the Type I error rates within research studies (Trafimow & Earp, 2017). The sample size was determined at a 95% confidence level and a sampling error of .05. A .05 alpha (\(\alpha\)) was selected for this study to minimize the risk of the researcher concluding that a potential effect might exist when the effect, in fact, is not evident (Frost, 2020).

As the noted the accepted \(\alpha\) was .05, this translates into the notion that there is a 5% probability of a type I error occurring. Table 10 displays the calculation of the probability of a type II error occurring. To determine the probability of a type II error occurring the researcher calculated the power of the analysis (\(\beta\)), effect size, significance. Thus, once Beta (\(\beta\)) was calculated the number rendered was subtracted from one (1 - \(\beta\)). This calculation provided a numerical indication as to the probability of a type II error occurring within the study. However, within the noted study the probability of a type II error occurring within any of the hypotheses is 0%.

Table 11 presents the summary of type II errors calculation.
Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Type II Error Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFV</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFV</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWB</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Questions

Research Question R1

RQ1. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee’s normative commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior?

Research question RQ1 was developed to determine whether a significant correlation exist between an employee’s normative commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior. Research RQ1 utilized TCM survey questions specifically questions 1 through 8, which measured an employee’s NC. RQ1 utilized all questions from the DVB survey questions which included 25-41 measuring an employee’s SFV and OFV. The developed hypotheses that were used within the study to answer RQ1 are listed below:

H<sub>0</sub>1: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s normative commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

H<sub>A</sub>1: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s normative commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

The presented null hypothesis states that there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s normative commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior. The researcher executed a Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) to test H<sub>0</sub>1.
Responses from the sample population which consisted of oil and gas maintenance workers located in the West Texas region of the Permian basin (N=385) compromised the sample that was utilized for the study. The researcher used IBM SPSS to conduct the Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) with a probability of p<.05, noting the findings can be found in the population at a 95% confidence level.

Table 12 presents the Pearson correlation coefficient for null hypothesis H₀₁.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation for Null Hypothesis H₀₁</th>
<th>TCM-NC</th>
<th>DVB-SFV</th>
<th>DVB-OFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCM-NC Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pearson coefficient presented between the variables of NC and SFV was statistically significant at r (385) = .220, p>.05. The Pearson coefficient presented between the variables of NC and OFV was statistically significant at r (385) = .213, p>.05. The outcome presented allowed the researcher to reject the null hypothesis H₀₁, which stated there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s normative commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

**Research Question R2**

**RQ2.** To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee’s affective commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior?

Research question RQ2 was developed to determine whether a significant correlation exist between an employee’s affective commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior. Research RQ2 utilized TCM survey questions utilized TCM survey
questions specifically questions 9 through 16, which measured an employee’s AC. RQ2 utilized all questions from the DVB survey questions which included 25-41 measuring an employee’s SFV and OFV.

The developed hypotheses that were used within the study to answer RQ2 are listed below:

\[ H_{02} : \] There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s affective commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

\[ H_{A2} : \] There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s affective commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

The presented null hypothesis states that there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s affective commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior. The researcher executed a Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) to test \( H_{02} \).

Responses from the sample population which consisted of oil and gas maintenance workers located in the West Texas region of the Permian basin (\( N=385 \)) compromised the sample that was utilized for the study. The researcher used IBM SPSS to conduct the Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) with a probability of \( p<.05 \), noting the findings can be found in the population at a 95% confidence level.

Table 13 presents the Pearson correlation coefficient for null hypothesis \( H_{02} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation for Null Hypothesis ( H_{02} )</th>
<th>TCM-AC</th>
<th>DVB-SFV</th>
<th>DVB-OFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCM-AC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Pearson coefficient presented between the variables of AC and SFV was statistically significant at \( r(385) = .195, p > .05 \). The Pearson coefficient presented between the variables of AC and OFV was statistically significant at \( r(385) = .153, p > .05 \). The outcome presented allowed the researcher to reject the null hypothesis \( H_02 \), which stated there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s affective commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

**Research Question R3**

**RQ3.** To what extent does a significant correlation exist between an employee’s continuance commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior?

Research question RQ3 was developed to determine a significant correlation exist between an employee’s continuance commitment and employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior. Research RQ3 utilized TCM survey questions specifically questions 25 through 41, which measured an employee’s CC. RQ3 utilized all questions from the DVB survey questions which included 25-41 measuring an employee’s SFV and OFV. The developed hypotheses that were used within the study to answer RQ3 are listed below:

- **\( H_03 \):** There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s continuance commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

- **\( H_A3 \):** There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s continuance commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

The presented null hypothesis states that there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s continuance commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior. The researcher executed a Pearson correlation (Pearson’s \( r \)) to test \( H_03 \). Responses from the sample population which consisted of oil and gas maintenance workers
located in the West Texas region of the Permian Basin (N=385) compromised the sample that was utilized for the study. The researcher used IBM SPSS to conduct the Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) with a probability of p<.05, noting the findings can be found in the population at a 95% confidence level.

Table 14 presents the Pearson correlation coefficient for null hypothesis $H_03$.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation for Null Hypothesis $H_03$</th>
<th>TCM-CC</th>
<th>DVB-SFV</th>
<th>DVB-OFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCM-CC Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pearson coefficient presented between the variables of CC and SFV was statistically significant at $r(385) = .075, p>.05$. The Pearson coefficient presented between the variables of CC and OFV was not statistically significant at $r(385) = .001, p<.05$. The outcome presented did not allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis $H_03$, which stated there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s affective commitment and an employee’s self-focused and other focused voice behavior.

**Research Question R4**

RQ4. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between employee’s self-focused voice behavior on an employee’s PWB?

Research question RQ4 was developed to a significant correlation exist between employee’s self-focused voice behavior on an employee’s PWB. RQ4 utilized all questions from the DVB survey questions which included 25-41 measuring an employee’s SFV and OFV. RQ4 utilized all questions from the PWB survey questions which included 42-84 measuring an
employee’s PWB. The developed hypotheses that were used within the study to answer RQ4 are listed below:

\( H_04: \) There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s self-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

\( H_A4: \) There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s self-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

The presented null hypothesis states that there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s self-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB. The researcher executed a Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) to test \( H_04 \). Responses from the sample population which consisted of oil and gas maintenance workers located in the West Texas region of the Permian Basin (\( N=385 \)) compromised the sample that was utilized for the study. The researcher used IBM SPSS to conduct the Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) with a probability of \( p<.05 \), noting the findings can be found in the population at a 95% confidence level. Table 15 presents the Pearson correlation coefficient for null hypothesis \( H_04 \).

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation for Null Hypothesis ( H_04 )</th>
<th>PWB</th>
<th>DVB-SFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pearson coefficient presented between the variables of AC and SFV was statistically significant at \( r(385) = .304, p>.05 \). The outcome presented allowed the researcher to reject the null hypothesis \( H_04 \), which stated there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s self-focused voice and an employee’s PWB.
Research Question R5

RQ5. To what extent does a significant correlation exist between employee’s other-focused voice behavior on an employee’s PWB?

Research question RQ5 was developed to a significant correlation exist between employee’s self-focused voice behavior on an employee’s PWB. RQ4 utilized all questions from the DVB survey questions which included 25-41 measuring an employee’s SFV and OFV. RQ4 utilized all questions from the PWB survey questions which included 42-84 measuring an employee’s PWB. The developed hypotheses that were used within the study to answer RQ5 are listed below:

H₀₅: There is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s other-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

Hₐ₅: There is a statistically significant correlation between an employee’s other-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

The presented null hypothesis states that there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s other-focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB. The researcher executed a Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) to test H₀₅. Responses from the sample population which consisted of oil and gas maintenance workers located in the West Texas region of the Permian Basin (N=385) compromised the sample that was utilized for the study. The researcher used IBM SPSS to conduct the Pearson correlation (Pearson’s r) with a probability of p<.05, noting the findings can be found in the population at a 95% confidence level. Table 16 presents the Pearson correlation coefficient for null hypothesis H₀₅.

Table 16
Pearson’s correlation coefficient for Null Hypothesis H₀₅

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PWB</th>
<th>DVB-OFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWB</td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pearson coefficient presented between the variables of CC and OFV was not statistically significant at $r(385) = .009, p<.05$. The outcome presented did not allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis $H₀₅$, which stated there is no statistically significant correlation between an employee’s other focused voice behavior and an employee’s PWB.

**SEC, Organizational Commitment, and Voice Behavior**

The theories that have been chosen to form the fundamental theoretical framework for this quantitative study are the Social Exchange Theory (SET) and the Conservation of Resource Theory (COR). Specifically, the SET notes that who witness organizational satisfaction and are emotionally committed to their organization witness increased levels of motivation to provide constructive feedback regarding potential changes or adaptations (Thomas et al., 2012). Where employees who execute this type of feedback are more apt to display various commit levels to his or her organization. Said differently, this type of engagement is a means for an employee who is committed to their organization to demonstrate reciprocity. The demonstration of reciprocity originates back to the organizational relationship between the employee and the organization. Conceptually, this further translates into the notion that organizational commitment is based upon the exchange between two parties. The fundamental dimension within the exchange that facilities and supports a healthy ongoing relationship is reciprocity. Reciprocity can be displayed through voice behavior. Employees exhibit voice behavior aiming to reciprocate for the
favorable treatment in which they have received through their employment relations (Burris et al., 2008; Choi, 2007; Thomas et al., 2012).

Research questions RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3 were all developed to determine to what extent does a significant correlation exists between an employee’s organizational commitment (normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) and an employee’s voice behavior (self-focused and other-focused voice behavior). The first three hypotheses ($H_01$, $H_{A1}$, $H_02$, $H_{A2}$, $H_03$, and $H_{A3}$) will answer the first three research questions. The researcher utilized the data from the sample population of oil and gas maintenance workers in the West Texas region of the Permian Basin to test the hypotheses that would assist with answering each research question. Furthermore, the test performed allowed the researcher to determine whether the theoretical framework that was originally proposed within the study was supported by the data analysis. Following the analysis, the researcher was able to determine that the theoretical framework provided valuable insight and support. The fundamental premise the framework provided further supports the research outcome of rejecting the null hypotheses associated with RQ1 and RQ2 ($H_01$, $H_{A1}$, $H_02$, and $H_{A2}$).

**COR, Voice Behavior, and Psychological Well-Being**

A primary tent within the COR suggest that individuals will activity engage in behaviors that are aimed at the direct avoidance of resource loss (Hobfoll, 1988). This is notably tied to the notion that resource loss negativity impacts an individual’s well-being. Voice serves as vital tool for all employees within the workplace. This ultimately would require an employee to increase the amount of time and efforts needed to clearly articulate, defend, and answer any concerns that have consequently risen from the execution of the employee’s voice behavior (Luria et al., 2009). One can argue that an employee may use more voice as a means of investment. This
investment would serve the individual in the future by enabling them to acquire new resources. PWB translates into the notion of an individual who experiences increased levels of positive emotions furthering witnessing increased levels of satisfaction from a general perspective (Park et al., 2017).

Research question RQ4 was developed to determine whether a significant correlation exist between employee’s self-focused voice behavior on an employee’s PWB. Where RQ 5 was developed to determine whether a significant correlation exist between employee’s other-focused voice behavior on an employee’s PWB. The last two hypotheses (H04, H A4, H05 and H A5) answered research questions RQ4 and RQ5. The test performed allowed the researcher to determine whether the theoretical framework that was originally proposed within the study was supported by the data analysis. Following the analysis, the researcher was able to determine that the theoretical framework provided valuable insight and support. The fundamental premise the framework provided further supports the research outcome of rejecting the null hypothesis associated with RQ4 (H04).

**Application to Professional Field**

As noted previously in the study, managers are tasked with the duty of ensuring organizational effectiveness. Employee PWB is regarded in the literature as being a vital factor that determines numerous employee effectiveness. Simply stated, employee effectiveness impacts whether or not an employee is able and capable of performing their tasks. Whereas, the inability to properly execute and complete task will bestow adverse impacts on a manager’s primary goal of ensuring organizational effectiveness. it became pertinent that managers create working environments that commence, facilitate, and maintain high levels of employee effectiveness. One way to accomplish this task is to create environments in which employees are
able to share thoughts, ideas, and concerns openly within managers. This type of exchange originating through voice behavior is linked to positive organizational outcomes (Rasheed et al., 2017). Additionally, employees who with higher levels of commitment are more likely to express his or her feedback that positively modify their work environment (Withey & Cooper, 1989), and consequently, have a positive psychological well-being.

This study was created to fill the gap of determining the extent to which the three types of employee’s organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) impact the two types of employee’s voice behavior (e.g., self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior) resulting in differing levels of employees PWB. The testing of hypotheses has now provided managers with the vital knowledge to create effective environments that support the needed employee actions that promote PWB through voice behavior. Additionally, the outcome of the study enables future managers to understand the patterns of engagement regarding self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior on the basis of an employee’s organizational commitment.

The noted study provides valuable insight to managers. The findings that have been articulated within the study provide evidence addressing the lack of understanding surrounding an employee’s PWB. Moreover, the presented findings provide the needed analysis to establish a relationship between organizational commitment and an employee’s PWB among service workers in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. Managers are now equipped with fundamental knowledge of the three types of organizational commitment relationship on the two types of employee voice behavior, resulting in differing levels of employee PWB. Within the next portion of the study, the researcher will extend the presented findings and offer suggestions that will improve general business practice and general application strategies.
Improving General Business Practice

Organizational commitment has been heavily analyzed within the management literature. The three dimensions of organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment) conceptually define why employees remain committed to their organization. Retaining talented employees allows organizations to develop and maintain a competitive advantage ( ). Thus, organizational commitment has been a topic of interest for an extended time. Regarding organizational commitment and voice behavior, employees who note higher levels of organizational commitment to their organization are more apt to experience various improvements within their working environment. Thus, increasing the likelihood of an employee’s engagement in voice behavior versus remaining silent, risking the infringement of a potential decline in their working environment (Withey & Cooper, 1989).

When an employee exhibits voice behavior, this includes their direct efforts to provide constructive change and, consequently, have positive psychological well-being. Within the presented study, an employee’s voice behavior is classified into two types (e.g., self-focused voice and other-focused voice). Following the presentation of the findings, the researcher was able to conclude that a statistical relationship existed between all three dimensions of organizational commitment and the two types of voice behavior. The finding provides valuable knowledge to future and current managers. Specifically, managers can now observe the impact of the three types of organizational commitment on the two types of voice behavior. The information serves to close the gap with regards to providing insight as to how an employee can further promote their PWB through voice behavior. Where voice behavior can now be linked to the three dimensions of organizational commitment, this notion allows managers to effectively observe organizational commitment displayed by employees and note that an employee’s voice
behavior is connected to the concept. This determination provides the necessary research for managers to understand the engagement patterns regarding Self-Focused Voice (SFV) and Other-Focused Voice (OFV) behavior based on an employee’s organizational commitment.

PWB has gained immense attention throughout various disciplines (Huang, 2017). PWB directly affects employee’s work on an individual level as well as daily organizational functioning (Žižek et al., 2015). Noting the importance of PWB, the findings presented within the current study offer valuable insight for current and future managers. The study findings provide statistical justification for establishing a significant relationship between an employee’s voice behavior and his or her PWB. The utilization of voice within the current study explicitly regards the type of voice an employee may exhibit within an organizational setting. These two types of voice are regarded as SFV and OFV.

The statistical results provided allowed the researcher to note that SFV is a type of behavior that maintains a direct relationship with PWB. The statistical results provided did not allow the researcher to determine whether a direct relationship exists between OFV and PWB. SFV is conceptually defined as an employee’s proactive attempts to convey opinions about changing their conditions (Chou & Barron, 2016). A reasonable assumption tied to the study’s findings is tied to the notion that an employee’s ability to use their voice to alter their conditions maintains a relationship with their PWB. Management can utilize this information to observe an employee’s voice patterns. Whereas, when an employee does not utilize their voice, the lack of voice may indicate managers to check on employees directly. This action can open lines of communication between the employee and the manager. Ultimately, the increased communication may prevent an employee from experiencing decreased levels of PWB due to management’s proactive efforts.
Potential Application Strategies

Managers are tasked with a multitude of daily responsibilities. One of their primary responsibilities is to ensure organizational effectiveness. As noted throughout the study, organizational effectiveness is impacted by an employee’s PWB. Said differently, whether an employee can perform daily duties under various constraints influences organizational effectiveness. When an employee cannot perform their daily duties, a manager must often intervene to ensure organizational effectiveness remains achievable. Therefore, it becomes essential that managers create working environments that commence, facilitate, and maintain high levels of employee effectiveness.

One way to accomplish this task is to create environments where employees can openly share thoughts, ideas, and concerns with managers. This type of exchange originating through voice behavior is linked to positive organizational outcomes (Rasheed et al., 2017). Additionally, employees with higher levels of commitment are more likely to express feedback that positively modifies their work environment (Withey & Cooper, 1989) and, consequently, have a PWB. Managers must recognize that employees are rich sources of potential ideas and feedback, but employees communicate their ideas and feedback differently (Matsunaga, 2015). Noting this infringement, managers must broaden their approach to managing diversity presented within the workplace. This includes managers being able to identify voice contributions among a diverse employee set.

The utilization of voice may range from subtle to more significant, dependent upon the individual employee. However, noting the relationship organizational commitment possesses with the two voice types can help managers identify and acknowledge voice patterns among diverse employee sets. For example, an employee experiencing Normative Commitment (NC) is
tied to an organization because they have a robust internal tie based on their feelings. Therefore, it becomes a reasonable assumption that an employee who experiences NC also wants to provide feedback that serves the organization. Therefore, these employees may be more likely to speak up based on themselves and others. Hence, employees who experience NC may utilize both types of voice behavior. In comparison, an employee experiencing Continuance Commitment (CC) is tied to their organization because the cost of leaving the organization poses a significant risk for the employee. Thus, an employee who experiences CC is more likely to execute voice behavior on their premises of advancing their position within an organization. The advancement of their position would further increase their CC within the organization and increase the risk associated with leaving.

Therefore, they may be more apt to speak up for themselves versus increase any additional risk associated with leaving the organization. Said differently, an employee who experiences CC and executes their voice for others could cause conflict within their working environment, increasing the risk associated with their position. However, an employee who experiences CC aims to avoid the risk associated with leaving their current position, therefore, would be less likely to engage in behavior that would further subject them to unwanted consequences. Identifying the type of commitment each employee maintains with their current organization will allow managers to predict better the type of voice behavior the employee may exhibit. This will further allow managers to seek feedback or increase communication efforts with those who are less likely to use their voice. Additionally, the findings within the presented research study provide managers with the vital knowledge to create effective environments that support the needed employee actions that promote PWB through voice behavior. Additionally, the outcome of the study enables future managers to understand the patterns of engagement
regarding SFV behavior and OFV behavior on the basis of an employee’s organizational commitment.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The study provided practical insight for managers and addressed is lack of analysis regarding the relationship between organizational commitment (e.g., normative, affective, and continuance commitment) and an employee’s PWB resulting in the existing inconclusive findings of the relationship between organizational commitment (e.g., normative, affective, and continuance commitment) and employee’s PWB among service workers in the Permian Basin region of West Texas. One notable area for consideration in the future is the opportunity for expansion of the current study. Future research efforts should focus on PWB as a multi-dimension construct versus one entity. The scale developed by Ryff (1995) allows researchers to measure and observe PWB as a multi-dimension construct. Within the current study, the researcher analyzed PWB as one entire construct. The general purpose of this approach centered on gathering data from an integrated perspective versus seeking to categorize specific dimensions. The dimensions of PWB are self-acceptance, purpose in life, autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, and positive relationship (Ryff, 1995).

Expanding the study to include the dimensions of PWB will allow a new body of knowledge to be established. The new body of knowledge will derive from analyzing the relationship between the six dimensions of PWB and the two types of employee voice behavior. As noted previously, the types of voice behavior were not established within the literature. Therefore, the findings presented are noteworthy, closing the apparent gap within the literature and establishing a reliable scale for future researchers to measure the types of voice behavior. Conceptually, the expansion of the study will allow managers to precisely determine the
dimension within an employee’s PWB that may be subject to a more significant influence by the two types of voice behavior.

**Reflections**

Within the next section, the researcher will provide a personal reflection and review the Biblical perspectives supported by the research study's findings. The researcher strives to provide vital information on how the execution of the study contributed to personal and professional growth. Additionally, the following section includes a detailed discussion of how the findings integrate within a Christian worldview.

**Personal & Professional Growth**

PWB is a concept that can impact an employee personally and professionally. The heightened focus placed on the detrimental consequences associated with lower levels of PWB is a rising concern. Conceptually speaking, humans are often evaluated in an organizational setting on the premise of their economic contribution. However, humans are not limited to their economic contribution. Humans are multi-layered beings (Cancer & Sarotar Zizek, 2014, 2015). Noting this assessment, managers and organizations need to view their employees from a multi-layered perspective. This perspective includes looking beyond the economic value derived from hiring or retaining an employee. This further translates into the notion that managers need to take a deeper look into their employees' multi-layers. Specifically, an employee's PWB should be a concept that managers look further into when evaluating.

Various dimensions are embodied within PWB. One area that remains solidified within the concept of PWB is regarded as employee happiness (Wright & Cropanzano, 2004). Where happier employees are noted as increasing workplace productivity, a manager's behavior can significantly influence an employee's PWB (Gilbreath & Benson, 2004). It then becomes a
reasonable assumption that a manager's behavior can significantly influence an employee's happiness, influencing an employee's PWB. The assumption places an immense amount of power within the manager's scope of control. However, the manager's scope of power is not controllable but is also an entity that can better serve employees.

From a reflection standpoint, this acknowledgment serves as a vital tool to convey the importance of behaving positively. Specifically, organizations should seek to hire managers who positively serve their employees. One viable way to better serve employees through exhibit behavior is to ensure their voices are heard and acknowledged. The study's findings provide a path for managers to understand better the types of voices that their employees exhibit. Additionally, managers are provided with conclusive findings that indicate a relationship between organizational commitment and voice behavior. The noted finding will provide investigative insight for managers to understand better why certain employees exhibit one form of voice-over another based on their commitment to their organization. This notion increases the scope of power a manager can harness within an organization. Thus, a manager can now assist an employee with witnessing increased happiness levels, which inadvertently will allow the employee to increase their levels of PWB. If every manager were to commit to increasing happiness through their exhibited behavior, humanity as a whole would prosper.

**Biblical Perspective**

The Biblical implications of this research relate to serving others within a professional setting and further ensuring an employee’s PWB. Moreover, this specific topic is relevant to the strategic management field for several reasons, including that many managers rely upon employees to utilize voice behavior to ensure effective and efficient communication. This type of communication is beneficial on an individual level and a collective level to the organization. The
exchange of information, concerns, ideas, or thoughts between managers and employees enables relationships to be commenced and maintained. The elimination of communication presents vast areas of concern that can significantly impact an employee’s PWB. The study’s findings will enable future managers to understand the patterns of engagement regarding SFV behavior and OFV behavior based on an employee’s organizational commitment.

Biblically, the life and work of Jesus Christ serves as the ultimate pinnacle of any faithful servant’s life. Challenges and troublesome times marked his journey. However, His pursuits and ability to exhibit tenacity in the face of adversary provided prosperity and plentifullness. There are many trivial areas an individual may encounter within the workplace, all of which maintain the capabilities of influencing their PWB. From a personal perspective, the ability to work with others to produce outcomes that better serve the world as a whole is the single best motivation. However, it is of no surprise that working with others to better serve the world can be challenging and troubling. The produced challenges and troubles can further infringe upon an individual’s PWB. PWB is conceptually defined as an individual’s efforts geared toward pursuing perfection that is representational of acknowledging one’s true potential (Ryff, 1995). Thus, the challenges and troubles an individual faces maintain the capabilities of impacting the efforts geared towards acknowledging one’s true potential. It then becomes a reasonable expectation that an individual’s PWB may be adversely impacted when challenges and troubles are present. The adverse impact may leave the individual ill reflections of themselves or their future. However, when these types of instances are presented, the Biblical words from God can help reinstall an individual’s mindset and positively influence their PWB.

For example, “Give generously to them and do so without a grudging heart; then, the LORD your God will bless you in all your work and everything you put your hand to” (Women’s
Devotional Bible, New International Version, 2012, Deuteronomy 15:10). The scripture provides a sense of direction to individuals within the workplace. The scripture conveys that working in challenging or troublesome environments do not mean that one develops a grudging heart. Instead, individuals must rest assured that God will always bless everything an individual puts their hand. Said differently, God assures each one of the children that the acknowledgment and reward of hard work stem from blessings only he can bestow upon us. Hence, when individual encounters challenging and troublesome working environments, they do not develop a grudge that will negatively impact one’s PWB. Instead, have faith that God will bless those who continue to work hard. Integrating the premises of the noted scripture will allow individuals to avoid any adverse impacts associated with lower levels of PWB. Whereas the scripture allows individuals to experience higher levels of PWB as long as the individual understands that rewards tied to hard work only come from God.

As noted throughout the presented study, one influential tool individuals possess is their voice. Thus, voice behavior conclusively maintains a relationship with PWB. Every individual has a voice. Our voice is unique and special. God created humans to use their special talents to advance humanity on earth. The same ideology can be applied to voice behavior within the workplace. The utilization of voice should be executed in a manner that seeks to serve our Lord better. Therefore, the use of voice should and can be used to advance humanity positively better. The advancement of humanity in a positive manner begins with each individual having higher levels of PWB. Higher levels of PWB are noted as increasing employees’ work on an individual level and daily organizational functioning (Žižek et al., 2015).

**Summary of Reflections**
The previous section addressed vital information on how the execution of the study contributed to personal and professional growth. Additionally, the previous section included a detailed discussion of how the findings integrate within a Christian worldview. The study did not exist without limitations or challenges. However, the study's outcome produced information to serve the scholarly community and practitioners alike better. Future researcher direction provides a conceptual approach to how the current study can be expanded.

Summary of Section 3

Within Section 3, the researcher articulated the outcome of the researcher study. Specifically, the researcher discussed the overview of the study, presentation of findings, and the application to professional practice within the first half of Section 3. The remaining half of Section 3 addressed potential recommendations for further study and the reflections derived from the study's outcome. All of the noted components addressed in Section 3 provide vital insight for future researchers seeking to explore PWB.

Summary and Conclusions

The study executed provides valuable insight to future managers and current managers. Specifically, understanding the correlation between organizational commitment (e.g., normative, affective, and continuance commitment) and an employee's PWB and between organizational commitment (e.g., normative, affective, and continuance commitment) and employee's PWB among service workers in the Permian Basin region of West Texas helps managers understand the importance of voice behavior. The study provides practical implications that better assist managers in understanding the engagement patterns regarding self-focused voice behavior and other-focused voice behavior based on an employee's organizational commitment. Said differently, the outcome of the data analysis solidifies a correlative relationship between the three
forms of organizational commitment and an employee's voice behavior concerning the two forms of voice behavior analyzed in the study by providing analytical support. In the future, managers can begin to implement feasible strategies that better assist employees with enhancing their voice patterns to support a healthy working environment that further leads to increased levels of PWB.
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Appendix A: TCM Questionnaire

Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling a number from 1 to 7 using the scale below.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree 4= undecided
5 = slightly agree 6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

Affective Commitment Scale

1) I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2) I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3) I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4) I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one. (R)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5) I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization. (R)

1 2 3 4 6 7
6) I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization. (R)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7) This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8) I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (R)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Continuance Commitment Scale**

1) I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up. (R)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2) It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3) Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4) It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now. (R)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5) Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6) I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7) One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

8) One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice - another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

Normative Commitment Scale

1) I think that people these days move from company to company too often.

2) I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization. (R)

3) Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me. (R)

4) One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.

5) If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.

6) I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one's organization.

7) Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.
8) I do not think that wanting to be a 'company man' or 'company woman' is sensible anymore. (R)
Appendix B: DVB Questionaire

Self-Focused

1. I usually speak up to my supervisor regarding new ideas I have that pertain directly to me.

2. I usually speak up to my supervisor regarding issues that I have that pertain directly to me.

3. I usually speak up regarding opportunities that benefit me.

4. I usually only speak up when organizational rules have been violated if the violation impacts me.

5. I tend to only voice concerns that directly impact me.

6. I am only concerned with using my voice if it directly impacts me.

7. I usually communicate my opinions to my supervisor only if the issue pertains to me.

8. I usually get involved in issues at work that directly impact me.

9. I usually communicate opportunities to others within the organization that relate to me.

Other-Focused

1. I usually speak up to my supervisor regarding new ideas I have that pertain to others.

2. I usually speak up to my supervisor regarding issues that I have that pertain to others.

3. I usually express concern to my supervisor regarding other employees.

4. I usually get involved in organizational issues that do not pertain to me.

5. I usually speak up for those around me.

6. I openly communicate opportunities to others within the organization that do not relate to me.

7. I usually speak up when organizational rules have been violated but the outcome has not impacted me.
8. I tend to speak up for others within an organizational setting.

9. I am only concerned with using my voice if it pertains to others within the organization.

10. I usually communicate my opinions to my supervisor even if the issues have nothing to do me.

11. I will speak on behalf of others, but will not speak on my behalf.

12. I get involved in issues at work that do not impact me.
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This document provides definitions and items for six scales of psychological well-being. There is no charge for using the scales, although users are requested to send copies of any publications generated with the scales to Dr. Ryff (contact info above).

Psychometric Properties:

Below are items for six 14-item scales of psychological well-being (6 x 14 = 84 items total) constructed to measure the dimensions of autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance.

Internal consistency (alpha) coefficients are indicated on each scale. Correlations of each scale with its own 20-item parent scale are also provided. (Note, embedded within the 14-item scales are shorter options (9-item scales, 7-item scales, 3-item scales).

Reliability and validity assessments of the 20-item parent scales are detailed in:

Psychometric properties of the 3-item scales are detailed in:


This article reviews psychometric properties of various length scales:

Ryff’s Scales of Psychological Well-Being (PWB) • 42 Item Version Formatted

**Scales & Items:**

Items shaded grey (# 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 39, 41) should be reverse scored:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Scales:</th>
<th>Items in that Scale (in the questionnaire below):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3 9 25 31 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>4 0 26 32 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>5 1 27 33 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relations with Others</td>
<td>0 6 2 28 34 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>1 7 3 29 35 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>2 8 4 30 36 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formatted 42 Item Instrument:** The following set of questions deals with how you feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most people see me as loving and affectionate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I live life one day at a time and don’t really think about the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The demands of everyday life often get me down.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree Somewhat</td>
<td>Disagree Slightly</td>
<td>Agree Slightly</td>
<td>Agree Somewhat</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I tend to worry about what other people think of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When I think about it, I haven’t really improved much as a person over the years.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel like many of the people I know have gotten more out of life than I have.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree Somewhat</td>
<td>Disagree Slightly</td>
<td>Agree Slightly</td>
<td>Agree Somewhat</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I have a sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I don’t have a good sense of what it is I’m trying to accomplish in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I like most aspects of my personality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circle the number that best describes your present agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. It's difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My attitude about myself is probably not as positive as most people feel about themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circle the number that best describes your present agreement or disagreement with each statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I sometimes feel as if I’ve done all there is to do in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>When I compare myself to friends and acquaintances, it makes me feel good about who I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>