

以下內容擷取自 2022 年發表於 Journal of Business Ethics 一篇文章的緒論，請詳細閱讀，然後回答文後五個問題。

**Reference:** Wang, Y., Xiao, S., & Ren, R. (2022). A Moral Cleansing Process: How and When Does Unethical Pro-organizational Behavior Increase Prohibitive and Promotive Voice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 176(1), 175 - 193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04697-w>

### Introduction

The striving and prosperity of a company depends on employees' in-role performance, as well as their extra-role efforts (e.g., Bass 1985; Podsakoff et al. 1990; Yukl 1989). Defined as unethical conducts with an intention to benefit the organization, unethical pro-organizational behaviors (UPB), a form of employees' extra-role behavior, widely exist in organizational settings (Umphress et al. 2010). For example, a survey of employed US workers as of May 2006 reported that a third of the staff witnessed unethical conducts at work, while 19% of them is cheating employees, customers, suppliers, or public for the interest of the organization (Gurchiek 2006). More recently, it was reported that the customer service staffs of a large travel agency in China persuaded their customers not to ask for invoices, in order to help the organization avoiding taxes (ThePaper, June 1st, 2019). Intending to promote the effective functioning of the organization or its members, employees conduct UPB but at the cost of core societal values, mores, laws, or standards of proper conduct, which may leave hidden troubles to the organization and the actors (Umphress et al. 2010; Umphress and Bingham 2011).

Although UPB has caught much attention from researchers (e.g., Chen et al. 2016; Matherne and Litchfield 2012; May et al. 2015; Umphress et al. 2010; Umphress and Bingham 2011; Wang et al. 2019a, b), most of them focus on investigating the antecedence of UPB while neglecting its potential consequences, especially to the actors. Understanding the influence of UPB on the actor is important because people usually value a moral self-image (Monin and Jordan 2009), and want to behave morally (Mazar et al. 2008). Although they may occasionally disengage from their core moral self and engage in unethical behaviors, ethical dissonance may occur afterwards (Barkan et al. 2012). In other words, people who conducted unethical behaviors could actually recognize the unethicality of their deeds, which violates their moral self-image (Bonner et al. 2017). In order to restore their moral self, these individuals usually go through a moral cleansing process by engaging in moral behaviors to offset prior bad deeds (Sachdeva et al. 2009).

As people appear to take targeted reparatory actions toward those they wronged or hurt (Cryder et al. 2012), we choose to focus on employees' voice behavior as their moral cleansing choice. On one hand, voice refers to employees' discretionary expression of their ideas or concerns about work-related issues to improve the functioning of the organization (Morrison 2011; Van Dyne and LePine 1998). Given the potential benefits to the organization, voice can balance the unethical deeds they performed previously which, though seem to be for the good of the organization, cost the organization in the long run. In addition, voice behavior is about either doing the right to improve processes or stopping the wrong to avoid errors (Liang et al. 2012), we contend that voice behavior may indirectly compensate the stakeholders who were harmed by previous UPB. For example, by suggesting ideas to improve the product, the necessity to hide flaws or exaggerate functions of the product can be accordingly reduced, preventing customers from being furtherly hurt; by voicing against illegal procedures like falsifying vouchers, shareholders may be protected from going broke.

Therefore, in the current research, we follow a moral cleansing perspective (Zhong and Liljenquist 2006) and propose that employees' past UPB may lead to feelings of guilt and consequently encourage their constructive behaviors to wash out their sins. Moreover, we suggest that people with a high moral identity symbolization (MIS), which refers to the degree to which the moral traits are expressed publicly through the person's actions in the world (Aquino and Reed 2002), will have a stronger desire to offset their immoral behavior by making compensations, in the form of voice (i.e., prohibitive and promotive voice). By engaging in reparatory behaviors that can be recognized, these employees can restore their self-image in the eyes of others (Carlsmith and Gross 1969).

The study contributes to the existing literature in the following aspects. First, it advances existing knowledge of UPB by examining psychological and consequently behavioral outcomes of UPB from the perspective of the actors. Current research on UPB primarily focus on its antecedences, and much less is known about its consequences. By introducing a moral cleansing mechanism, we extend our understandings about UPB that although it is conducted in the name of others' good, UPB actors are likely to feel guilty and in turn engage in compensating behaviors, such as prohibitive and promotive voice.

Second, we also contribute to the voice literature by examining the role of felt guilt in predicting prohibitive and promotive voice, answering calls of research on affect and emotion in influencing voice behavior (Morrison 2011). In addition, by examining voice as a choice to cleanse moral debts, we provide evidence for its moral facet.

Third, we also contribute to the moral identity literature by emphasizing the role of its symbolic dimension in strengthening the process of moral cleansing. Although several studies call attention to differentiating the specific roles of moral identity internalization and symbolization (e.g., Gotowiec and van Mastrigt 2019; Jordan et al. 2011; Skarlicki et al. 2008; Winterich et al. 2013), most studies exploring the moderating effects of moral identity theorize the effect of the unidimensional construct but operationalized it with the internalization subscale (e.g., Johnson and Umphress 2019; Skarlicki et al. 2016; Xu and Ma 2016). The current research adds to the moral identity literature by clarifying the role that MIS plays in restoring a public moral self-image via engaging in observable compensating behaviors such as prohibitive and promotive voice.

#### 問題：

1. 請依緒論中所提供的資訊定義並解釋下列本研究中的主要研究變數（21%）：
  - Unethical pro-organizational behaviors (UPB)
  - Voice
  - Moral identity symbolization (MIS)
2. 請畫出本篇文章的研究架構圖（包含文章中所有變數與變數間的關係）（19%）？
3. 請問這篇文章的主要研究問題為何（10%）？本研究的研究動機為何（5%）？
4. 您覺得本研究的實證發現，對企業有哪些實務意涵（10%）？
5. 根據本篇研究，您覺得還可以延伸出哪些新的研究議題（20%）？探討這些議題的價值為何（15%）？

#### 注意事項：

1. 答題可以使用中文或英文，也可以兩者交互使用。
2. 回答問題以切重要點、論述清晰為宜，長篇大論未必有加分作用。