以下內容擷取自 2022 年發表於 Journal of Applied Psychology 中一篇文章的緒論，請詳細閱讀，然後回答文後的五個問題。

Introduction

Scholars and practitioners have long emphasized the importance of employees speaking up about ethical issues at work (Gentile, 2010; Near & Miceli, 1995), a behavior we refer to as "ethical voice." We define ethical voice as individual organization members' communication of concerns about violations of societal ethical standards (e.g., honesty, fairness, care, respect) and/or suggestions about upholding societal ethical standards. Examples of ethical voice include an employee expressing serious concerns about the safety of a new product for customers' health (Chen et al., 2020) or proposing ways to treat disabled employees more fairly. Ethical voice is important because it has the potential to inform peers and managers of perceived ethical issues while they have time to act to improve ethical decisions and/or avoid ethical missteps.

Because it is aimed at promoting societal or stakeholders' (e.g., employees, customers) welfare, ethical voice qualifies as a kind of prosocial, constructive voice (Morrison, 2014). However, it is also conceptually distinct from the forms of prosocial voice long studied in that literature. Ethical voice "involves an explicit appeal to ethical principles" (Wellman et al., 2016, p. 793) or super organizational interests (Graham, 1986) while prosocial voice studies have traditionally focused on improving organizational/unit efficiency or effectiveness (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Morrison, 2011). Examples of traditional constructive voice include proposing plans to reduce costs (Burris, 2012) and making suggestions to improve sales (McClean et al., 2018). Noting the difference, Liang et al. (2012) acknowledged that traditional voice is "born out of a desire to help one's organization…rather than out of … moral norms." (p. 76)

Although multiple types of ethical voice have been studied (e.g., whistleblowing, Miceli et al., 2008; ethical championing, Chen et al., 2020; moral objection, Wellman et al., 2016), empirical research has focused primarily on whistleblowing, the reporting of ethical concerns to organizational authorities or external entities (the media or government; Klaas et al., 2012; Near & Miceli, 1985). Less attention has been paid to informal ethical voice that occurs in work groups (Chen et al., 2020; Wellman et al., 2016). This scarcity of research is consequential because employees typically begin voicing their concerns within their own work groups and to their supervisors (Culiberg & Mihelič, 2017; Kaptein, 2011). Informal ethical voice is where ethical voice begins, whereas whistleblowing is generally treated as a last resort, when the issues are serious and remain unaddressed (Vandekerckhove & Phillips, 2019).

Because ethical voice is perceived to be quite risky for the ethical voicer (Ethical Compliance Initiative, 2021; Milliken et al., 2003) who may feel alone and unsupported, we are particularly interested in understanding whether and when (informal) ethical voicers can garner verbal support from their coworkers at the time the ethical issue is raised. Coworkers' verbal support for the ethical voice matters because such support can amplify the voiced ideas (Bain et al., 2021) and influence additional coworkers and/or supervisors (Nemeth et al., 1977), contributing to momentum toward ethical decisions and their implementation (Anderson & Bateman, 2000; Satterstrom et al., 2021).

Although we know of no empirical study that focuses explicitly on coworker support for ethical voice, related research suggests that coworkers may or may not provide such support. The research on retaliation against and derogation of ethical voicers (Cortina & Magley, 2003; Monin et al., 2008; Park et al., 2020; Wellman et al., 2016) suggests that coworkers may view ethical voice expressed in their group negatively and therefore may be disinclined to support the ethical voice. However, recent experimental studies find that ethical voicers can positively influence team decisions (Chen et al., 2020) and engender trust from peers (Kennedy & Schweitzer, 2018). Further, an emerging positive view from the moral psychology literature (Bai, 2017; Goodwin, 2015) suggests that highly ethical behavior (such as that exhibited by an ethical voicer) may signal the actor's good character, eliciting favorable responses and even support from observers.

In the set of studies presented here, we explore when and why ethical voice in work groups results in coworker support. Building on the prohibitive–promotive distinction in the voice literature (Liang et al., 2012) and in the moral psychology literature (Janoff-Bulman et al., 2009), we conceptually distinguish prohibitive from promotive ethical voice. Prohibitive ethical voice emphasizes what we should not do (i.e., ethically wrong behaviors such as harm to others or violation of ethical standards), while promotive ethical voice emphasizes what we should or can do (i.e., ethically good behaviors such as advancing others' welfare). Further, drawing upon the approach/avoidance and behavioral activation/inhibition systems (Carver, 2006; Gray, 1990; Sherf et al., 2021), we develop a new theory, proposing that these two forms of ethical voice should differentially influence coworker verbal support by triggering approach or avoidance-oriented affective mechanisms. We propose that prohibitive ethical voice discourages coworker verbal support by triggering feelings of threat (an avoidance-oriented emotion experienced when one believes that they fail to meet moral standards held by others and anticipates potential negative moral judgment from others, Higgins, 1987), whereas promotive ethical voice motivates coworker verbal support by triggering moral elevation (an approach-oriented moral emotion experienced when one witnesses others' dis- plays of virtue, Algoe & Haidt, 2009).

This research contributes significantly to the ethical voice, the broader behavioral ethics, and the broader voice literatures. First, we shift the focus of ethical voice research from *managerial retaliation against whistleblowers to coworker verbal support for the more* common ethical voice that occurs in their work groups. Whistleblowers report wrongdoing, potentially putting managers' and organizations' interests at risk, resulting in feared or actual retaliation. Our research moves us beyond the thinking that only negative consequences are associated with ethical voice and helps to push research on ethical voice and its consequences in a more positive direction by focusing on the consequences of the more informal and common type of ethical voice. Importantly, we provide a theoretical lens for understanding when and why more positive consequences are likely, by distinguishing promotive and prohibitive forms of ethical voice and the associated underlying affective mechanisms (i.e., elevation and threat).

We also contribute to the broader behavioral ethics literature by focusing on what leads coworkers to verbally support ethical voice, which is essentially an extraordinary ethical behavior (Treviño et al., 2014) because it is potentially risky and extends beyond just following company rules or codes. Thus, our research moves beyond the dominant prohibitive emphasis in the behavioral ethics literature that focuses on (preventing) unethical behavior (e.g., lying, cheating, stealing; De Cremer & Moore, 2020; Higgins & Cornwell, 2016). This is important because it helps us understand not just when employees fail the ethical test but when and why employees make positive ethical contributions to their groups, organizations, and society (Spreitzer et al., 2021). Importantly, we show not only that good behavior (i.e., ethical voice) can be "contagious," leading to coworker

verbal support but also that moral elevation, a uniquely positive moral affective mechanism explains the contagion.

Our research contributes to the broader voice literature as well. Despite a broadened definition of prosocial voice (Morrison, 2014), empirical research on prosocial voice has either focused on voice aimed at improving an organization's work methods and procedures (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Morrison, 2011), or it has not specified voice issue content (Burris, 2012; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). However, voice researchers have recently called for more fine-tuned theorization about voice content (Burris et al., 2017; McClean et al., 2021). In theorizing how coworkers will respond to voice about ethical issues, we take this approach and propose ethics-based affective mechanisms (moral elevation and threat) underlying reactions to promotive and prohibitive ethical voice. Affective mechanisms may be more important in understanding ethical voice consequences because processing ethics-related information is thought to be highly intuitive and affective (Haidt, 2001; Salvador & Folger, 2009). For example, elevation is a uniquely moral emotion experienced when someone views an admirable moral behavior and it motivates the person to emulate it (Algoe & Haidt, 2009; Haidt & Morris, 2009). Further, negative information about the moral self has been shown to be particularly threatening (Fleischmann et al., 2021). These ethics-based affective mechanisms are quite distinct from the cognitive mechanisms recently shown to explain peer positive evaluation of traditional voicers: perceived voicer competence (Weiss & Morrison, 2019; Zhang et al., 2020) and perceived constructiveness for the organization (Whiting et al., 2012). Thus, our research helps to distinguish theoretical mechanisms underlying consequences of different kinds of voice. Further, in contrast to traditional voice research that shows negative or nonpositive effects for prohibitive voice (Chamberlin et al., 2017; McClean et al., 2018), we find that even prohibitive ethical voice can produce moral elevation in observers. Thus, there appears to be something quite powerful and inspiring about observing a coworker "sticking their neck out" to speak up about an ethical issue at work (whether promotive or prohibitive). This finding appears to further differentiate ethical voice from traditional forms of constructive voice.

問題：

1. 請依緒論中所提供的資訊回答下列關於主要研究變數定義之問題（21%）：
   - 請定義並解釋 ethical voice。
   - Ethical voice 與過往研究所著重之 prosocial constructive voice 的樣態有何不同？
   - 請解釋 prohibitive ethical voice 與 promotive ethical voice。兩者有何不同？請為兩個名詞各舉出一個例子。
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。