

# 國立交通大學 107 學年度碩士班入學考試試題

科目：管理個案分析(8181)

考試日期：107 年 2 月 2 日 第 4 節

系所班別：管理學院碩士在職專班

組別：經營管理組

第 1 頁, 共 4 頁

【不可使用計算機】\*作答前請先核對試題、答案卷(試卷)、准考證之所組別與考科是否相符!

## Part I. 25%

小英在 A 公司上班小華在 B 公司上班，兩家公司是同一個新興產業的競爭者，A 公司才剛成立三年，起步較 B 晚三年，規模也較小，但很有衝勁。營業額約是一比三。在新人面談的時候是用不同的方式。小英的公司通常都是由用人主管一個人就面談做的決定。小華的公司面談的時候，都是由用人單位的幾位主管集體來面談，面談之後再各自表述，而最終的用人推薦權是在該用人部門的最高主管。這兩種方式的面談都有他各自在效率與成本的優缺點。人資主管在 AB 兩家公司都是被動單位，起初只負責初步過濾、整理、與通知面談的工作；最後人選確認時才開始比較細節的任用程序。你目前的履歷表經過初步篩選，兩家公司都約你去面談。

- (1) 面談之前應該要做什麼準備？
- (2) 面談時如果被問及自己為什麼要換工作你該如何回答？
- (3) 面談的過程中要記住哪些原則？面談進行過程如果有些問題一時答不上來該怎麼辦？
- (4) 如果被問到自己五年之後的期待是什麼你該如何回答？
- (5) 如果兩家公司最後都通知要錄用你，待遇也差不多，你的決定將考慮那些因素？對於沒去的公司你該如何交代？

# 國立交通大學 107 學年度碩士班入學考試試題

科目：管理個案分析(8181)

考試日期：107 年 2 月 2 日 第 4 節

系所班別：管理學院碩士在職專班

組別：經營管理組

第 2 頁, 共 4 頁

【不可使用計算機】\*作答前請先核對試題、答案卷(試卷)、准考證之所組別與考科是否相符!

## Part II 25%

不像其他的新興行業欣欣向榮，最近幾年大環境對於公司所在的產業非常不利。本公司的業務已經連續三年沒有起色。最近高層有策略性決定，想要在人事費用項精簡並重整組織再出發。這個策略的實踐終於下到我們這個事業體。我的主管先分析了產業的大環境，跟公司目前的內在處境，給了我一個任務，要我將部門人事費用精簡。我的部門有三組人各自負責北中南三區的業務；不含我，總共有 24 位同仁。我的主管希望我先達到下降 10% 的目標。除建議希望我能夠將本部門的最資深但表現平庸的阿忠先解聘以外，主管並沒有指示具體執行得方法。阿忠是十六年前跟我同梯次進公司的同事目前負責北區的業務。主管希望我明天上班時先跟他討論出一個初步方案，我真的不知如何是好。但是我又必須達成長官交代的任務。

- (1) 第一步該由何開始呢？
- (2) 我要秉持甚麼中心思想去執行這項交付任務呢？
- (3) 集體減薪是一種方案嗎？何時可行？何時不可行？
- (4) 我要跟阿忠說是老闆指定他該走嗎？
- (5) 我跟阿忠該如何說呢？

# 國立交通大學 107 學年度碩士班入學考試試題

科目：管理個案分析(8181)

考試日期：107 年 2 月 2 日 第 4 節

系所班別：管理學院碩士在職專班

組別：經營管理組

第 3 頁, 共 4 頁

【不可使用計算機】\*作答前請先核對試題、答案卷(試卷)、准考證之所組別與考科是否相符!

## Part III. 25%

A 公司為 B 公司轉投資成立之子公司，且 B 公司持有 A 公司百分之百股份。原 A 公司及 B 公司董事長為同一自然人時，相關決策及股利政策，較易達成共識。然而，當 A 公司及 B 公司董事長為不同人時，各自立場及考量觀點互異，就有磨合、談判、溝通之過程。

A 公司是打仗、獲利部隊，A 公司董事長當然希望照顧員工，多發績效獎金慰勞辛苦員工，但 B 公司當然希望股利維持一定水準，貢獻收益越多越好。一是員工、一是股東，立場實在不同。如何達成二家公司皆滿意之數字，實是考驗二位領導者智慧的謀略及有效談判的技能。

於是，A 公司董事長委由總經理負責本案之談判，希達成給予 B 公司比去年較低金額之股利，在此任務及期間內，總經理左右為難，一方面希望能有效揣摩上意，向上管理唯一的主管-董事長，但另一方面，股東 B 公司堅持立場，不肯退讓；總經理希談判出一折衷數字，過程中雖經過數番你來我往，但仍鎩羽而歸

- (1) 這是管理問題還是領導問題？為甚麼？
- (2) A 公司董事長的職權來自何處？
- (3) AB 兩公司董事長職位互換會有不同思考嗎？
- (4) 政府希望企業多給員工加薪少給股東股利，這種思考是在解決甚麼問題？
- (5) 承上題，這種思考是在創造了甚麼問題？

# 國立交通大學 107 學年度碩士班入學考試試題

科目：管理個案分析(8181)

考試日期：107 年 2 月 2 日 第 4 節

系所班別：管理學院碩士在職專班

組別：經營管理組

第 4 頁, 共 4 頁

【不可使用計算機】\*作答前請先核對試題、答案卷(試卷)、准考證之所組別與考科是否相符!

## Part IV. 25%

The **Firestone and Ford tire controversy** was a period of unusually high failures of P235/75R15 ATX, ATX II, and Wilderness AT tires installed on the Ford Explorer and other related vehicles.

The tire failures are linked to 271 fatalities and over eight hundred injuries in the United States with more injuries and fatalities occurring internationally, it led Bridgestone/Firestone and Ford Motor Company to recall and replace 23 million tires, it cut the market value of Bridgestone/Firestone in half, Firestone closed the Decatur, Illinois factory where the tires were manufactured, several executives in Bridgestone and Ford resigned or were fired, it led Congress to pass the TREAD Act, and it brought an end to the nearly 100 year corporate relationship between Ford Motor Company and Firestone.

As early as 1996 personal injury lawyers were aware of accidents, injuries and fatalities caused by the tread of Firestone tires separating from the tire at high speeds. Lawyers and traffic safety researchers decided not to contact the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) because they lacked confidence in the agency and feared that an investigation might conclude that there were no defects thereby compromising existing personal injury lawsuits. All but 13 of the 271 fatalities from these tires took place after 1996.

In 1996 the State of Arizona told Firestone that the tread on its tires were separating in high temperatures. Firestone sent several engineers to inspect the tires and concluded that normal passenger tires were being used in heavy conditions, on dirt roads, off road, and under heavy loads. Firestone replaced those tire with heavier duty tires.

Internal Firestone documents showed a rise in injury claims for ATX, ATX II, and Wilderness AT tires as early as 1997.

In July 1998 Samuel Boyden, a researcher for State Farm Insurance, received a call from a claims handler asking for information about tread separation in Firestone tires. Boyden found 21 cases of accidents caused by tread separation and forwarded the information to the NHTSA. In 1999 he found an additional 30 cases and forwarded that information to the NHTSA.

Sean Kane, a researcher at Strategic Safety Consulting, found documents showing that Ford had been replacing Firestone tires in Venezuela starting in 1998 where 46 deaths had occurred. Firestone was aware of tire defects in Venezuela as early as 1999.

A Ford dealer in Saudi Arabia noticed high failure rates of Firestone tires in Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Kuwait starting in 1997 and in July 1999 began replacing Firestone tires on unsold Ford Explorers and to offer a 75% discount for replacement tires when customers came in for maintenance. Ford and Firestone began testing tires in late 1997 or 1998 and began a limited recall in the Middle East, Venezuela, Malaysia, and Thailand in 1999 and the spring of 2000 but did not notify the NHTSA.

On February 7, 2000 KHOU-TV in Houston Texas ran a 9 minute story about high speed Firestone tire failures on Ford Explorers that led to 30 deaths. KHOU was overwhelmed by phone calls from concerned citizens and started directing callers to contact the NHTSA.

Clarence Ditlow, Executive Director for the Centre for Auto Safety, stated before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation that, "Emerging Information shows that both Ford and Firestone had early knowledge of tread separation in Firestone Tires fitted to Ford Explorer vehicles but at no point informed the NHTSA of their findings".

Firestone had more information about tire failures than Ford did because of warranty claims, but Firestone never acted on this information because it always blamed consumers for not maintaining their tires correctly or operating their vehicles in extreme environments, leading to these failures. When either Ford or the NHTSA looked into concerns about tire failures or rollovers they always consulted consumer complaints to the NHTSA's toll-free hotline. The consumer complaints didn't reflect the size of the problem because attorneys and their clients had almost completely stopped using the hotline to report tire failures or other complaints

你可以用中文簡要回答。

- (1) 車廠與輪胎廠，誰先發現問題？
- (2) 誰該負起最後責任？
- (3) 這個案中有甚麼利益衝突？
- (4) 保險公司的立場跟律師的立場是否相同？為什麼？
- (5) 在這個案中學到什麼教訓？