

國立中山大學 113 學年度

碩士班暨碩士在職專班招生考試試題

科目名稱：管理學【行銷傳播所碩士班乙組】

— 作答注意事項 —

考試時間：100 分鐘

- 考試開始鈴響前不得翻閱試題，並不得書寫、劃記、作答。請先檢查答案卷（卡）之應考證號碼、桌角號碼、應試科目是否正確，如有不同立即請監試人員處理。
- 答案卷限用藍、黑色筆(含鉛筆)書寫、繪圖或標示，可攜帶橡皮擦、無色透明無文字墊板、尺規、修正液（帶）、手錶(未附計算器者)。每人每節限使用一份答案卷，請衡酌作答。
- 答案卡請以 2B 鉛筆劃記，不可使用修正液（帶）塗改，未使用 2B 鉛筆、劃記太輕或污損致光學閱讀機無法辨識答案者，後果由考生自負。
- 答案卷（卡）應保持清潔完整，不得折疊、破壞或塗改應考證號碼及條碼，亦不得書寫考生姓名、應考證號碼或與答案無關之任何文字或符號。
- 可否使用計算機請依試題資訊內標註為準，如「可以」使用，廠牌、功能不拘，唯不得攜帶書籍、紙張（應考證不得做計算紙書寫）、具有通訊、記憶、傳輸或收發等功能之相關電子產品或其他有礙試場安寧、考試公平之各類器材入場。
- 試題及答案卷（卡）請務必繳回，未繳回者該科成績以零分計算。
- 試題採雙面列印，考生應注意試題頁數確實作答。
- 違規者依本校招生考試試場規則及違規處理辦法處理。

國立中山大學 113 學年度碩士班暨碩士在職專班招生考試試題

科目名稱：管理學【行銷傳播所碩士班乙組】

題號：446002

※本科目依簡章規定「不可以」使用計算機(混合題)

共 5 頁第 1 頁

一、單選題(共 10 題，每題 3 分，共計 30 分)

1. 團隊討論後所產生的決策往往不是更加保守就是更加風險偏好是因為？
(A) 團體迷思
(B) 團體偏移
(C) 團隊謬誤
(D) 團體共識
2. 下列敘述何者正確？
(A) 組織中的計畫性變革通常由變革驅動者來負責，變革驅動者可能是管理者或員工，也可能是公司外聘的顧問團
(B) 運用一些新想法，改善品質、程序或勞務稱做創新，是以所有的創新都會涉及變革；所有的變革也都會涉及創新
(C) 創新的組織擁有傾向注重手段而非重結果的文化特質
(D) 以上皆是
3. iPhone 的出現改變了智慧型手機的生態，則 iPhone 是源於哪一種創新來源？
(A) 意料之外的事件
(B) 市場結構的改變
(C) 不協調的狀況
(D) 新知識
4. 有的企業常保留擅長的核心理業務，將其它非核心理業務外包，以創造最高價值及保持最佳彈性，但外包時為了找尋合作的外包業者，則容易產生？
(A) 交易成本
(B) 外部成本
(C) 變動成本
(D) 沉沒成本
5. 五力分析(five forces model)的分析標的為？
(A) 總體環境
(B) 個別企業
(C) 競爭現況
(D) 產業環境
6. _____ 是根據每一個工作要素的標準，將所有員工按照劃分等級的百分比予以評核。
(A) 強制分配法
(B) 座標式評等法
(C) 直接排列法
(D) 輪替排列法

國立中山大學 113 學年度碩士班暨碩士在職專班招生考試試題

科目名稱：管理學【行銷傳播所碩士班乙組】

題號：446002

※本科目依簡章規定「不可以」使用計算機(混合題)

共 5 頁第 2 頁

7. 關於領導的敘述，下列何者為非？

- (A) 領導是屬於「帶心」的工作
- (B) 領導是指藉由影響他人的行為以達到群體或組織目標所採取的行動
- (C) 領導著重於「對人」的影響，其工作重點在於魅力與權力
- (D) 領導工作包含管理

8. 在組織中，下列何者是影響高倫理行為最重要的因素。

- (A) 環境因素
- (B) 組織因素
- (C) 倫理政策與法規
- (D) 領導者的行為

9. 阿明：「嗚哇，今天營養午餐有三色豆耶...真不想吃。」阿美：「你不吃等下老師來就碎碎唸啦~」阿明：「好吧，我吃，老師的碎碎唸比三色豆痛苦多了...」阿明的行為屬於下列何種增強理論(reinforcement theory)的方法？

- (A) 正向增強 (positive reinforcement)
- (B) 負向增強 (negative reinforcement)
- (C) 懲罰 (punishment)
- (D) 削弱 (extinction)

10. 阿雄看到某業者的廣告文案寫著：「天天都便宜！」心想：「不可能啦，我一看就知道了，業者都黑心，一定是天天都騙你。」阿雄這樣的心態是屬於？

- (A) 過濾作用(filtering)
- (B) 資訊超荷(information overload)
- (C) 選擇性知覺(selective perception)
- (D) 定錨偏誤(anchoring bias)

二、問答題(請以中文作答，字跡請勿潦草以免影響閱讀與對內容的理解，共計 3 大題，故請妥善調配時間)(70 分)

1. 請解釋何謂「沉沒成本效應(sunk cost effect)」，並說明企業在經營決策上可能會如何受到「沉沒成本效應」之影響。(10 分)

2. 請先閱讀以下關於「企業道德違規」研究的摘錄內容：

Company moral transgressions are prevalent in today's marketplace. Company moral transgressions can be broadly defined as the breach of social and/or moral norms (Huber, Vogel, and Meyer 2009; Kaptein 2008).¹ According to research on business ethics, people have a belief system about right and wrong and thus what companies ought and ought not to do (Evan and Freeman 1988). These moral beliefs about business organizations comprise the rules, standards, principles, or codes that people use to evaluate company behaviors (Lewis 1985). When a company deviates from these moral beliefs, it constitutes a moral transgression (Jones 1991). Consider Nike's poor labor practices in developing countries, BP's oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, Urban Outfitter's offensive clothing and advertising, and Volkswagen's emissions scandal. Due to the Internet and social media, such company moral transgressions rapidly receive public scrutiny (Crockett 2017) and can damage transgressing firms. For example, company sales

國立中山大學 113 學年度碩士班暨碩士在職專班招生考試試題

科目名稱：管理學【行銷傳播所碩士班乙組】

題號：446002

※本科目依簡章規定「不可以」使用計算機(混合題)

共 5 頁第 3 頁

and stock market value may plummet due to angry customers and disappointed investors (Frooman 1997; Grappi, Romani, and Bagozzi 2013; Klein, Smith, and John 2004). Yet not all consumers are likely to have the same level of concern toward company moral transgressions given that people often differ in how they judge and respond to everyday moral transgressions (Graham, Haidt, and Nosek 2009; Lovett, Jordan, and Wiltermuth 2012).

While this organizational misconduct may lead consumers to penalize companies when it comes to purchasing their products (Hardeck and Hertl 2014), little is known about the reasons that explain why most consumers actually decide to continue to support these perpetrators. Research on corporate social irresponsibility and expectancy violation theory supports the idea that organizations can be punished by consumers for their unethical conducts (Bhattacharya et al. 2009; Trudel and Cotte 2009; Kim et al. 2019). According to Hardeck and Hertl (2014), unethical actions might be value-destroying activities that may erode buying intentions, corporate reputation, and consumers' willingness to pay price premiums. However, as explained by Jackson et al. (2014), in contrast to accepted wisdom, evidence suggests that the link between corporate irresponsibility and reputational penalties is actually weaker than expected. From a consumer behavior perspective, many consumers decide not to boycott irresponsible brands, even though doing so could damage their moral self.

Research exploring individuals' support for transgressors has its origin in motivated reasoning theory, which essentially explains that individuals need to preserve cognitive consistency in their decisions to protect the self (Kunda 1990). To achieve this, individuals tend to engage in a variety of moral justification processes. For example, the disengagement theory suggests that individuals tend to support transgressors by engaging in a process of moral rationalization (Tsang 2002). This mechanism involves a self-regulatory process by which individuals employ diverse strategies to justify immoral actions and make them personally acceptable (Bandura 1999). As moral rationalization puts the individuals' social image at risk by publicly revealing information about their own moral standards, Bhattacharjee et al. (2013) proposed that individuals may prefer to use alternative reasoning strategies that do not imply condoning the immoral action. These authors claimed that individuals may be supporting transgressing actors by engaging in a process of moral decoupling. Moral decoupling is a moral reasoning strategy by which the individual selectively dissociates judgments of performance and judgments of morality (Haberstroh et al. 2017). Thus, moral decoupling enables individuals to acknowledge that an organization is engaged in an immoral action, but to still justify their support for the company because of its performance. Both moral rationalization and, more recently, moral decoupling have been applied to explain counterfeit purchasing behaviors (Chen et al. 2018), support for public figures or celebrities or endorsed brands (Lee et al. 2016; Wang and Kim 2019), or purchases of pirated products (Eisend 2019). In addition to rationalization and decoupling, Lee and Kwak (2016) propose coupling as another moral reasoning strategy, which integrates morality judgment with performance judgment. Owing to their high moral standards or the nature of the scandal, some consumers may find it difficult to justify improper behavior or to dissociate judgment of morality from judgment of performance. Individuals engaged in moral coupling tend to take company moral transgressions into consideration when evaluating a company's performance. This strategy may lead individuals to view a transgressed celebrity unfavorably, and such perceptions may be transferred to the associated brands and products. As a result, consumers using moral coupling strategies view the transgressor's morality, as well as the transgressor's performance, more negatively, and thus, react negatively to the transgressor and related entities (Lee and Kwak, 2016; Lee et al., 2016).

Despite this recent research interest, there is still only a limited understanding of the essential issue as to why consumers continue to buy products from legal companies that have been publicly exposed as performing unethical actions. While most of the previous studies are focused on analyzing morally reprehensible purchasing conducts that can generate increased cognitive dissonance, such as buying

國立中山大學 113 學年度碩士班暨碩士在職專班招生考試試題

科目名稱：管理學【行銷傳播所碩士班乙組】

題號：446002

※本科目依簡章規定「不可以」使用計算機(混合題)

共 5 頁第 4 頁

counterfeit goods (Chen et al. 2018; Orth et al. 2019), little effort has been devoted to exploring how consumers react to business misconduct. Due to the complex nature of moral dilemmas, it is critical to understand how consumers respond to businesses' unethical actions in ambiguous situations where they may engage in different reasoning strategies to support the perpetrators with their own actions. Furthermore, a literature review on the central topic on consumers' reactions to business misconduct reveals additional research gaps. Although it has been acknowledged that ethical organizational misbehaviors in the marketplace affect consumers' emotions, attitudes and behavioral reactions, consumers do not always arrive at similar negative moral judgments (Lo et al. 2019). Some consumers reduce and rationalize the offense, others judge the transgression in a strict way, others dissociate the immorality and performance judgments to maintain their support for the transgressor, and still others find it difficult to make these disassociations and engage in coupling routes to condemn the perpetrator (Ingram et al. 2005; Lee and Kwak 2016; Lo et al. 2019). Hence, diverse contextual and personal idiosyncrasies and boundary conditions could explain why consumers reach different moral judgments and engage in different reasoning mechanisms to continue to buy products from a transgressing brand.

摘自：

Kim, D., Lee, J. S., Jang, W., & Ko, Y. J. (2022). Does causal reasoning lead to moral reasoning? Consumers' responses to scandalized athletes and endorsements. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 23(3), 465-484.

Matute, J., Sánchez-Torelló, J. L., & Palau-Saumell, R. (2021). The influence of organizations' tax avoidance practices on consumers' behavior: The role of moral reasoning strategies, political ideology, and brand identification. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 174, 369-386.

Wang, S., & Kim, K. J. (2020). Consumer response to negative celebrity publicity: The effects of moral reasoning strategies and fan identification. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 29(1), 114-123.

Xu, H., Bolton, L. E., & Winterich, K. P. (2021). How do consumers react to company moral transgressions? The role of power distance belief and empathy for victims. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 48(1), 77-101.

(1) 請說明人們可能使用哪幾種道德推論策略來面對企業組織的不道德行為，並介紹個別的內涵以及產生的道德判斷結果。(15分)

(2) 無論就危機管理或危機溝通而言，瞭解人們會如何知覺或是回應企業組織的不道德行為，都至關重要。請嘗試結合過去所學習過的理論，或根據個人的經驗與觀察，提出一個會影響人們決定採用何種道德推論策略的重要變數，並請邏輯性推導出該變數的影響效果。(25分)

3. 請先閱讀下列文章

“Consumer-brand relationship and psychological distance”

We employ psychological distance as a useful complement to the consumer-brand relationship (CBR) literature as a means of conceptualizing self-brand distance. Psychological distance refers to the “subjective experience that something is close or far away from the self, here, and now” (Trope and Liberman 2010, p. 440). At its core, psychological distance reflects the subjective feeling of how far, in abstract psychological space, a target (e.g., object, event) is perceived to be from the self (Alter and Oppenheimer 2008). We suggest that psychological distance can be construed as the foundation underlying the numerous conceptualizations of self-brand distance in the CBR literature.

Because CBRs represent socially construed dyads that are in many ways akin to an interpersonal relationship (Fournier 1998), the array of consumer-brand relationships identified in previous research

試題請隨卷繳回，請留意背面是否有題

國立中山大學 113 學年度碩士班暨碩士在職專班招生考試試題

科目名稱：管理學【行銷傳播所碩士班乙組】

題號：446002

※本科目依簡章規定「不可以」使用計算機(混合題)

共 5 頁第 5 頁

should vary predictably along the social dimension of psychological distance, based on the relational norms and behaviors that constitute each relationship. Consider two examples. With “committed” brand relationships, consumers are faithful to the brand in some lasting way and think about these brands relatively similarly to their more intimate interpersonal connections (Miller, Fournier, and Allen 2012). In this case, much like personal relationships (e.g., Linville, Fischer, and Yoon 1996), it is clear that the brand will be perceived as psychologically close and incorporated into the self-concept (Fournier 1998). Conversely, “secret affair” brand relationships, also characterized by high levels of affect, imply that brands are kept hidden to avoid a public association. Indeed, their nearest relational neighbor is the “complete stranger” type (Zayer and Neier 2011), underlining that secret affair brands lie more in the domain of “not me.”

節錄自 Connors, S., Khamitov, M., Thomson, M., & Perkins, A. (2021). They're just not that into you: how to leverage existing consumer-brand relationships through social psychological distance. *Journal of Marketing*, 85(5), 92-108.

(1) 請簡單摘要此文章的內容 (6 分)

(2) 若你是企業主管，你如何應用此文章的內容？請從 committed brand 與 secret affair brand 的觀點分別說明 (14 分)