國立清華大學 107 學年度碩士班考試入學試題

系所班組別：教育心理與諮商學系碩士班 工商心理組
考試科目（代碼）：管理學（6702）

壹、 名詞解釋 （每題 5 分，共 20 分）

1. 雙趨衝突 (Approach-Approach Conflict)
2. 領導權變理論(Contingency Theories of Leadership)
3. 平衡計分卡(Balanced scorecard)
4. 企業社會責任(Corporate social responsibility)

貳、 申論題（每題 20 分，共 80 分）

1. 在全球經濟變化下，傳統人力資源管理思維正面臨嚴苛挑戰。從網際網路起家的企業，績效管理做法也與傳統不同，不以「關鍵績效指標」（Key Performance Indicators, KPI），而改以「目標與關鍵成果法」（Objectives and Key Results, OKRs）作為績效管理工具。請說明目標與關鍵成果法之內涵，並請舉例說明。（20 分）
2. John Kotter 於 1996 年強調企業若要成功轉型，必須靠著經理人的領導與管理能力，號召大家一同踏上「變革」這條船。近期，台灣大學新任管中閔校長，宣示以「變革」推動教育競爭、人才競逐、研究創新及國際學術地位的「亞洲旗艦計畫」，讓台大從現代大學變為未來大學。請說明變革管理(Change Management)之定義、必要性、步驟與模式。（20 分）
3. 在網路科技創新及人工智慧快速發展的趨勢下，企業經營需面對哪些不同於以往的挑戰？企業經理人又應具備哪些管理能力以因應前述之挑戰？（20 分）
4. 請閱讀次頁文章後，摘要其內容重點（300 字內）；並擬定一延伸研究問題，且說明該研究之預期貢獻為何。（20 分）

Despite the contributions of the dimensional approach to our understanding of the role of justice in organizational life, there is recognition that the focus on specific dimensions of justice does not capture the depth and richness of the totality of an individual's experience of workplace justice (Ambrose and Arnaud, 2005; Ambrose and Schminke, 2009; Greenberg, 2001; Lind, 2001; Shapiro, 2001). Informed by fairness heuristic theory (Lind, 2001; Lind and Tyler, 1988), a small but steady stream of research has started to focus on overall justice which describes a global perception of the fairness of an entity stemming from one's experiences as well as those of others (Ambrose and Arnaud, 2005; Ambrose and Schminke, 2009; Barclay and Kiefer, 2012; Beugre and Baron, 2001; Choi, 2008; Hollensbe et al., 2008; Holtz and Harold, 2009; Jones and Martens, 2009; Kim and Leung, 2007). As Lind (2001, pp. 68–69) observed, 'this global judgment of fair treatment draws information from procedural, process, and distributive elements'. Similarly, Colquitt and Shaw (2005) suggested that when the objective is to account for global job attitudes and behaviours such as job performance (as in this study), it is appropriate to use overall justice.

Although research has shown overall justice to mediate the influence of the dimensions of justice on some work outcomes (Ambrose and Schminke, 2009), there is a dearth of research that has examined the psychological pathways through which it (overall justice) influences these work outcomes (for an exception, see Barclay and Kiefer, 2012). In this study, we integrate social exchange (SET) and self-determination (SDT) theories to account for the previously demonstrated influence of overall justice on job performance (Ambrose and Schminke, 2009). By pursuing this objective, we contribute to the extant research in two significant ways. First, despite the recognition of need satisfaction in both SET (Cropanzano et al., 2001a) and SDT (Deci and Ryan, 2000), research has yet to examine its role in explaining why justice influences trust in organization and intrinsic motivation. Zapata-Phelan et al. (2009) suggested need satisfaction as a pathway through which justice (procedural) may influence intrinsic motivation but this has not yet been empirically examined. Similarly, despite Cropanzano et al.'s (2001a, p. 175) observation that 'justice matters to the extent that it serves some important psychological needs', research has not examined the role of need satisfaction in accounting for the overall justice–trust in organization relationship. By examining need satisfaction as a mediator, we account for the previously demonstrated influence of overall justice (Frazier et al., 2010; Jones and Martens, 2009) on trust while concurrently expanding the outcomes of overall justice to include intrinsic motivation.

Second, although trust has been shown to influence job performance (Aryee et al., 2002; Begley et al., 2006; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Pillai et al., 1999) until recently, research has not accounted for this relationship. In a recent article, Colquitt et al. (2012) examined two pathways that combined social exchange and uncertainty management theories to account for the influence of affect- and cognition-based dimensions of trust on job performance. They found that normative commitment accounted for the affect-based trust–job performance relationship while uncertainty accounted for the cognition-based trust–job performance relationship. Although their findings represent an important step in understanding the trust–job performance relationship, it does not exhaust pathways through which trust may influence job performance. Indeed, Colquitt et al. (2012) suggested integrating conceptual lenses to provide a more parsimonious explanation of the influence of justice on job performance. By examining intrinsic motivation as a pathway through which trust influences job performance, we integrate the conceptual lenses offered by SET and SDT to account for the motivational under-pinnings of the performance implications of overall justice.

(Source: *Journal of Management Studies* 52:2 March 2015)