銘傳大學九十二學年國際企業學系碩士在職專班招生考試

管理理論與實務 試題

一、 說明馬士洛(Maslow)的「需求階層理論」(Need Hierarchy Theory)。
(20 分)
二、 何謂「工作描述」(Job Description)？「工作規範」(Job Specification)？
「工作擴大化」(Job Enlargement)？「工作豐富化」(Job Enrichment)？
(20 分)
三、 何謂「彼得原理」(The Peter Principle)？試述促使組織改變的途徑或機制有哪些？(20 分)
四、 簡述下篇文章的內容並提出你個人的心得看法。(40%)
What Makes a Company “American”?

During the 1980s and early 1990s, many calls have been advanced for U.S. companies to revitalize their international competitiveness. But wait! What is an “American” company? Are General Motors, IBM, and Whirlpool “American” companies? How about Toyota, Honda, or Sony?

Consider two hypothetical corporations. First is ABC Computers that is headquartered in San Francisco. Its managers, directors, and stockholders are U.S. citizens. However, most of ABC’s employees are South Korean because the firm conducts its product design and manufacturing in South Korea. Many of these computers are exported to the United States. The second firm is XYZ Computers, headquartered in Germany. Its managers, directors, and stockholders are German citizens. But most of XYZ’s employees are Californians who design and manufacture computers, many of which are exported to Germany. Which of these firms is the “American” corporation? Which is most important for the U.S. economic welfare?

As Professor Robert Reich of Harvard University notes, we have witnessed an increasing number of examples of corporations ABC and XYZ economy has become internationalized. Reich notes that the U.S. corporation is typically perceived as the main vehicle for improving U.S. competitiveness. He speculates that most people would designate ABC Computers as the “American” corporation.

But in the 1990s, the competitiveness of U.S.-owned corporations is no longer the same as “American” competitiveness. Consider IBM who is often considered to be a hall-mark of U.S. competitiveness. Consider IBM who is
often considered to be a hallmark of U.S. competitiveness. Over 40 percent of IBM’s employees are foreign. Its Japanese subsidiary employs over 18,000 Japanese workers and is one of Japan’s leading exporters of computers. Or consider Whirlpool who employees over 43,000 people around the world in 45 countries. Another example is Texas Instruments who conducts most of its research and development, product design, and manufacturing in East Asia.

Reich argues that in an economy of increasing international investment, foreign-owned corporation XYZ Computers, with its manufacturing presence in the United States, is far more significant to U.S. economic welfare than U.S.-owned ABC Computers, with its staff of South Korean workers. Reich defines “American competitiveness” as the capacity of U.S. workers to add value to the international economy irrespective of the nationality of the company that employs them. U.S. competitiveness is thus not the profitability or market share of U.S.-owned corporations. Indeed, the interests of U.S.-owned firms may or may not coincide with those of the U.S. population.

So who represents the United States? Reich maintains that it is represented by the U.S. workforce, the people, but not necessarily the U.S.-owned corporation. U.S. ownership of a corporation is less significant for U.S. economic well-being than the training, skills, and knowledge attained by U.S. workers – workers that are increasingly hired by foreign-owned firms.

The policy implications of this view are clear. If the United Stated desires to revitalize its competitiveness, it must invest in people, not in nationally defined corporations. The United States must open its boundaries to foreign investors instead of favoring firms that training, research, and infrastructure, so that the United States becomes a good location to set up shop for any international firm desiring talented employees.

Reich notes that, in reality, the U.S. government often does the opposite of what he advocates. Namely, it identifies national interest with the self-interest of home-based corporations. For example, in 1989 the U.S. government criticized Japan for excluding Motorola from the Tokyo market for telephone equipment and speculated about retaliation. But Motorola designs and manufactures much of its telephone equipment in Kuala Lumpur; most of the U.S. workers, who manufacture telephone equipment in the United States to be exported to Japan, are hired by Japanese-owned firms. If Reich is correct, the U.S. allegiance to a Texas Instruments or an IBM should be conditional instead of merely patriotic, just as America’s affection for Toyota and Honda should be based on what they bring to the United States.