

大葉大學 九十三 學年度 研究所博士班 招生考試試題紙

| 系 所 別 | 組 別 | 考 試 科 目 (中文名稱) | 考 試 日 期 | 節 次 | 備 註 |
|-------|-----|-------------------|------------|-----|-----|
| 管理研究所 | 甲組 | 管理學 | 6月21日 | 第一節 | 第1頁 |

註：考生可否攜帶計算機或其他資料作答，請在備註欄註明（如未註明，一律不准攜帶）

(共四頁)

請閱讀以下文章，並根據後面問題作答，你的分數是依照你答題的真實，詳實與重點掌握程度，請確實作答。

The two decades from 1980-2000 marked tremendous growth in the organizational adoption of information technologies. Many firms adopted their first computers with the availability of desktop computing, while for larger enterprises computing shifted from being a back office data processing system to become an integral part of daily operations. New systems such as supply chain management (SCM), enterprise resource planning (ERP) and customer relationship management (CRM) required not only alignment of the technology to support business goals, but also a change in business processes to realize the benefits of that technology. We use the term enterprise to refer to an organization that has an IS function that is part of the organization's planning process. Usually such organizations have thousands of employees.

This huge growth in technology adoption masked a contrary trend in the declining real cost of computing. Nordhaus (2001) estimated that the cost of computing power has declined in constant dollars at a compounded growth rate of 55% per annum from 1940 to 2001.

The decades of 1980's and 1990's brought waves of new technology that gradually weakened the control that proprietary IT vendors held over their customers. In the first round, vertically-integrated mainframe vendors lost business to new vertically-integrated "open systems" vendors, which offered lower purchase and switching costs but still used proprietary R&D to keep out new entrants and partially lock in customers (Bresnahan and Saloner, 1997). The proprietary vendor control was further eroded by a shift to horizontal specialization of component vendors, standardized components and modular systems design that led to the commoditization of once cutting-edge technology (Grove 1996; Bresnahan and Greenstein 1999).

As a result, buyer organizations deployed systems that have similar capabilities but at a lower cost, a process of right sizing that accelerated after the end of the technology bubble in 2000. This commoditization and associated pervasiveness of IT prompted Carr (2003) to assert "IT doesn't matter" in terms of providing competitive advantage. Even those that disagree with Carr concede that many previously "strategic" information systems are no longer a source of differentiation.

The maturation of information technologies had a traumatic impact on IT industry vendors. The rise of commoditized hardware components have reduced proprietary barriers to entry, increasing competition and buyer power, and reducing profit margins. These shifts have been fatal for systems vendors such as Digital Equipment Corporation and have threatened

大葉大學 九十三 學年度 研究所博士班 招生考試試題紙

| 系 所 別 | 組 別 | 考 試 科 目 (中文名稱) | 考 試 日 期 | 節 次 | 備 註 |
|-----------|-----|-------------------|------------|-------|------------------|
| 管 理 研 究 所 | 甲 組 | 管 理 學 | 6 月 21 日 | 第 一 節 | 第 2 頁 (共 四 頁) |

註：考生可否攜帶計算機或其他資料作答，請在備註欄註明（如未註明，一律不准攜帶）

Compaq, HP and Sun Microsystems. More recently, software vendors have faced similar pressures with the increasing popularity and capabilities of open source software.

The demand for IT is not homogeneous across all enterprises. The systems deployed by enterprises differ in their technological composition — in terms of performance, features, complexity, reliability, cost, and support requirements. Systems also differ in how they are used, the degree to which they align with strategic goals, and ultimately how much business value they provide for the resources invested. Prior research has attempted to use the varying goals and technological intensity to explain differences in business value realized from IT investments.

McFarlan, McKenney and Pyburn (1983) proposed a grid approach to explain differences among firms in the strategic impact of their information systems. Based on the IS planning process, they classify firms into four different IS environments: support, factory, turnaround and strategic. Their framework allows for different organizational subunits to occupy different quadrants and for the position of a firm (or unit) to change over time. This Strategic Grid model has been validated by various empirical studies including Neumann, Ahitev and Zviran (1992) and Raghunathan and Raghunathan (1990).

In recent years, the Strategic Grid model has been complemented and supplemented by various models. Henderson and Venkatraman (1993) proposed a Strategic Alignment model as a framework to understand and evaluate the potential of IT in contributing to the overall strategic goals of the organization. They argue that firms must consider both the strategic fit from the external to the internal domain of the organization, and the integration between the business and functional domains. The general applicability of this framework has also been established (e.g., see Luftman 1996). Luftman et al (2004) have provided a method for assessing the maturity of enterprise IT's strategic alignment as well.

Venkatraman (1994) further developed the Strategic Alignment model by classifying the business value received from information systems into five levels of benefits, based on the degree of business transformation that the systems enable and the benefits that have been realized. Tallon et al (2000) also investigated the relationship between the investment made in IT and its impact on organizational performance and productivity. They developed a process-level model of IT business value to assess the impacts of IT on vital business activities within the value chain.

Weill and Vitale (1999) discussed the assessment of the health of an IS applications portfolio that has implications on IT portfolio management in general. The practice of IT portfolio management is also frequently discussed in industry publications.

大葉大學 九十三 學年度 研究所博士班 招生考試試題紙

| 系 所 別 | 組 別 | 考 試 科 目 (中文名稱) | 考 試 日 期 | 節 次 | 備 註 |
|-------|-----|-------------------|------------|-----|--------------|
| 管理研究所 | 甲組 | 管 理 學 | 6月21日 | 第一節 | 第3頁 (共四頁) |

註：考生可否攜帶計算機或其他資料作答，請在備註欄註明（如未註明，一律不准攜帶）

As the previous summary suggests, most of the work on IT adoption and IS strategy has focused on differences between organizations. Such differences in IT intensity are certainly important and empirically validated, whether between industries or between leaders and laggards in the same industry. Some of this inter-organizational focus can also be attributed to the use of the individual-centered diffusion of innovations (DOI) frameworks popularized by Rogers(1983) that were later adapted for studying organizational adoption of innovation (e.g. Tornatzky & Fleischer, 1990). There is also a natural tendency in analysis (whether journalistic or academic) to highlight "first movers" and other best practices as exemplars for other firms to emulate.

However, the reality is that there is also considerable variation of IT demand within organizations and even organizational subunits, particularly the larger ones. Even for an enterprise that uses key information systems as its primary source of competitive advantage, there will likely be other systems of little or no strategic importance, with concomitant lower levels of top management visibility, staffing and investment. Such intra-organizational heterogeneity has received very little consideration in the research on IS strategy. Therefore, to consider how variations in IT demand drives technology choices, a complete model would allow for differences both between organizations and within organizations. This would be captured by measuring the portfolio of differing IT investments by a single organization, how that IT portfolio changes over time, and also differences in the IT portfolios between organizations.

Resources : S. K. Kwan and J. West (2004)

問 題

1. 請摘要說明本文的重點（約 400~500 字內）(15%)
2. 策略方格（**Strategic Grid**），有那些重要理論，請說明之。(15%)
3. 針對這些理論，本文作者有什麼看法？(15%)
4. 根據這樣的研究，你認為這篇研究的題目，應該是什麼？(5%)

大葉大學 九十三 學年度 研究所博士班 招生考試試題紙

| 系 所 別 | 組 別 | 考 試 科 目 (中文名稱) | 考 試 日 期 | 節 次 | 備 註 |
|-------|-----|-------------------|------------|-----|--------------|
| 管理研究所 | 甲組 | 管理學 | 6月21日 | 第一節 | 第4頁 (共四頁) |

註：考生可否攜帶計算機或其他資料作答，請在備註欄註明（如未註明，一律不准攜帶）

5. 舉例說明如何善用 Balance Scorecard 的方法。根據 Kaplan，此法的實施原則為何？實施此法成功的公司有何共同特質？（10%）
6. 舉例說明 Succession Planning 的重要性及做法。在台灣企業實施不易的可能原因為何？如何改善？（10%）
7. 試述美國和日本的管理精神，其主要差異何在？各有何優缺點？（10%）
8. 我國以國際代工聞名，請問其利弊及未來的發展為何？（10%）
9. 試述下列名詞的含義：（10%）
 - (1) behavior-anchored interview
 - (2) fundamental attribution error
 - (3) ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning)
 - (4) 360 degree appraisal
 - (5) BCG Model (Boston Consulting Group Model)