

本試卷共有兩大部分，考生只選其中一大題作答，考試成績也以該部分的回答作為評分依據。第一大題為今年刊登於Harvard Business Review關於企業應該如何回覆消費者評論及其影響，第二大題則為今年刊登於Harvard Business Review關於經營管理的文章。

第一大題：Study: Replying to Customer Reviews Results in Better Ratings

By Davide Proserpio and Giorgos Zervas
FEBRUARY 14, 2018

Every now and then, firms make mistakes that leave their customers unsatisfied: a restaurant misplaces an order, a hotel's air conditioning breaks down, or a dry cleaner damages a garment. With increasing frequency, disappointed customers share these negative experiences by writing online reviews, and many potential customers take these reviews into account when making choices about which firms to frequent. Because of this, even small service failures can have a lasting negative impact on a firm's reputation — and financial performance.

In the age of consumer reviews and digital word-of-mouth, how can a firm participate in shaping its online reputation? There are standard service recovery strategies, such as offering perks and discounts to disappointed customers. Many managers have also started publicly responding to consumer reviews as a way to apologize and outline steps the firm has taken to avoid future service failures. Review platforms claim that responding to reviews is good practice, and even provide guidelines for responding (here are TripAdvisor's, for example). But does it improve a firm's online reputation?

To answer this question, we examined tens of thousands of hotel reviews and responses from TripAdvisor, which uses a review scale from 1 (terrible) to 5 (excellent). On TripAdvisor, management responses are common: Roughly one-third of reviews receive a response, and nearly half of all hotels respond to reviews. By analyzing these responses, we found that when hotels start responding, they receive 12% more reviews and their ratings increase, on average, by 0.12 stars. While these gains may seem modest, TripAdvisor rounds average ratings to the nearest half star: A hotel with a rating of 4.26 stars will be rounded up to a 4.5, while a hotel with 4.24 stars will be rounded down to a 4. Therefore, even small changes can have a significant impact on consumers' perceptions. Approximately one-third of the hotels we studied increased their rounded ratings by half a star or more within six months of their first management response.

Digging deeper, we wanted to understand why hotels get more and better reviews when they start responding. For example, if managers are more likely to respond when hotels renovate, we may associate better ratings with responses when they are actually the direct result of improved hotel quality.

To establish a causal link between responses and improved ratings, we exploited the fact that although nearly all hotels in our data were reviewed on both TripAdvisor and Expedia, the vast majority of them responded only to their TripAdvisor reviews. This allowed us to use Expedia ratings as a control group. What we found is that when hotels started responding on TripAdvisor, their TripAdvisor ratings went up, but their Expedia ratings remained unchanged. If hotels had made improvements — unobserved to us — at the time they started responding, we would have expected to see Expedia ratings improve as well.

This analysis increased our confidence that the improvement in ratings was a consequence of hotels' responding. However, we could not yet rule out one final scenario that would have produced the same patterns in the data, even if management responses had no effect on ratings: What if hotels made improvements specifically tailored to the preferences of TripAdvisor users at the time they started responding to TripAdvisor reviews? In that case, we would see TripAdvisor ratings improve relative to Expedia ratings, even if management responses had no effect.

To rule out this alternative explanation, we relied on a frequent pattern we discovered in our TripAdvisor data. Picture two travelers, Alice and Rodrigo, who stay at the same hotel at the same time. One week later Alice leaves a review on TripAdvisor. Two weeks later Rodrigo also leaves a review. But in the time between the two reviews, the hotel starts responding. Therefore, while Alice and Rodrigo stayed at the same hotel at the same time, only Rodrigo was exposed to previous management responses before leaving his review. Comparing the ratings of all users like Alice and Rodrigo, we found the same effect: Ratings by users who were exposed to management responses were approximately 0.1 stars higher than ratings by those who were not.

Overall, these analyses suggested that improved ratings can be directly linked to management responses. And, perhaps surprisingly, we also found that when managers respond to positive reviews, it has the same benefits as when they respond to negative reviews.

To understand why, imagine visiting your favorite restaurant, where the service and food have always been impeccable — except this time your main course arrives late. You're annoyed and point this out to your dinner companions. Seconds later, the

restaurant manager checks in with your party and asks, “How is everything?” For a moment, you consider complaining, but instead choose to avoid confrontation and focus on enjoying the rest of your meal. Why did you complain to your dinner companions but not the restaurant manager?

A consumer who is considering complaining on TripAdvisor may face a similar choice. If the consumer notices a manager responding to past reviews, they might decide not to leave a trivial or unsubstantiated negative review, to avoid a potentially uncomfortable online interaction with the manager. Even though reviewers don’t have to meet the manager in person, an online interaction between the two parties is permanently recorded and available for anyone to read in the future. To avoid situations like this, some consumers might choose not to leave a negative review.

In our analysis, we used the length of the reviews as a proxy for trivial (short) and detailed (long) reviews. We found that consumers who had read past management responses were less likely to leave short reviews than consumers who had not. Consequently, once hotels started responding, they experienced a sharp drop in the rate of short negative reviews. And while longer negative reviews still cropped up, these reviews often contained constructive feedback that could be useful to managers trying to make changes.

The rise of review platforms has left firms with a diminished sense of control over their online reputations, leading to questionable practices such as soliciting positive reviews in exchange for perks — or even writing fake reviews. While negative reviews are unavoidable, our work shows that managers can actively participate in shaping their firms’ online reputations. By monitoring and responding to reviews, a manager can make sure that when negative reviews come in — as they inevitably will — they can respond constructively and maybe even raise their firm’s rating along the way.

1. 請用三百字以內的中文說明本文的大意。(25%)
2. 請就您對本文的瞭解說明為何公司回覆顧客的留言比起顧客的評分效果更好?(25%)
3. 請並說明公司在評論網站上回復顧客的留言所帶來的影響。(25%)
4. 請試以一位管理研究學者，以本文為基礎，提出三點管理意涵 (managerial implications)及其可能的具體作法。(25%)

第二大題：Why the Most Productive People Don't Always Make the Best Managers

By Jack Zenger and Joseph Folkman
APRIL 17, 2018

When a company needs a supervisor for a team, senior leaders often anoint the team's most productive performer. Some of these stars succeed in their new role as manager; many others do not. And when they fail, they tend to leave the organization, costing the company double: Not only has the team lost its new manager, but it's also lost the best individual contributor. And the failure can be personally costly for the new manager, causing them to doubt their skills, smarts, and future career path. Everyone loses.

Why, then, do some fail while others succeed?

In another article, we explained the seven behaviors of the most productive people, based on an analysis of 7,000 workers. The behaviors were: setting stretch goals, showing consistency, having knowledge and technical expertise, driving for results, anticipating and solving problems, taking initiative, and being collaborative.

These competencies all leverage individual skills and individual effectiveness. They are valued skills and make people more productive, but all except for the last one (collaboration) focus on the individual rather than the team. When we went back to our data, the skills that our analysis identified as making a great manager are much more other-focused:

Being open to feedback and personal change. A key skill for new managers is the willingness to ask for and act on feedback from others. They seek to be more self-aware. They are on a continuing quest to get better.

Supporting others' development. All leaders, whether they are supervisors or managers, need to be concerned about developing others. While individual contributors can focus on their own development, great managers take pride in helping others learn. They know how to give actionable feedback.

Being open to innovation. The person who focuses on productivity often has found a workable process, and they strive to make that process work as efficiently as possible. Leaders, on the other hand, recognize that innovation often isn't linear or particularly efficient. An inspiring leader is open to creativity and understands that it can take time.

Communicating well. One of the most critical skills for managers is their ability to present their ideas to others in an interesting and engaging manner. A certain amount of

communication is required for the highly productive individual contributor, but communication is not the central core of their effectiveness.

Having good interpersonal skills. This is a requirement for effective managers. Emotional intelligence has become seen as perhaps the essential leadership skill. Although highly productive individuals are not loners, hermits, or curmudgeons, being highly productive often does not require a person to have excellent interpersonal skills.

Supporting organizational changes. While highly productive individuals can be relatively self-centered, leaders and managers must place the organization above themselves.

When we further analyzed our data, we found that many of the most productive individuals were significantly less effective on these skills. Let's be clear, these were not negatively correlated with productivity; they just didn't go hand in hand with being highly productive. Some highly productive individuals possessed these traits and behaviors, and having these traits didn't diminish their productivity.

But this helps explain why some highly productive people go on to be very successful managers and why others don't. While the best leaders are highly productive people, the most highly productive people don't always gravitate toward leading others.

Nearly one-quarter (23%) of the leaders who are in the top quartile on productivity are below the top quartile on these six leadership-oriented skills. So, the odds are that one out of four times a person is promoted to a leadership position because of their outstanding productivity, they will end up being a less effective leader than expected. If the highly productive person possesses technical expertise that is specific and acquired over a long period of time, it is tempting to hope the individual will quickly acquire the needed leadership skills shortly after being put into a new role. Sadly, it only happens part of the time.

Managers need to be aware that the skills that make individual contributors effective and highly productive are not the only skills they will need to be effective managers. We are convinced that the best time for individual contributors to be learning these managerial skills is when they are still an individual contributor.

Some organizations are much more adept at identifying those individuals who will be successful managers. These organizations tend to get a jump on developing managerial skill in these high-potential individuals, training them before they're promoted.

Why start early? After all, most people who end up being ineffective supervisors are not terrible at the skills listed above, and those who recommend them for promotion believe

that those skills can be further developed once they're in a managerial role. The problem is that developing these skills takes time and effort, and organizations typically want to see immediate positive results. New managers tend to be overwhelmed with their new responsibilities and often rely on the skills that made them successful individual contributors, rather than the skills needed to manage others. The time to help high-potential individuals develop these skills is before you promote them, not after.

This should come as a wake-up call to the many organizations that put off any leadership development efforts until someone is promoted to a supervisory position. There's no reason to wait; after all, when individual contributors improve these leadership skills, they will become more effective individual contributors. The time and money spent investing in individual contributors' leadership development will help both those who are promoted and those who are not.

The bottom line: Start your leadership development efforts sooner. Then when you promote your best individual contributors, you can be more certain that they'll become your best managers.

1. 請用三百字以內的中文說明本文的大意。(25%)
2. 請根據文章內容說明身為一個好的經營主管所需要的特質。(25%)
3. 公司經常因為員工表現優異而後將其升職成為管理者，有何方法不扼殺其創造力又能培養成為領導者？(25%)
4. 請試以一位管理研究學者，以本文為基礎，提出三點管理意涵 (managerial implications)及其可能的具體作法。(25%)