



英语二阅读真题同源过关练习 15

文章来源：哈佛商业评论 段落：五段 字数：428 内容：心理学

要求：A. 做题 B. 找到出题处 C. 挑五个句子翻译 D. 将文中单词认真背完

If lying — or even just exaggerating a bit — would help your team win, would you do it? More provocatively: should you do it? Being honest and never dissembling is very consistent with the bland axioms of a “feel good” leadership discourse, but as in the case of sports, it is also remarkably inconsistent with what actually goes on in the real world. Truth is, some of the most successful and iconic leaders, including many CEOs, were (and are) consummate, accomplished prevaricators.

There's Steve Jobs, 2005 Stanford commencement speaker and technology icon. The phrase “reality distortion field,” coined by one of members of the original Macintosh team, refers to Jobs' s amazing ability to present what he would like to be true as if it were already reality.

My takeaways? First of all, the amount of hypocrisy, in the world but particularly in the writing and speaking about leadership, is almost too vast to comprehend. Second, all the moral “cluck-clucking” about how harmful this dishonesty is does nothing — or maybe even less than nothing — to change anything. Because people mistakenly believe that expressing disapproval is sufficient, they fail to follow through with initiatives that might actually compel people to be (more) honest. Third, organizations — whether they are companies or soccer teams — exist in ecosystems and if you want to change individual behavior, you need to change the systems in which that behavior occurs. Or as a software company chairman once put it to me in conversation, “if everyone else is misrepresenting product availability, can we afford not to?” (This is where vaporware emanates from.)

Fourth, even as people express outrage over deception and misrepresentation, research shows that many, many people frequently engage in two processes that permit them to continue to do business with and support companies and leaders who have engaged in moral transgressions. One psychological process is moral rationalization — convincing themselves that the misbehavior wasn't actually that serious. The other process is **moral decoupling** — arguing that the particular transgression is not relevant to the decision at hand — for instance, that sexual misbehavior is not probative of an athlete's skills on the field.



Lying is incredibly common in everyday life in part because it helps to smooth over relationships. And the ability to convince people of something even if it is not quite the case, the art of salesmanship, is a quality actually both common to and useful in leaders. Note that even one of the early, iconic stories of truthfulness, George Washington admitting to his father that he cut down the cherry tree, is itself made up.

1. the word ‘prevaricators’ in the paragraph 1 may mean

- A. liars B. cheaters C. scoundrels D. hooligans

2. the phrase ‘too vast to comprehend’ in the paragraph 3 may mean

- A. too good to be true
- B. too much to be counted
- C. too complicated to understand
- D. too important to be overlooked

3. some companies exaggerate their products’ functions because

- A. other companies are too strong
- B. they can make more profits
- C. they are confronted with severe competition
- D. other companies may do so

4. one reason why people continue trading with those dishonest companies is that

- A. people didn’t realize the seriousness of those companies’ improper behavior
- B. people tended to express the good side of their human nature



- C. people degraded the severity of those companies' misconduct
- D. people failed to take into account the disastrous impact of such harmful conduct

5. we can learn from the last paragraph that

- A. honesty exerts a negative impact on interpersonal relationships
- B. salesmanship in a good many cases is based on telling lies
- C. salesmanship is as important as leadership
- D. truthfulness in the present-day society is ridiculous and unrealistic

答案：ABDCA

If lying — or even just exaggerating a bit — would help your team win, would you do it? More provocatively: should you do it? Being honest and never dissembling is very consistent with the bland axioms of a “feel good” leadership discourse, but as in the case of sports, it is also remarkably inconsistent with what actually goes on in the real world. Truth is, some of the most successful and iconic leaders, including many CEOs, were (and are) consummate, accomplished prevaricators. 第一题答案出处

There's Steve Jobs, 2005 Stanford commencement speaker and technology icon. The phrase “reality distortion field,” coined by one of members of the original Macintosh team, refers to Jobs' s amazing ability to present what he would like to be true as if it were already reality.

My takeaways? First of all, the amount of hypocrisy, in the world but particularly in the writing and speaking about leadership, is almost too vast to comprehend. 第二题答案出处 Second, all the moral “cluck-clucking” about how harmful this dishonesty is does nothing — or maybe even less than nothing — to change anything. Because people mistakenly believe that expressing disapproval is sufficient, they fail to follow through with initiatives that might actually compel people to be (more) honest. Third, organizations — whether they are companies or soccer teams — exist in ecosystems and if you want to change individual behavior, you need to change the systems in which that behavior occurs. Or as a software company chairman once put it to me in conversation, “if everyone else is misrepresenting product availability, can we afford not to?” 第三题答案出处 (This is where vaporware emanates from.)

Fourth, even as people express outrage over deception and misrepresentation, research shows that many, many people frequently engage in two processes that permit them to continue to do business with and support companies and leaders who have engaged in moral transgressions. One psychological process is moral rationalization — convincing themselves that the misbehavior wasn't actually that serious. 第四题答案出处 The other process is moral decoupling — arguing that the particular transgression is not relevant to the decision at hand — for instance, that sexual misbehavior is not probative of an athlete' s skills on the field.



Lying is incredibly common in everyday life in part because it helps to smooth over relationships. 第五题答案出处 And the ability to convince people of something even if it is not quite the case, the art of salesmanship, is a quality actually both common to and useful in leaders. Note that even one of the early, iconic stories of truthfulness, George Washington admitting to his father that he cut down the cherry tree, is itself made up.

全文翻译：

如果说谎，夸张一点来说，能帮助你的团队赢得胜利，你会这样做么？更加直白一点，你应该这样做么？讲诚信，不虚伪，在那些教导众人如何成为杰出领导的书中，都是老生常谈的道理。但是，不论是在体育赛事中，还是在实际生活中，这显然完全不是那么一回事。反而事情的真相却是，众多事业无比成功的标志性领导人物个个都是撒谎的高手，其中不乏许多公司 CEO。

斯蒂芬·乔布斯就是其中之一。他曾受邀在 2005 年斯坦福毕业典礼上致辞，在科技领域被视为业界风向标。一位参与第一代苹果机研发的小组成员创造了“现实扭曲力场”一词，用来形容乔布斯本人所展现出的令人咂舌的能力，只要他自己认定是对的事情，他就能够口若悬河地表述出来，让人感觉他所说的东西似乎早就存在了。

那么从这么多案例中，我们又学到了什么呢？首先，虚伪行径在生活中无处不在，远远超出我们的预期。在众多领导人物的讲话发言和个人著作中更是比比皆是。其次，在弄虚作假问题上，聒噪的道德宣教对于改变现状简直于事无补，甚至可以说完全是吃力不讨好，因为人们往往存在这样一个误区，认为只要在态度上不助涨此等风气就已足够，从而没能够进一步采取措施，实实在在地敦促众人要讲求诚信，追求更高道德水准。再来，所有组织，不论是公司企业还是足球俱乐部，都存在于一定的生态系统中，所以想要改变个体行为，就势必要改造诱发行为发生的整个环境系统。否则，正如某软件公司总裁在一次谈话中所说：如果周遭每个人都在吹捧自家产品，那我们自己又如何能免俗呢？（“雾件”一词便是来源于此）。

最后一点，纵使民众对欺骗谎话深恶痛绝，但是有研究发现，人们还是愿意继续和这些有过不良道德记录的公司乃至领导进行商业合作，一如既往的支持他们。而造成这种现象的原因就在于很多人往往难以跳脱两大心理过程。其一便是道德理性化，即说服自己相信这种不当行为并不会引发严重后果。其二便是道德脱钩，辩解某种行为失德与当前所做的决定之间并不存在任何关联。比如，运动员爆出性丑闻，却并不妨碍人们看好其比赛表现。



在日常生活中，说谎简直可以说是家常便饭。究其原因，也许一部分就在于谎言可以润滑人际关系，减少人与人之间的摩擦。有本事颠倒黑白却能让人深信不疑，这是营销艺术，更与领导艺术有异曲同工之妙，让人受用无穷。想想也是，就连乔治·华盛顿小时候向其父坦白自己砍到樱桃树这样赞扬个人诚实品质的典型故事都存在作假之嫌。

