

**UNIVERSITY OF SWAZILAND**  
**INSTITUTE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION**  
**MAIN EXAMINATION: ACADEMIC YEAR 2012/2013**  
**(DECEMBER 2012)**

---

<b>COURSE TITLE</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>LEADERSHIP IN ORGANISATIONS</b>
<b>COURSE CODE</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>BAE 425</b>
<b>TIME ALLOWED</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>THREE (3) HOURS</b>

---

**INSTRUCTIONS**

1. This paper consists of Section A and Section B
2. The Case Study in Section (A) is compulsory;
3. Answer any (3) three questions from Section B

**NOTE**

You are reminded that in assessing your work, credit will be given on the accuracy of language, the general quality of expression, the layout and presentation of your final answer.

**GOOD LUCK!!**

---

**CANDIDATES ARE NOT ALLOWED TO READ THE QUESTIONS UNTIL THEY ARE TOLD  
TO DO SO BY THE INVIGILATOR**

## **SECTION A: CASE STUDY – COMPULSORY (40 MARKS)**

**READ THE CASE BELOW AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS THAT FOLLOW**

### **THE AIRPLANE CRASH SURVIVORS<sup>1</sup>**

In the spring of 1972, an airplane flew across the Andes Mountains carrying its crew and 40 passengers. Most of the passengers were members of an amateur Uruguayan rugby team en route to a game in Chile. The plane never arrived. It crashed in snow-covered mountains, breaking into several pieces upon impact. The main part of the fuselage slid like a toboggan down a steep valley, finally coming to rest in waist-deep snow. Although a number of people died immediately or within a day, the picture for 28 survivors was not much better. The fuselage initially offered little protection from the extreme cold, food supplies were scant, and a number of passengers had serious injuries from the crash. Over the next few days, several of them became psychotic, and several others died from their injuries. Those passengers who were relatively uninjured set out to do what they could to improve their chances of survival.

Several worked on “weatherproofing” the wreckage, others found ways to get water, and those with medical training took care of the injured. Although shaken from the crash, the survivors initially were confident they would be found. These feelings gradually gave way to despair, as search and rescue teams failed to find the wreckage. After several weeks had passed with no sign of rescue in sight, the remaining passengers decided to mount several expeditions to determine the best way to escape. The most physically fit were chosen for the expeditions, as the thin mountain air and the deep snow made the trips extremely taxing. The results were both frustrating and demoralizing. The expeditionary determined they were in the middle of the Andes Mountains; finding help on foot was believed to be impossible. Just when the survivors thought nothing worse could possibly happen; an avalanche hit the wreckage and killed several more of them.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hughes Richard L, Robert C. Ginnet, and Gordon J. Curphy. Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1996. USA. IRWIN. pp. 3 - 5

The remaining survivors concluded they would not be rescued and their only hope was for someone to leave the wreckage and find help. Three (3) of the fittest passengers were chosen for the final expedition, and everyone else's work was directed toward improving the expedition's chances of success. The three (3) expeditionaries were given more food and were exempted from routine survival activities; the rest spent most of their energies securing supplies for the trip. Two (2) months after the plane crash, the expeditionary set out on their final attempt to find help. After hiking for ten (10) days through some of the most rugged terrain the world, the expeditionary stumbled across a group of Chilean peasants tending cattle. One of the expeditionary stated, "I come from a plane that fell in the mountains. I am Uruguayan...." Eventually, 14 other survivors were rescued.

When the full account of their survival became known, it was not without controversy. It had required extreme and unsettling measures – the survivors remained alive only by eating the flesh of their deceased comrades. Nonetheless, told by Piers Paul Read in *Alive* (1974). It is a story of tragedy and courage, and it is a story of leadership.

Before the flight, a boy named Parrado was awkward and shy, a "second-stringer" both athletically and socially. Nonetheless, this unlikely hero became the best loved and most respected among the survivors for his courage, optimism, fairness and emotional support. Persuasiveness in group decision making also was an important aspect of leadership among the Andes survivors. During the difficult discussions preceding the agonising decisions to survive on the flesh of their comrades, one of the rugby players made his reasoning clear: "I know that if I do die and you don't eat me, then I would want you to use it. In fact, if I die and you don't eat me, then I'll come back from wherever I am and give you a good Kick in the ass"

### **Questions**

Given the description of the leadership situation facing the airplane crash survivors, how would the following leadership theories prescribe how a leader should act?

- (i) the Situational Leadership Theory **[20 Marks]**
- (ii) the Path-Goal Theory **[20 Marks]**

## **SECTION B [60 MARKS]**

### **INSTRUCTION**

**Answer any Three (3) questions below:**

1. (a) How would you define leadership? **[10 Marks]**  
(b) Compare and contrast authority with power **[10 Marks]**
2. The trait approach to leadership has failed to present a universally acceptable set of effective leadership traits. Agree or disagree **[20 Marks]**
3. Do you think broad behavioural categories like “*employee-centred*” or “*job-centred*” are independent of personality traits or other individual differences? **[20 Marks]**
4. (a) Are some people the “leader type” and others not? If so, what, in your judgment, distinguishes them? **[10 Marks]**  
(b) Outline and explain the five (5) sources of power **[10 Marks]**
5. Would you consider it a great compliment for someone to call you a good manager or a good leader? Why? Do you believe you can be both? **[20 Marks]**