

BERJAYA BUSINESS SCHOOL

FINAL EXAMINATION

Student ID (in Figures)	:												
Student ID (in Words)	:												
Subject Code & Name	:	MG	T 510	3 LEA	DING	IN A	GLOB	AL EN	VIRO	NMEN	IT		
Semester & Year	:	MAY	Y - AU	GUST	2017	,							
Lecturer/Examiner	:	Lee	Yee V	Van									
Duration	:	3 Ho	ours										

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

1.	This question paper consists of 3 parts:					
	PART A (40 marks)	:	Answer TWO (2) short-structured questions. Answers are to be written in			
			Answer Booklet provided.			
	PART B (25 marks)	:	Answer ONE (1) essay question. Answers are to be written in the Answer			
			Booklet provided.			
	PART C (35 marks)	:	Answer THREE (3) Case Study questions. Answers are to be written in the			
			Answer Booklet provided.			

- 2. Candidates are not allowed to bring any unauthorized materials except writing equipment into the Examination Hall. Electronic dictionaries are strictly prohibited.
- 3. This question paper must be submitted along with all used and/or unused rough papers and/or graph paper (if any). Candidates are NOT allowed to take any examination materials out of the examination hall.
- 4. Only ballpoint pens are allowed to be used in answering the questions, with the exception of multiple choice questions, where 2B pencils are to be used.
- **WARNING:** The University Examination Board (UEB) of BERJAYA University College of Hospitality regards cheating as a most serious offence and will not hesitate to mete out the appropriate punitive actions according to the severity of the offence committed, and in accordance with the clauses stipulated in the Students' Handbook, up to and including expulsion from BERJAYA University College of Hospitality.

Total Number of pages = 5 (Including the cover page)

PART A : SHORT-STRUCTURED QUESTIONS (40 MARKS)

INSTRUCTION(S) : Answer **TWO (2)** questions. Write your answers in the Answer Booklet(s) provided.

- 1. a. Define individualized leadership. (5 marks)
 - b. Based on vertical dyad linkage model, leader-member exchange and partnership building theories. Explain the development of individualised leadership.
 (15 marks)

(Total: 20 marks)

- 2. a. Describe the Herzberg's two-factor theory. (10 marks)
 - b. Discuss why you agree or disagree hygiene factors cannot provide increased satisfaction and motivation. (10 marks)
 (10 marks)

END OF PART A

PART B : ESSAY QUESTION (25 MARKS)

INSTRUCTION(S) : Answer **ONE (1)** question. Write your answers in the Answer Booklet(s) provided.

 Illustrate Five (5) types of leader power. Access which type(s) of power would you rely on to implement an important decision quickly. Justify which type is MOST valuable and sustainable in the long-run. (25 marks)

END OF PART B

PART C : CASE STUDY (35 MARKS)

INSTRUCTION(S) : Answer **Three (3)** questions. Write your answers in the Answer Booklet(s) provided.

CASE STUDY - CONSOLIDATED PRODUCTS

Consolidated Products is a medium-sized manufacturer of consumer products with nonunionised production workers. Ben Samuels was a plant manager for Consolidated Products for 10 years, and he was very well liked by the employees there. They were grateful for the fitness center he built for employees and they enjoyed the social activities sponsored by the plant several times a year, including company picnics and holiday parties. He knew most of the workers by name, and he spent part of each day walking around the plant to visit with them and ask about their families or hobbies.

Ben believed that it was important to treat employees properly so they would have a sense of loyalty to the company. He tried to avoid any layoffs when production demand was slack, figuring that the company could not afford to lose skilled workers that are so difficult to replace. The workers knew that if they had a special problem, Ben would try to help them. For example, when someone was injured but wanted to continue working, Ben found another job in the plant that the person could do despite having a disability. Ben believed that if you treat people right, they would do a good job for you without close supervision or prodding. Ben applied the same principle to his supervisors, and he mostly left them alone to run their departments as they saw fit. He did not set objectives and standards for the plant, and he never asked the supervisors to develop plans for improving productivity and product quality.

Under Ben, the plant had the lowest turnover among the company's five plants, but the second worst record for costs and production levels. When the company was acquired by another firm, Ben was asked to take early retirement, and Phil Jones was brought in to replace him

Phil had a growing reputation as a manager who could get thing done, and he quickly began making changes. Costs were cut by trimming a number of activities such as the fitness center at the plant, company picnics and parties, and the human relations training programs for supervisors. Phil believed that human relations training was a waste of time, if employees do not want to do the work, get rid of them and find somebody else who does.

Supervisors were instructed to establish high performance standards for their departments and insist that people achieve them. A computer monitoring system was introduced so that the output of each worker could be checked closely against the standards. Phil told his supervisors to give any worker who had substandard performance one warning, and then if performance did not improve within two weeks, to fire the person. Phil believed that workers do not respect a supervisor who is weak and passive. When Phil observed a worker wasting time or making a mistake, he would reprimand the person right on the spot to set an example. Phil also checked closely on the performance of his supervisors. Demanding objectives were set for each department, and weekly meetings were held with each supervisor to review department performance. Finally, Phil insisted that supervisors check with him first before taking any significant actions that deviated from established plans and policies.

As another cost-cutting move, Phil reduced the frequency of equipment maintenance, which required machines to be idled when they could be productive. Since the machines had a good record of reliable operation, Phil believed that the current maintenance schedule was excessive and was cutting into production. Finally, when business was slow for one of the product lines, Phil laid off workers rather than finding something else for them to do.

By the end of Phil's first year as plant manager, production costs were reduced by 20 percent and production output was up by 10 percent. However, three of his seven supervisors left to take other jobs, and turnover was also high among the machine operators. Some of the turnover was due to workers who were fired, but competent machine operators were also quitting, and it was becoming increasingly difficult to find any replacements for them. Finally, there was increasing talk of unionising among the workers.

(Source: The Leadership Experience, by Richard L. Draf, 5th Edition)

Questions

- 1. Compare the leadership traits and behaviors of Ben Samuels and Phil Jones. (10 marks)
- 2. Justify which leadership style is more effective to an effective organization. (15 marks)
- 3. If you were Phil Jones' boss, propose what would you do now to improve the overall performance of this company. (10 marks)

(Total: 35 marks)

END OF EXAM PAPER