DOES THE FIELD OF STUDY INFLUENCE THE CHOICE OF LEADERSHIP? A CROSS CULTURAL COMPARISON OF BUSINESS VS NON-BUSINESS MAJORS

Michael Monahan
Frostburg State University

301.687.3090

Amit Shah
Frostburg State University, USA

Yan Bao
Frostburg State University

Jyoti Rana
DAVC College, Faridabad, India

ABSTRACT

Leadership is an integral component of the success of any organization or country. The two largest countries; China and India were the focus of this study. In order to help firms and their respective countries, university students preparing to enter the workforce need to develop their leadership skills. This study sought to ascertain their leadership style via the Bolman and Deal Four Frame Model. An analysis of the leadership style and frames by country and by academic major was conducted. Statistically significant differences were revealed.

Key Words: Leadership, Academic Major, Bolman & Deal, Styles, Frames

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is an intangible quality which permeates every human endeavor. Noted management guru, Peter Drucker asserts "Above all, the performance of the managerial leadership determines the success or failure of the organization**"** (Zahra, 2003). These individuals were able to rise above the crowd, provide direction and influence to obtain organizational goals. Further, it was commonly assumed that these leaders were born. However, there is abundant literature that

contends that leadership is a skill which can be practiced and learned, thereby contending that leaders are made. In fact, renowned American football coach, Vince Lombardi, stated "Contrary to the opinion of many people, leaders are not born, leaders are made, and they are made by effort and hard work" (Hill, 2004).

But where does this transformation occur. Many feel a primary function of higher education institutions is the leadership development of its students. Connaughton et al., (2003) asserts curriculum and programs which emphasize students' leadership competencies can foster and stimulate leadership ability. This view is shared by Posner (2004) who found leadership education classes and programs positively influence the leadership behaviors of students. As further validation, Berson et al., (2006) found management students were more aware of the need for leadership skills in teamwork settings as opposed to working alone. Further, Cress et al., (2001) asserts leadership development in higher education directly affects the postsecondary college experience by promoting civic responsibility and improving conflict resolution. In fact, after leadership training the student's perception of their ability to work with groups, communicate, lead, make decisions and understand themselves all increased (Bruck, 1997). In addition, leadership training produces the positive attributes of honesty, morality, fulfillment and personal satisfaction (Logue et al., 2005).

While much has been written about leadership in the West more research is needed to understand the East. Consequently, studying the leadership style of one of the most populous countries would be instructive. India is the second largest country with 1.27 billion inhabitants (world population statistics, 2013). However, despite being second in size its GDP ranks 10th at approximately $2 trillion. But the sheer size of its population coupled with the country's attempts at modernization should increase dramatically over the coming decade (statista.com, 2014). In fact, the election of business friendly Narendra Modi to the post of Prime Minister is expected to increase economic growth in the 7-9% range due to his initiatives (Agrawal, R., 2014). Further, India ranks second in terms of labor force but since, India's labor rate is one-quarter that of China, investment should follow there (Einhorn, Krishman, & Pradhan, 2014).

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the leadership styles and frames of university students in China and India using the Bolman and Deal Four Frame Model. Further, the analysis will seek to determine if there are statistically significant differences on the basis of country and academic major.

The following research hypotheses guided this study:

H1. There is a difference in the leadership styles of Chinese and Indian students and in the variable of academic major
H2. There is a difference in the leadership frames of Chinese and Indian students in the variable academic major
H3. There is a difference in the strongest/weakest frames of Chinese and Indian students in the academic major.

METHODS

An anonymous voluntary survey, Bolman and Deal's 1990 Leadership Orientations (Self) instrument, to determine leadership style was completed by university students in China and India.

The survey tool consists of 32 questions which respondents rated on a 5 point Likert scale. The questions assessed the degree of usage for each of the four frames which are structural, human resources, political, and symbolic. The 964 usable responses were analyzed using SPSS. This model has been successfully used with both high reliability and validity in a variety of areas including College Presidents to Auburn University doctoral leadership program (Bentley, 2004). Especially in the area of education, they contend that teachers are able to reframe situations, they become more confident, feel less anxious and become more efficient and effective (Bolman& Deal, 1994).

The respondent demographics are listed in Table 1.

Table 1	India		China	
Demographics	N	%	N	%
Total	516	54	448	46
Gender				
Female	308	60	269	60
Male	208	40	179	40
Major				
Business	378	73	311	69
Non-Business	140	27	137	31
Level				
Undergraduate	282	55	334	76
Graduate	235	45	106	24

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Leadership Model

While many leadership theories focus on the juxtaposition of task and relationship the Four Frame Model utilizes those components and adds two more dimensions. The Bolman and Deal model consists of four leadership styles: the No-style, Single, Paired and Multi-styled. Leaders using a single style predominantly use one style. Similarly, leaders using a paired style predominately utilized two leadership styles and those using the multi-style utilize three or more leadership styles. Those leaders categorized as No-style do not exhibit a preference for any of the four rated leadership styles (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

Embedded within the style are the four leadership frames. Bolman and Deal (1991) defined these frames that assist decision making with regard to the specific situation. The Four-Frame model is the result of synthesizing a variety of prior theories, particularly the cognitive, and research to explain how leaders address issues. The frames consist of (a) the structural frame, (b) the human resource frame, (c) the political frame, and (d) the symbolic frame. Each of the frames is a separate perspective with its own assumptions and behaviors. These frames, or windows, allow

users to view the world and problems from various perspectives. The structural frame relates to hierarchy and formal rules. The human resource frame focuses on the people in the organization. The political frame views organizations as arenas where participants compete over resources, power, influence, and interests. The symbolic frame focuses on the ceremonies, culture, and myths within an organization. Leaders may predominantly use one style, but are better equipped to handle complex problems by using a multi-frame style.

Reframing, or changing your vantage point to view issues enables the leader to view, analyze, and develop solutions from one or more different perspectives. Bolman and Deal (1997) contend that effective leaders are multi-framed, that is they utilize at least three of the four frames. This multi-frame leadership provides the leader with more potential opportunities and solutions. The Four-Frame model will be used to identify which frames future leaders utilize. Further, this study will seek to identify if there are any statistically significant demographic variables that influence the type of leadership used.

There is a paucity of research on the variance of leadership styles different cultures, however there have been many studies of the Four Frame model among university administration. Most studies on leadership frames have focused on university presidents and deans. These studies have found the balance of leadership frames is influenced by experience. New university leaders have been found to use a single leadership frame, while more experienced leaders use paired and multiple framed methods.

The educational level of American deans was found to have no significant impact on the usage of different frames nor did the years of non-educational business experience had no significant differences in the dean's use of leadership frames (Sypawka, 2010). Results of Bolman and Deal's 1991 samples showed that in challenging situations most leaders only used single or paired frames, rather than using the superior multi-frame methods. Less than 25% of leaders used multi-frame styles and only 5% used all four frames (Bolman, Deal, 1991).

Interestingly, gender has not been found to have a significant difference between leadership frames and effectiveness. Like their male counterparts, most female deans new to their positions only used a single frame leadership style (Sypawka, 2008).

Effectiveness of leadership styles is important to creating a well-run organization. Deans who reported using multiple frame leadership styles also indicated lower stress and higher work satisfaction than deans who only reported using one leadership frame. Many studies have shown that multiple frame use results in more effective organizations, higher job satisfaction, lower stress and better communication (Sypawka, 2008). University presidents tended to focus on human resource frames; however, research suggests leaders need to use a multi-framed approach to build the most effective organizations (Kezar, Eckel, Contreras-McGavinn, Quaye, 2008). Significant differences of the perceived effectiveness of leaders between multi, paired and single frame styles were found in Thompson's (2010) study as leaders who used multi or paired frames recorded higher effectiveness than those who used single frame styles. Educational leaders who used multi-framed styles, regardless of which frames they used, were perceived to be more effective. The structural frame was found to be the best predictor of initial effectiveness in Singapore; however, it is also the weakest predictor of long term effectiveness as a leader. Both the symbolic and political frames were found to be the best predicators of leadership effectiveness regardless of group (Bolman, Deal, 1991). A strong relationship between which frames a manager used and how effective employees perceived him as was found, even when managers from different groups displayed different preferences. In fact, the only group where the structural frame was not a "dominant predictor of managerial effectiveness was the corporate sample" (Bolman, Deal, 1991).

Department chairs that used multiple frames were found to have the highest job satisfaction in both intrinsic and extrinsic values (Sypawka, 2008).

The use of different frames changes depending on where the individual works. Studies of community college deans indicate the preferred frame did not vary from four-year university deans. Both groups preferred the human resource frame as the primary frame and the structural frame as the secondary frame (Sypawka, 2008). The one exception to the human resource frame's dominance was found in university presidents who used the human resource frame the least (Sypawka, 2010). Different frames are seen as significant during the years of change in an organization. In the first year, the political frame is seen as having the highest significance. By the third year, the structural frame consistently replaced it. Onward from the fifth year, the human resource frame becomes perceived as the most significant (Schumacher, 2011).

Frames

Structural Frame

The structural frame views an organization as a machine, with rules and policies to keep it running well. The structural frame was widely used and is predominant when relating the four frames to a business environment. Sypawka (2008) found the structural frame was used most often in their survey regarding length of employment, nearly all respondents perceived the structural frame as their secondary frame orientation. The structural frame has a perceived theme of professionalism along with the symbolic frame, making it equally important to the functions of an organization (Thompson, Farmer, Beall, Evans, Melchert, Ross, Schmoll, 2008). This was the only frame in which there were no significant differences among different populations, policies, procedures and regulations. The structural frame is the best predictor of initial effectiveness for all but the corporate sample of managers. In regards to the sample of corporate managers, the results may be due to a ceiling effect or from a particular company included in the study (Bolman, Deal, 1991). A unique pattern emerged among corporate managers in Bolman and Deal's study; they showed a very high emphasis on the structural frame. The structural frame is also shown to be a key to effective leadership, and appeared in about 60% of cases throughout all populations of the study (Bolman, Deal, 1991).

Human Resource Frame

The view of organizations through the human resource frame focuses on relationships and needs of individuals within the organization. Overall, the human resource frame was found to be the most frequently found frame among leaders (Sypawka, 2010). Leaders described emphasis as listening, including, supporting and motivating others, all characteristics of the human resource frame (Kezar, Eckel, Contreras-McGavin, Quaye, 2008). The human resource frame is the "lens that explores the foundations of the relationships that must be developed for these things to occur" (Schumacher, 2011). While all frames are important, the human resource frame was perceived as the most successful in helping leaders move their agendas forward (Kezar, Eckel, Contreras-McGavin, Quaye, 2008). The prevalence of the human resource frame was consistent across all the disciplines studied (Sasnett, Clay, 2008). Very few leaders used all four frames, most relied on one or two frames, of which human resource and political were the most common (Howard, Logue, Quimby, Schoeneberg, 2009). Leadership programs tend to focus on the human resource frame (Bolman, Deal, 1991). In Singapore, Bolman and Deal's study found that the human resource

frame was widespread among leaders.

Political Frame

The political frame focuses on power, conflict and competition. Along with the symbolic frame, this frame was the least used by university managers. The results of Synawka's (2008) study indicate that in educational settings the political frame is the most effective. University presidents' leadership was found to lack a political strategy which needs to be better integrated into leadership practices for organizations (Kezar, Eckel, Contreras-McGavin, Quaye, 2008). However, individuals indicated that they perceived the organization's preference as strongly political (Howard, Logue, Quimby, Schoeneberg, 2009). In addition, Howard et al's found that very few subjects used all frames as most of the leaders relied on either the political frame or both the political and human resource frames.

Interestingly, students indicated a desire for more strategies from the political frame to be included in their curriculum (Thompson, Farmer, Beall, Evans, Melchert, Ross, Schmoll, 2008). Along with the human resource frame, the political frame is not receiving enough educational attention for leaders to understand how to use all the frames in a multi-frame model of leadership Major differences were found between groups in Bolman and Deal's study; the political frame particularly influenced long term leadership effectiveness. The type of institution and the nation it was located in both had a significant effect on the challenges managers faced (Bolman, Deal, 1991). However, leadership development programs tend to focus very little on the political frame. Use of the political frame varied very wildly between the different groups in the Bolman and Deal study. Sburlan, (2009) in a study of Chinese educators working with global education found the political and symbolic frames as the most prominent.

Symbolic Frame

The symbolic frame is based on the culture, values and rituals of an organization. This frame has been shown to have a "significant positive influence on a leader's effectiveness and overall worker satisfaction" (Sypawka, 2008). However, the symbolic frame was one of the least-used frames by organizations. College programs need to focus more on symbolic frame strategies to empower their leaders in their use of the symbolic frame and development of balanced organizational management. Both manager's and their employees' overall job satisfaction was higher if the leader mainly used the symbolic frame over any other. Respondents in the Bolman and Deal study used the symbolic frame in less than 20% of documented cases (Bolman, Deal, 1991). Because of its importance yet low usage, colleges need to prepare leaders who can effectively use the symbolic frame (Kezar, Eckel, Contreras-McGacvin, Quave, 2008). The level of preference in individual frame usage indicated that use of the symbolic frame by leaders was very weak (Howard, Logue, Quimby, Schoeneberg, 2009). When the symbolic frame was mentioned in Howard et al's study, it was mentioned positively, although it was chosen least among both individuals and the perceived preference of the company. Professionalism training in the medical fields stresses the structural and symbolic frames which benefits their graduates, especially in the field of pharmacy where symbolic activities were common in over 90% of the schools (Thompson, Farmer, Beall, Evans, Melcert, Ross, Schmoll, 2008). In Bolman and Deal's study, the best predictors of the leadership effectiveness in every group were the symbolic and political frames. While a symbolic orientation is critical to effectiveness, leadership development programs hardly focus on the symbolic frame (Bolman, Deal, 1991). Symbolic issues are almost absent from literature on effective management until the 1980s (Bolman, Deal, 1991). Therefore,

any managers trained before the 1980s would not have been trained in the Symbolic frame and may not be aware of how to effectively use the frame.

Summary Characteristics of the Bolman and Deal Four Frame Model*

Characteristic	Structural	Human Resources	Political	Symbolic
Metaphor	Machine	Family	Jungle	Carnival
Central Concepts	Rules	Relationships, Needs	Power, Conflict	Culture, Rituals
Decision Making	Rational	Open to Produce Commitment	Gain or exercise power	Confirm values
Leader	Analyst	Servant, Advocate	Negotiator	Prophet
Communication	Transmit facts	Exchange Needs	Influence Others	Tell stories

* Adapted from Bolman and Deal, 1997.

Managerial Tendencies

Bolman and Deal (1991) assessed how many frames managers tended to utilize as well as which frames were utilized. Their finding suggests most managers utilized one or two frames of leadership. It was rare that a manager utilized all four frames. The structural frame was the most commonly utilized frame, while the symbolic frame was the least utilized. The political frame of leadership varied significantly between America and Singapore, with more American managers utilizing the political frame of leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Bolman and Deal's Model Applied to Various Professions

With regard to their status in the university, librarians must address human resource, political, and symbolic factors. However, the political and symbolic factors that librarians must address appear to be influenced by top level administrators (Fleming-May & Douglass, 2014). In a study concerning organizational changes in a university library's structure, it was concluded that the challenges faced by these librarians would require an increased emphasis on the symbolic and political frames of leadership to successfully implement the needed changes (Sowell, 2014).

Another study found principals rated the human resource frame as the most extensively utilized frame of leadership while rating the political frame of leadership as the least utilized (Bista & Glasman, 1998). In addition, in a study of community college administrators found that the administrators and supervisors perceived that they utilized the human resource frame most often, followed by structural, symbolic, and political. However, peers and subordinates perceived structural to be the most utilized frame used by the administrators. This was followed by human resource, symbolic, and political frames (Little, 2010). Similarly, a study of leadership in collegiate athletic departments found the structural frame of leadership was the most descriptive of the required leadership style. This suggests that athletic directors and coaches may emphasize goals and tasks as opposed to interpersonal relationships. However, the participants all reported the human resource frame as the most commonly utilized frame (Scott, 1999). Further, Phillips (2013) found that aviation program leaders tend to utilize the structural frame of leadership most often. This is followed by the human resource frame, political frame, and symbolic frame.

Interestingly, Edmunds (2008) found that most female superintendents rated their leadership style as multi-framed, with the human resource frame being the most utilized and the political frame being the least utilized. Further, Wiggins (2014) found most chief state school

officers utilize a multi-frame approach to leadership. The more years of experience a chief state school officer had, the more likely they are to utilize a multi-framed approach to leadership.

General Leadership

Effective Leadership does not merely occur because one obtains a leadership position, but rather occurs because the leader has the familiarity and awareness of leadership skills and possesses the ability to utilize those skills (Sharma, Sun, & Kannan, 2012).A study of successful professionals in the business field found that these individuals were much higher than the average in terms of transformational leadership, conscientiousness and political use of communication and interpersonal skills (Burke & Attridge, 2011).

Feminine Leadership

In many cultures, the meaning of leadership is masculine, thus equating leadership to males who are decisive, assertive and independent (Bailyn, 2006; Calás & Smircich, 1991; Dennis & Kunkel, 2004). Conversely, females are viewed to be communal, friendly, unselfish, caretaking and therefore not equipped for leadership (Fletcher, 2004; Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989; Schein, 2001). Further, women of Asian descent are particularly likely to be stereotyped as passive, reserved, and lacking in ambition (Giscombe & Mattis, 2002), Thus, women are often faced with a lose-lose situation. If their behavior conforms to the traditional gender stereotype they are not thought to be acting as a proper leader. However, if their behavior is consistent with the leader stereotype, they are thought not to be acting as a proper woman (Ryan & Haslam, 2007).

Research suggests that women possess certain traits that lead to an androgynous style of leadership, which combines both masculine and feminine qualities. This may indicate that woman's strengths in leadership are not attributed to conforming to a stereotypical male style of leadership, but instead in the uniquely feminine traits (Vasavada, 2012). In addition, Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb (2013) asserts that women have not been socialized to compete successfully in the world of men, so they must be taught the skills and styles their male counterparts acquire as a matter of course. Further, Ely, Insead and Kolb (2011) propose a 360 degree feedback, coaching, and women only training to help women develop their leadership skills.

Regarding gender, women have been consistently underrepresented in leadership. For example, in India, women only accounted for 11% of large company chief executives in India (EMA Partners International, 2010). This barrier arises from both cultural beliefs and workplace structures that inadvertently favor men (Calás & Smircich, 2009; Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Kolb & McGinn, 2009). In Indian banking and IT industries, instrumental leadership has a greater impact on organizational effectiveness than participative and supportive leadership styles (Budhiraja & Malhotra, 2013).

There appears to be a role-model effect in regards to women in leadership positions and the educational goals of females in India. Places in India who have long had women in local government positions set higher educational goals for themselves compared to females living in villages with only male leaders (Forbes, 2012). Further, in a study of women leadership in the IT field in India, Ushasri (2013) noted that gender stereotypes are the main barrier to women obtaining leadership positions. In addition, in a study of male and female professionals in India found that although men may recognize gender discrimination within the workplace, they are not sensitive to gender supportive measures that females in the workplace desire (Buddhapriya, 2011).

While still the minority in a male-dominated business field, more and more Indian woman are joining the professional work force in roles such as financial advisors, investment bankers, and

many more professional jobs (Ghanashyambhai, 2011). A firm such as Gram Mooligai Company Limited (GMCL), an Indian community enterprise, was developed and is run by untouchables. GMCL allows women to develop leadership, social, and productive skills, however it does not manage to challenge the ostracism of the caste system still witnessed in India's patriarchal society (Torri & Martinez, 2014).

India

A study comparing Indian companies to US companies found that US companies give more attention to external aspects, such as the board and regulatory concerns. However, Indian companies tended to place more effort into setting strategies and the organization's structure and culture (*Business Today*, 2010). Similarly, when viewing the paternalistic leadership style which combines authority with compassion and kindness. In India, this leadership style had a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction, whereas in the US, the correlation was not significant (Pellegrini, Scandura, & Jayaraman, 2010).

Leadership can be regarded as influencing others' behaviors and attitude, usually to achieve certain goals. Desale (2008) believed that in order for leaders in India to be effective, they must be transparent and make employees' aware of their value and potential. Thus, in a study of Indian executives Limbare (2012) found that missionary leadership was the most preferred leadership style among executives. The deserter leadership style was the most rejected leadership style. Missionary leaders are typically concerned about harmony while deserters are very passive. Further, in a study of academic leaders in India found that 75% preferred a democratic leadership style (Nandamuri & Rao, 2011).

Transformational leadership one of the most studied and accepted leadership theories and is viewed as a universal approach to leadership. A study of Indian organizations found that transformational leadership positively predicted employee's job satisfaction (Biswas, 2011). Further, another model recently developed in India and is culture-specific is the nurturant-task leadership model by Sinha in 1980. This model asserts that the ideal leader is both nurturant and task oriented (Palrecha, Spangler, & Yammarino, 2012).

According to a 2012 study, American, Japanese, and German manufacturing firms tended to be well managed, but firms in China, India, and Brazil tend to be less well managed (Bloom, Genakos, Sadun, & Van Reenen, 2012). Perhaps it is due to the fact that both China and India tend to emphasize an autocratic leadership style. Further, another study found Indian CEOs tend to place great importance on their nation's welfare before making business decisions (Gutierrez, Spencer, & Zhu, 2012).

In a study of school principals, leadership was evaluated in China, India, and Malaysia by the teachers of the school. The study found there was no difference between the rating of the principal and tenure, gender, or nationality. This could imply that if principals possess great leadership qualities, gender, nationality, and tenure does not factor into how the teacher assesses the principal (Sharma, Sun, & Kannan, 2012).

Business Majors vs Non-majors

In a study of the personality traits of business majors and non-business majors, business majors scored higher in extraversion, assertiveness, conscientiousness, tough-mindedness, and emotional stability than non-majors. All of these traits, with the exception of tough-mindedness and agreeableness, were positively correlated to life satisfaction (Lounsbury, Smith, Levy, Leong, & Gibson, 2009).

One study examined the relationship between moral development and transformational/transactional moral development. No significant relationship was found. However, the authors found that there were significant differences in regard to student type. Science and Art majors scored significantly higher than education majors in moral development. However, education majors scored higher on transformational leadership behaviors. Business majors scored higher than other student groups in Management-by-Exception (Active) behaviors. Males tended to score higher in transactional leadership while females scored higher in transformational leadership (Burgette, 2008).

Leadership education for engineering may be different than other disciplines' leadership education. Engineering schools focus on helping students create solutions to difficult and complex problems. These means less emphasis needs to be places on transforming problem solving into a leadership vision. The focus in leadership education for engineering majors is interpersonal communication as opposed to organizational communication. Engineering majors also focus on developing a self-awareness in regards to their behaviors and motivations when interacting with others (Bayless, 2013).

China

A study examining the emotional intelligence of business majors in the United States and China found that American students have higher mean emotional intelligence scores than Chinese business students. American graduate students scored significantly higher than Chinese graduate students, however the scores showed no significant difference between Chinese or American undergraduates. Emotional intelligence may have an impact on leadership styles and differences between cultures can provide insight into what constitutes leadership between cultures (Margavio, Margavio, Hignite, & Moses, 2012).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The students' responses determined what their predominant leadership style. A single style signifies that one primary style is used. Similarly, a paired style denotes two leadership styles. Those using a multi style utilize at least 3 or 4 leadership styles. Finally, No Style does not mean an absence of a leadership style, but that no singular style reached the threshold of style usage.

The majority (46%) of Chinese students employed the "Multi Style" while fully half of the Indian students were polar opposites in that half favored "No Style". Interestingly, the respondents using the Single and Paired style from both countries were nearly identical. A Chi-Square goodness of fit revealed a strong difference at the .001 level (see Table 2). When analyzing by major no significant differences were found between Business and Non-Business majors. However, significant differences were found by major and country.

Table 2
Leadership

Styles		China	India			
				χ^2	df	Sig
	Single	19%	17%			
	Paired	15%	14%	110	3	0.000
	Multi	46%	19%			
	No Style	21%	50%			
				χ^2	df	Sig
Business	Single	19%	15%	68	3	0.000

				χ2	df	Sig
	Paired	14%	14%			
	Multi	46%	21%			
	No Style	22%	49%			
Non-Business	Single	18%	20%	49	3	0.000
	Paired	18%	14%			
	Multi	46%	14%			
	No Style	18%	53%			

There are a total sixteen possible leadership styles when one examines all of the potential possibilities. Four are for single styles, six are paired styles, five are multi styles, and finally one is no emergent style at all. The Chinese students led in nine of the categories. Consequently, the differences were significant at the .000 level (see Table 3). Again, no significant differences were found by major. However, 10.6% of Indian Business students utilized the full four frames while only 6.4% on Indian Non-Business majors used the four frames.

Table 3
Styles by full list of options

Business	China	India	χ2	df	Sig
STRUCTURAL	5.5%	2.9%	130	15	0.000
HUMAN RESOURCES	5.5%	8.5%			
POLITICAL	6.8%	1.6%			
SYMBOLIC	1.3%	2.9%			
STR-HR	2.6%	4.2%			
STR-POL	3.9%	1.1%			
STR-SYM	1.6%	1.1%			
HR-POL	4.8%	1.9%			
HR-SYM	0.3%	4.0%			
POL-SYM	0.3%	2.1%			
STR-HR-POL	2.6%	0.8%			
STR-HR-SYM	5.1%	7.7%			
STR-POL-SYM	1.9%	0.8%			
HR-POL-SYM	1.9%	1.3%			
FOUR FRAME	34.1%	10.6%			
NO FRAME	21.9%	48.7%			
Non-Business	China	India	χ2	df	Sig
STRUCTURAL	5.8%	2.1%	84	15	0.000
HUMAN RESOURCES	5.1%	12.1%			
POLITICAL	5.8%	1.4%			
SYMBOLIC	0.7%	4.3%			
STR-HR	2.9%	2.9%			
STR-POL	3.6%	2.1%			
STR-SYM	2.2%	2.9%			
HR-POL	7.3%	0.7%			

HR-SYM		5.0%
POL-SYM	2.2%	
STR-HR-POL	1.5%	1.4%
STR-HR-SYM	7.3%	4.3%
STR-POL-SYM	2.2%	1.4%
HR-POL-SYM	2.2%	
FOUR FRAME	32.8%	6.4%
NO FRAME	18.2%	52.9%

The Business students in China used the frames in the following rank order: Structural, Political, Human Resources, and Symbolic while the Non-Business Chinese students employed the Political, Human Resources, Structural, Symbolic frames. Conversely, the Business students in India used the Human Resources, Symbolic, Structural, and Political frames while the Indian Non-Business students used the Human Resources, Structural, Symbolic and Political frames (see Table 4).

Interestingly, only three statistically significant differences emerged. The use of the Structural and Political frame between students in China and India. In both cases, the Chinese students greater utilized the respective frames. Finally, Business students were more apt to employ the Symbolic frame than Non-Business students.

Table 4
Frame Strength

China	Business Mean	India	Business Mean
Structural	3.5823	Human Resources	3.6002
Political	3.5691	Symbolic	3.4801
Human Resources	3.5457	Structural	3.4623
Symbolic	3.3614	Political	3.2782

China	Non-Business Mean	India	Non-Business Mean
Political	3.6066	Human Resources	3.5268
Human Resources	3.5307	Structural	3.3634
Structural	3.5277	Symbolic	3.2731
Symbolic	3.2971	Political	3.1630

Comparison	Frame	F	Sig
China/India	Structural	7.6	0.006
China/India	Political	50.2	0.000
Business/Non-Business	Symbolic	5.7	0.017

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

12

When comparing the results with the research hypotheses it was found that:

> H1. There is a difference in the leadership styles of Chinese and Indian students and in the variable of academic major

> Hypothesis H1 was not supported. There was a difference in leadership styles by students from the two countries as the Chinese students most employed the full "Multi-4" style (34%) while fully half of the Indian students selected the "No Style." But, the validity of the Chinese students' responses were questionable since Bolman and Deal (1991) contend it was rare that a manager utilized all four frames. Similarly, Sburlan (2009) asserts that most leaders do not have the flexibility to use this multi-framed approach. Perhaps the Chinese students were overly eager and optimistic of their abilities without application experience, i.e. managerial experience. Conversely, the Indian students appear to have assessed their abilities in a more realistic fashion. However, in the variable of major, there were no statistically significant differences due to being a Business student versus another major.

> H2. There is a difference in the leadership frames of Chinese and Indian students in the variable academic major

> Hypothesis H2 was supported in the use of the symbolic frame as Business students were more apt to use this frame than Non-Business students. Perhaps this difference is due to the curriculum of the academic programs as Business students may have had more training in viewing solutions to organizational programs.

> H3. There is a difference in the strongest/weakest frames of Chinese and Indian students in the academic major.

> Hypothesis H3 was confirmed as there were weak, but statistically significant differences in the use of the Structural and Political frames. Normally, the structural frame generally has the strongest usage (Little 2010, Phillips, 2010) while the Political frame is used least (Bista & Glasman, 1998). However the respondents from China scored the Political frame highest while the Indian students mostly favored the Human Resources frame which supports the findings of Fleming-May & Douglass, (2014), Bista & Glasman, (1998) Scott (1999).

> In summary, there were wide differences in the leadership styles of Chinese and Indian students as the Chinese students were much more in tune with the various frames and nearly half stated that they practiced the "Multi-frame" leadership style. Conversely, fully half of the Indian students did not utilize a particular leadership style. Even though there were differences by gender between the two countries, i.e. Chinese "Multi-Frame" usage compared to Indian "No Frame". However, when viewing by academic major minimal differences emerged.

> Leadership training at the college and university level should occur in both countries. This training could include internships, experiential learning activities, role playing, and cooperative learning models among other tools. These recommendations support the work of Ibarra, Ely, and Kolb (2013) and Ely, Insead and Kolb (2011).

FUTURE RESEARCH

Additional research could focus on other variable such as the student's status of being undergraduate or graduate, their marital status, ethnicity and their gender. Also, a study could compare these students with students from the USA, Sweden, Spain, and Singapore to see if leadership styles and frames exist and if they are cultural in nature.

REFERENCES

(2013). Retrieved Nov 7, 2014 http://www.worldpopulationstatistics.com/india-population-2013/

(2014). Retrieved Nov 7, 2014 http://www.worldpopulationstatistics.com/population-of-china-2014/

(2014). Retrieved Nov 7, 2014 http://www.statista.com/statistics/268173/countries-with-the-largest-gross-domestic-product-gdp/

Agrawal, R. (2014). India's economy will get its "big bang**.** Retrieved Nov 7, from money.cnn.com/2014/11/05/news/economy/india-finance-minister/index.html

Bailyn, L. 2006. *Breaking the mold: Redesigning work for productive and satisfying lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Berson, Y., Dan, O., Yammarino, F. (2006). Attached style and individual differences in leadership perceptions and emergence. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 146, 2

Bird, M. (2014). China just overtook the US as the worlds largest economy Retrieved October 22 from   http://www.businessinsider.com/china-overtakes-us-as-worlds-largest-economy-2014-10

Bista, M., Glasman, N. (1998). Principals' perceptions of their approaches to organizational leadership: Revisiting Bolman and Deal. *Journal of school leadership*, 8(1), 26.

Biswas, S., & Varma, A. (2011). Antecedents of employee performance: An empirical investigation in India. *Employee Relations*, 34(2), 177-192.

Bloom, N., Genakos, C., Sadun, R., & Van Reenen, J. (2012). Management practices across firms and countries. *Academy Of Management Perspectives*, 26(1), 12-33.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Leadership and Management Effectiveness: A Multi-Frame, Multi-Sector Analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30(4), 509-534.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1990). *Leadership Orientations (Self).* Brookline, MA: Leadership Frameworks.

Bruck, J. (1997). The influence of field dependence on college students' leadership attitudes a

and self perceptions *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences* 58, 4A

Buddhapriya, S. (2011). Identifying the critical dimensions of gender sensitivity at workplace: Study of the perception of male and female professionals. *International Journal Of Diversity In Organisations*, Communities & Nations, 10(5), 21-36.

Budhiraja, S., & Malhotra, M. (2013). Leadership style & organizational effectiveness in Indian it & banking industry. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 49(2), 270-285.

Burke, J. M., & Attridge, M. (2011). Pathways to career and leadership success: Part 1-A psychosocial profile of $100k professionals. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 26(3), 175.

Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1991). Voicing seduction to silence leadership. *Organization Studies*, 12: 567– 601.

Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (2009). Feminist perspectives on gender in organizational research: What is and is yet to be. In D. Buchanan, & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational research methods:* 246 –269. London: Sage Publications.

Connaughton, S., Lawrence, F., & Ruben, B. (2003). Leadership development as a systematic and multidisciplinary enterprise. *Journal of Education for Business* 79, 1

Cress, C. Astin, H. , Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. (2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 15-27.

Dennis, M. R., & Kunkel, A. D. (2004). Perceptions of men, women, and CEOs: The effects of gender identity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 32: 155–172.

Desale, P. (2008). Effective leaders are transparent. *Siliconindia*. pp. 38-39.

Edmunds, M. (2008). The female superintendency: Reframing our understanding of women's leadership styles and behaviors. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A,* 69, 2061.

Einhorn, B., Krishman, U., & Pradhan, B. (2014). India vs china: India aims to be the next manufacturing power. *Bloomberg Business Week, Special Issue* Nov 10, 2014-Jan 6, 2015. p 32-34.

Ely, R., Insead, H., & Kolb, D. (2011). Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women's leadership development programs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10 (3), 474–493.

Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Theories of gender: A new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22: 103–153.

EMA Partners International. Undated. Gender splits; Retrieved from http://www.ema-partners.com/center/ quest2010/gender_splits.php.

Fletcher, J. K. (2004). The paradox of post heroic leadership: An essay on gender, power and transformational change. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15: 647– 661.

Fleming-May, R, Douglass, K. (2014). Framing librarianship in the academy: An analysis using Bolman and Deal's model of organizations. *College & research libraries*, 75(3), 389.

Gao, G., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1998). *Communicating effectively with the Chinese.* London: Sage.

Ghanashyambhai, T. H. (2011). Woman leaders: The visionary of today's competitive market. An overview. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research in Business Management*, *2*(7), 1-2.

Giscombe, K., & Mattis, M. C. (2002). Leveling the playing field for women of color in corporate management: Is the business caseenough? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 37: 103–119.

Gutierrez, B., Spencer, S. M., & Zhu, G. (2012). Thinking globally, leading locally: Chinese, Indian, and Western leadership. *Cross Cultural Management*, 19(1), 67-89.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. 1989. Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women and managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74: 935–942.

Hill, L, (2004). New manager development for the 21st century. *Academy of Management Executive* 18(2), 121-126.

Ibarra, H., Ely, R. & Kolb, D. (2013). Women rising: The unseen barriers. Harvard Business Review, 91, (9)

Kolb, D. M., & McGinn, K.(2009). From gender and negotiation to gendered negotiation. Negotiation and Conflict Manage- mentResearch, 2: 1–16.

Lau, W. (2014). A study of effective leadership in the Chinese context. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A,* 74.

Leadership Lessons from India. (2010). *Business Today*, 19(6), 17.

Liang, W. (2010). Intersection between culture and leadership: An analysis of chines leadership assumptions in an American study group. *Intercultural Communication Studies XIX* retrieved from http://www.uri.edu/iaics/content/2010v19n1/10WenboLiang.pdf

Limbare, S. (2012). Leadership styles & conflict management styles of executives. *Indian*

Journal of Industrial Relations, 48(1), 172-180.

Little, S. (2010). Perception or Reality? A frame analysis of leadership behavior, style, and effectiveness among selected community college administrators. *ProQuest LLC.*

Logue, C., Hutchens, T., & Hector, M. (2005**).** Student leadership: A phenomenological exploration of postsecondary experiences. *Journal of College Student Development* 46, 4

Loi, R., & Ngo, H. (2009). Work outcomes of relational demography in Chinese vertical dyads. *International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, 20(8), 1704-1719.

Nandamuri, P., & Rao, K. V. (2011). Leadership and school principals - a study. *Asia Pacific Journal Of Research In Business Management*, 2(12), 1.

Palrecha, R., Spangler, W. D., & Yammarino, F. J. (2012). A comparative study of three leadership approaches in India. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(1), 146-162

Pellegrini, E. K., Scandura, T. A., & Jayaraman, V. (2010). Cross-cultural generalizability of paternalistic leadership: An expansion of leader-member exchange theory. *Group & Organization Management*, 35(4), 391-420.

Phillips, R. (2013). Perceived leadership styles and effectiveness of aviation program leaders: A four-frame analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, 73.

Pihlak, Ü. (2013). Change management in Indian organizations compared to Chinese and Estonian organizations (2009-2011). *Baltic Journal of Economics*, 13(1), 111-112.

Posner, B. (2004). A leadership development instrument for students: Updated *Journal of College Student Development* 45, 4

Ryan, M. & Haslam, S. (2007). The glass cliff: exploring the dynamics surrounding the appointment of women to precarious leadership positions. *Academy of Management Review* 32, (2), 549–572.

Sburlan, A. (2009). Globalization of a teacher education program at a comprehensive state university campus: A case study. *ProQuest LLC*. Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California uscthesesreloadpub_Volume32/etd-Sburlan-3213.pdf

Schein, V. E. 2001. A global look at the psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*,57: 675– 688.

Scott, D. (1999). A multiframe perspective of leadership and organizational climate in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13(4), 298-316.

Sharma, S., Sun, H., & Kannan, S. (2012). A comparative analysis on leadership qualities of

school principals in China, Malaysia & India. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *4*(3), 1-14.

Sowell, S. (2014). Building a new paradigm: Analysis of a case study in organizational change in collection management using Bolman and Deal's four frame model. *Collection management*, 39(2/3), 211.

The Role Model Effect: Women Leaders Key To Inspiring The Next Generation. (2012). *Forbes.com*, 42.

Thompson, M. D. (2000). Gender, leadership orientation, and effectiveness: testing the theoretical models of Bolman & Deal and Quinn. *Sex Roles,* 42(11/12), 969-992.

Torri, M., & Martinez, A. (2014). Women's empowerment and micro-entrepreneurship in India: Constructing a new development paradigm? *Progress In Development Studies*, *14*(1), 31-48.

Ushari, T.S. (2013). Women leadership in the Indian it industry. *Siliconindia*, 38-39.

Vasavada, T. (2012). A cultural feminist perspective on leadership in nonprofit organizations: A case of women leaders in India. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 36(4), 462.

Wang, A., Chiang, J. T., Tsai, C., Lin, T., & Cheng, B. (2013). Gender makes the difference: The moderating role of leader gender on the relationship between leadership styles and subordinate performance. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, *122*(2), 101-113.

Wang, B. (2011). Cultural understanding is essential for effective leadership in China. Retrieved from http://www.hrmagazine.co.uk/hro/features/1020572/cultural-understanding-essential-effective leadershipchina?WT.rss_f=Learning+and+development&WT.rss_a=Cultural+understanding+is+essential+for+effective+leadership+in+China

Wiggins, L. A. (2014). The self-perceived leadership styles of chief state school officers and models of educational governance. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, 75.

Wu, C., & Bao, W. (2013). The effects of individual characteristics, socioeconomic status, and political engagement on the attainment of student leadership roles in Chinese university students. *International Journal Of Educational Development*, *33*(2), 149-155

Zahra, S. A. (2003). The practice of management: Reflections on Peter F. Drucker's landmark book. *Academy of Management Executive 17* (3) 16-23.