BENEDICTINE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE PRESIDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SUCCESSFUL DYADIC PARTNERSHIPS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
IN
HIGHER EDUCATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

BY
CAROLYN M. MARAIST

LISLE, ILLINOIS
MAY 2012
Abstract

This study explores how university and college presidents within institutions in United States higher education perceive their experiences of their successful dyadic partnerships. The presidents in the study represent institutions from across the Carnegie sector classifications and were selected for the study using convenient sampling. The research methodology involved a qualitative approach utilizing constructivist grounded theory and semi-structured interviews with an appreciative inquiry focus. The findings of the study show the emergence of three salient thematic factors that are present in the successful dyadic partnerships of all five presidents: trust, common mission, and the situational use of power. The thematic factors that were present for four of the five presidents were communication, complementary strengths, and time/longevity. The findings also show that the thematic factors within these successful dyadic partnerships are interactive in ways that are characterized by complexity. The nature of this complexity is unclear. However, there is a finding from the study that some of the most salient common factors are also the most interactive factors. The prevalent interactive factors are trust, communication, common mission, and relationships. Further findings indicate some stereotypic gender differences in the ways in which male and female presidents partner, as well as differences in patterns of trusting within their partnerships.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Context

This study explores United States higher education (USHE) university and college presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships to gain an understanding of what factors help create and improve leadership partnerships at the highest level in the academy. USHE is facing many challenges requiring optimal and effective leadership. Thus, a study of presidential leadership partnerships is important for several reasons:

- The landscape of USHE is evolving due to pressure from current and anticipated change forces, and insights into optimizing leadership for effectively dealing with those changes are needed.

- Collaborative partnerships in USHE are becoming more important than ever. The leadership of the academy is unique and reflective of its core culture and has traditionally involved partnerships such as the president-provost partnership that help presidents deal with the responsibilities of their complex role.

- University and college presidents are representative of this distinctive leadership tradition and their perceptions can provide important learning and perspectives into the nature of successful dyadic partnerships at the leadership level in USHE.

- These perspectives can help to generate a theory/model that will help leaders in the academy and those who work with them to maximize leadership with reference to partnerships.
The following sections discuss the specific details underlying this contextual rationale.

**Forces of Change**

After centuries of challenge and development, USHE now faces fundamental forces of change that will drive it into uncharted territory. These forces are simultaneously occurring at the global, national, regional, and institutional levels and include economic shifts/recession, globalization, changes in IT and telecommunications, postsecondary re-learning, shifting demographics, and shifting student needs. The impact of these forces on USHE can be seen in limited resources; increased calls for quality and quality measurements; increased calls for accountability, transparency and efficiency; increased emphasis on inter-disciplinary approaches to knowledge creation; and the shifting nature of competition within institutions in USHE, including the rise of proprietary institutions (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 2005; Berdahl & Gumport, 2005; Fullan & Scott, 2009; Peterson, 1999).

The specific nature of such change forces and their impact on USHE is heavily documented. In chapter five of *American Education in the Twenty-First Century* (Altbach et al., 2005), Ami Zusman looks at external forces such as government and market pressures and the resulting questions being raised as to the value, role, and control of USHE. He also addresses the challenges of privatization, access, governance, and accountability. An example of the impact of government and policy makers is provided by the work of Ewell, who examines the impact of the Spellings Commission’s Report of 2005 and increased pressures for accountability in accreditation (Ewell, 2008).
Marvin Peterson (1999) outlines the six societal conditions and forces re-shaping USHE: diversity, telematics revolution, quality reform, economic productivity, post-secondary relearning, and globalization. Their impact includes greater numbers of students with more diverse backgrounds and increased diversity of needs, new forms of competition within higher education, and the use of technology and telecommunications as key tools in providing access to education (Peterson, 1999, p. 91).

Karoly and Panis (2004) document the changing demographic trends for higher education and the workforce. These changes will challenge USHE to meet the needs of stakeholders such as students and employers in providing educational skill sets aligned with those of the new workforce. Furthermore, the new workforce is characterized by a need for continuous learning and upgrading of skill sets, and therefore USHE must create the requisite opportunities for students to enter and re-enter the educational continuum throughout their careers.

The NAFSA (Association of International Educators) report of October 2007 documents the need for an educational policy that supports international initiatives and learning. Additionally, global educational initiatives such as the Bologna process raise the challenge of how to standardize educational assessments and outcomes. Such standardization could help USHE students become more competitive in the international arena through recognition of global degree qualifications and increased opportunities for mobility across borders. The need for USHE to address global and international issues is supported by the Institute of International Education Open Doors Report of 2009 on International Educational Exchange, which shows the recent dramatic 16% increase in
numbers of international students attending institutions of higher education within the United States.

**Effects on Higher Education**

In addition to the research on the nature of the change forces, there are studies exploring how the current change situation is affecting higher education. Kezar (2009), for example, addresses the need for change and its impact on the change process. She explores change as a factor in creating resistance and a sense of overload, due to pressures on USHE to change in many ways at the same time.

**Challenges and Opportunities for Leadership**

There is a danger that the fundamental and core values that have distinguished USHE as a global educational leader will be undermined by the academy’s response to the change forces. Denial and resistance to change could derail important adaptation and flexibility in moving forward. However, there is also a perhaps unparalleled opportunity for USHE to change in a positive direction and re-invent itself so it is aligned with its enduring and fundamental values while also positively responsive to forces of change. This alignment could lead to actualization of new and exciting potential for growth and synergistic development. There is a great deal at stake, with much to be gained and much to be lost. A key factor in the path taken at this crucial time and in future endeavors in this arena is leadership. Now, more than ever, USHE needs not only strong leadership but leadership that can manage change successfully, including overcoming internal forces of resistance. Such leadership must be able to weather the current storms while also providing clear vision and future direction for USHE.
Unique Culture of the Academy

The challenges for leadership reflect not only the strong societal forces driving towards change but also the history, tradition, and unique culture of the academy. Developing out of medieval models of scholarship and communities of learners, with later influences from the Oxbridge and Germanic ideals of higher education, the academy has always made key fundamental assumptions about its intrinsic value proposition in the advancement of knowledge and as a positive societal force (Altbach et al., 2005, 2005). Within this context, USHE has developed in response to external pressures but always with a core belief in accountability to a separate set of standards. To a large degree, society has supported this—with governance and even certain legal areas viewed as best decided within the jurisdiction of the academy itself (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). However, this situation is changing rapidly. Economic exigencies are calling into question the tenure system. Workforce shifts are driving the need for education that includes new skill sets aligned with job requirements. Additionally, new market entrants, combined with the lack of funding resources, are raising questions about the fundamental value propositions of offerings such as the traditional liberal arts education. Thus, there is a congruence of events calling for externally accountable and successful leadership from USHE, while, paradoxically, leadership models within this sector have been primarily based upon a tradition of internally determined standards and accountability.

Trends Toward Collaborative Partnerships

In this challenging period, new leadership skills will be necessary (Diamond, 2002). One aspect of this new skill set could be the ability to work effectively in
collaborative partnerships. There are strong trends in USHE toward collaborative partnerships at multiple levels (Ferren & Stanton, 2004; Fullan & Scott, 2009; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Leadership involving collaborative partnerships could be a good fit with the cultural and traditional emphasis in the academy on collaboration across multiple power structures and sub-cultures (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008).

**Complexity of Leadership in the Academy**

The leadership role in higher education is unique—reflecting the distinctive nature of the academy itself. University and college presidents must be simultaneously responsive to multiple levels of stakeholders. They are fundamentally responsible to their board while also needing to deal with the diffuse structures of formal and informal power in higher education. Presidents must be able to work collaboratively with the “two sides of the house”—the academic and the administrative. This is particularly complicated because in the tenure structure, faculty work for the university but do not report to the administration within the same traditional hierarchical models found in corporate and military sectors.

As a further aspect of dual responsibility, university presidents must be responsive to both their internal constituencies and their external societal stakeholders. External stakeholders include governmental agencies that provide funding, private foundations, students and parents, and the societal end-users of the educational “product,” such as graduate schools and potential employers (Altbach et al., 2005).

While balancing all these responsibilities, university and college presidents must be visionaries who can steer the ship and implementers who can get things done.
Presidents must be aware of the external landscape impacting their institutions and have a strategic sense of the direction forward. In addition presidents must communicate their vision and have a team in place that can implement the specific aspects of an overall strategic plan that is informed by both the vision and the specific institutional mission and culture.

Given the complex nature of the presidential leadership role in higher education, university and college presidents in USHE have traditionally had leadership teams helping them with their multiple areas of responsibility. These teams may involve dyadic partnerships or larger groups that may consist of aggregated dyads. For example, a president might have a number of dyadic partnerships within an institution, and these partnerships might also come together to form the cabinet that works across dyadic functions.

There has been a large amount of seminal work in recent decades on leadership in sectors such as corporate, military, and global organizational structures and cultures (Bass, 1990; Northouse, 2010) as well as on the functioning of teams (Smith & Berg, 1987). However, there has been a smaller amount of research on the nature of leadership in higher education, and much of the higher education leadership research to date has focused specifically on the presidential role (Amey, 2006). There has been far less research on higher education leadership teams and the special type of team that is comprised of leadership dyads. The current study of the perceptions of college and university presidents of their successful dyadic partnerships can help generate new
theories and models that provide a basis for creating more effective leadership partnerships in the academy.

**The Challenges**

Due to the pressures from change forces, this is a time when effective presidential leadership is crucial for the academy. This is also a time when there are demands for positive partnerships and collaboration in USHE. The need for partnerships exists at all levels, including between disciplines, across governance structures, and across institutions. As leaders, presidents can play an important role in modeling collaborative partnerships and setting a top-down example indicating that such partnerships are valued within their institutions.

The study of leadership partnerships is particularly appropriate for USHE because the unique organizational culture of the academy has often involved key partnerships for presidents. The role of the president is complex and highly demanding and in order to meet all responsibilities, the role of the president has traditionally had assistance and support from others, including teams. One specific type of team is a dyadic partnership in which the relationship focus is on two people. For USHE presidents, the dyadic partnership can be powerful and can constitute their primary working relationship. This presidential dyadic partnership can encompass positional roles that may vary according to individual institutional culture, traditions, and the personalities and interrelationships of the people involved. For example, a key dyadic partnership may exist between the president and provost or between the president and executive director. However, the key dyadic partnership could also exist with another position or role within the institution.
The question explored within this research study is, *What are presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships in USHE?*

**Research Study**

The purpose of this study was to understand how successful dyadic partnerships function at the presidential level in higher education. Hopefully this understanding will be helpful to presidents, provosts, and others as they create leadership partnerships and work within partnerships. Additionally, findings about success factors for dyadic partnerships could potentially be extrapolated to dyads within larger teams, as well as to triads and other groups that form within teams.

Increased insight into such dyadic partnerships could provide data that would allow for generation of an emergent theory or a model. One goal of the study was to generate such a theory or model for optimizing dyadic leadership partnerships in higher education. This study also provides an understanding of the unique form of leadership in higher education, which reflects the overall culture of the academy. Thus, a key element of this study is providing a voice for the perceptions and experiences of educational leaders within the context of their unique culture. This may have significance not only for those within USHE but also for those societal stakeholders who are involved with the academy’s leadership. For example, external consultants will be able to use the findings to improve organizational and interpersonal functioning within institutions of higher education.

The central phenomena in this study are the perceptions and insights of university and college presidents of their experiences in successful dyadic partnerships. The
understanding of these phenomena is based upon data derived from semi-structured interviews based on a grounded theory approach. The specific unit of analysis for this study is presidents of colleges and universities within USHE.

**Working Definitions of Successful, Dyadic, and Partnership**

Presidents who participated in this study defined for themselves what they believe to be *successful dyadic partnership*. They provided their own perspectives and understanding of these terms. The only basic assumption is that a *dyadic partnership* involves two people. Except for this assumption, no standard definitions of *successful* or *partnership* are provided apart from those of the individual presidents.

**Research Questions**

The overall research question for this study, as stated previously, was, *What are presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships in USHE?* Related primary and secondary research questions also informed this study. Some of these questions were created as part of the initial research protocol and some developed as a result of theoretical sampling during the research process. These questions included the following:

**Primary Questions**

- How do the presidents describe the processes and other aspects involved in these relationships?
- What are the thematic factors that emerge from these descriptions?
- Are any of these thematic factors particularly salient?
• Are any of these thematic factors common to all five presidents or to four of the five presidents?

Secondary Questions
• Are there gender differences in partnering for these presidents?
• How do these gender differences manifest?
• Are there differences in trust patterns in these partnerships and if so how do they manifest?
• What is the nature of the interactivity of the emergent thematic factors?

There were additional secondary questions that informed the study based upon the eight themes from the Gallup research by Wagner and Muller (2009), presented in *Power of 2*. These eight themes as delineated in *Power of 2* are as follows:

• Complementary strengths
• A common mission
• Fairness
• Trust
• Acceptance
• Forgiveness
• Communicating
• Unselfishness
The secondary questions about these themes were as follows:

- Do the Gallup themes emerge in the presidential narratives?
- How would the presidents rank the importance of the Gallup themes for their successful dyadic partnerships?

**Overview of the Literature Review**

The review of the literature for this study was conducted within the context of a grounded theory approach based upon the constructivist perspective of Charmaz (2008). Specifically this meant that a comprehensive review of the literature was explored in such a way that every effort was taken to preclude framing or biasing perspectives that could influence the emergence of theory grounded in the data of the study. The review of the literature put forth in chapter 2 thus presents an overview of themes that have an overall pertinence to the study at both the general and specific levels. The goal of this presentation was to demonstrate familiarity with the relevant scholarship in the field while simultaneously maintaining an open perspective in keeping with the constructivist grounded theory approach. Additional perspectives from the literature were explored in this study after the data collection and analysis, and these perspectives are presented in chapter 5. The review of the literature indicated gaps in the literature relative to the phenomenon being studied in this dissertation. This dissertation endeavors to address such gaps and make a contribution to the field.

The themes that are the focus of the literature review in chapter 2 are clustered around four topic areas: (1) leadership: a working definition, relevant theory, transformational leadership, and dyadic leader-member exchange (LMX) partnerships;
(2) dyadic partnerships: team and group theory; research on dyadic partnerships across sectors; (3) culture: a working definition, relevant theory including dimensions of culture, organizational culture, and the relationship between leadership and culture; and (4) the academy: the culture of the academy; the role of leadership in the academy; the trends impacting the academy, including collaboration; and the need for research on presidential partnerships within the academy. The additional exploration of the literature in chapter 5 includes the following topics: partnership theory, gender theory, trust theory, further research in leadership theory and situational use of power, and complexity theory. The review of the literature in this study involved a process of systematic search using primary and secondary source materials.

**Methodology**

This is a qualitative study utilizing a constructivist grounded theory approach, informed by an underlying worldview of social constructivism. The methodology incorporated an inductive-abductive emergent process characterized by flexibility of design whereby the methodology itself had an emergent element as a part of the research progression. The primary method of data collection was semi-structured interviews with college and university presidents who were selected through convenient sampling. The interviews were characterized by an appreciative inquiry (AI) approach utilizing positively premised, open-ended questions. The interviews were recorded using both manual and digital tape recorders and were transcribed by the researcher. A secondary method of data collection involved journaling, memo writing, and observations of the environment and interactions of the presidents at their institutions. The data analysis
followed grounded theory protocol with its iterative nature of constant comparison and theoretical sampling. The data analysis involved three levels of coding: open, axial, and selective.

**Limitations of the Study**

There were several areas of limitation within this study, including size of the study, the nature of saturation, researcher bias, logistical limitations, inclusion of presidents C and E, cultural differences for President D, and inconsistencies and variability in the data.

An additional anticipated area of limitation for the study was the degree to which the leaders involved had an understanding of the actual nature of their successful partnerships. Specifically, to what degree were their perceptions reflective of what was actually occurring within their partnership relationship? This limitation was mitigated by a fundamental ontological assumption informing the study: namely, that there are multiple perceptions of potentially different aspects of realities/reality. Thus the perceptions of the participants were viewed as valid data points describing an understanding of an individual perspective on reality.

**Significance of the Study**

There are multiple levels of significance for this research. USHE is facing a crisis. It needs to be able to meet challenges and change in a way that will ensure its continued survival and success while staying true to its core values. Having successful leadership in these challenging times is crucial to this process. Given trends toward collaborative partnerships, in conjunction with the unique culture of the academy, dyadic
Presidential partnerships are a fundamental leadership vehicle that can facilitate optimal effectiveness for leadership and institutional functioning. Gaining further insight into such successful partnership functioning in USHE could help leaders, institutions, and practitioners move toward higher levels of performance.

Additionally, the results of this study could be helpful for practitioners such as consultants and societal stakeholders who work with leaders in the academy. Thus, the targeted audience for this research includes leaders and all those internal and external stakeholders who deal with leaders in USHE.

This research could also have significance in laying the groundwork for extrapolation to other team dynamics within higher education, such as dyads and triads within larger groups.

Some specific areas in which the study could add value include the following:

- Increased insight into the perceptions and voices of presidential leaders who have been influenced by and also influence the unique culture of the academy.

- New theories and models that add to the knowledge in the field about successful dyadic leadership partnerships. These theories and models provide a greater understanding about the functioning of these partnerships and also provide new ways to view the patterns and processes of these partnerships. In turn, these might lead to a model or theory that could provide a roadmap for how to form potential dyadic partnerships and to assess their fit. Such roadmaps would be helpful in reviewing candidates for leadership positions as well as developing future leaders over time.
• The implications of these theories and models could help improve the functioning of existing dyadic presidential partnerships and could provide tools for practitioners to use when assessing partnership functioning as well as partnership formation.

• An extrapolation of the findings from dyads to larger groups such as triads and leadership and management teams in USHE.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Overview

This chapter presents an overview of the existing literature in the field. This literature was reviewed prior to beginning the data collection and analysis for this study as part of the constructivist grounded theory protocol. The literature reviewed in this section presents four different strands considered to have potential relevance for the study. These strands include leadership, dyadic partnerships, culture, and the academy.

There was a second review of the literature after the data analysis to research the findings as a basis for generating a new theory that is grounded in the data and that also is referent to current theory in the field. This further exploration of the literature is presented in chapter 5 and includes partnership theory, gender theory, trust theory, further research in leadership theory and situational use of power, and complexity theory.

Chapter 2 is organized into five sections as follows:

Introduction

Leadership

Dyadic Partnerships

Culture

The Academy

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of the existing literature for themes that have relevance to the study of university and college presidents’ perceptions of their successful
dyadic partnerships. It is important to acknowledge that there has been dialogue within the field of grounded theory research around the role of the literature review. Suddaby (2006) delineates the nature of the dialogue and examines the misconception that grounded theory does not involve knowledge of the existing literature. Suddaby posits that the danger inherent in the literature review for grounded theory research is “…not that it will contaminate a researcher’s perspective, but rather that it will force the researcher into testing hypotheses, either overtly or unconsciously, rather than directly observing” (p. 635).

However, he maintains that it is still essential that grounded theory research be based on an awareness of research in the field while maintaining the openness to allow for generation of new theory. He describes different approaches that grounded theorists can use to limit the framing of extant theory, while also stating emphatically that,

None of these approaches justifies ignorance of existing literature or knowledge. The reality of grounded theory research is always one of trying to achieve a practical middle ground between a theory-laden view of the world and an unfettered empiricism. A simple way to seize this middle ground is to pay attention to extant theory but constantly remind yourself that you are only human and that what you observe is a function of both who you are and what you hope to see. (p. 635)

Creswell (2007) also supports the importance of a review of the literature for qualitative research. He acknowledges that there can be differing views on this matter but also substantiates the need for such a review, including for grounded theory.

Although opinions differ about the extent of literature review needed before a study begins, qualitative texts (e.g., Creswell, 2003; Marshall & Rossman, 2006) refer to the need to review the literature so that one can provide the rationale for the problem and position one’s study within the
ongoing literature about the topic….For a grounded theory study, I would expect to learn how we need a theory that explains a process because existing theories are inadequate, nonexistent for the population or need to be modified. (pp. 102–103)

Within this context, this review of the literature provides an overview of general and specific themes that have overall pertinence to the study. These themes are explored from the perspective of providing familiarity with the research in the field, while simultaneously keeping an open perspective. The review also indicates areas where there are gaps in the literature. The gaps derive from the absence of significant research and consequent lack of existing theories that are explanatory for the specific phenomenon that is the basis of the study.

The themes that are the focus of this literature review are grouped around the four main topic areas of leadership, dyadic partnerships, culture, and the academy. The theoretical perspectives on leadership are important for this study because a key aspect of the study involves looking at the nature of leadership and leadership partnerships. Thus research on dyadic partnerships is also a relevant topic area. The issue of culture is important because there is a strong interrelationship between leadership and culture, and this study highlights the voices of these leaders as representative of their culture. Finally, the academy is a key element within this study because the leaders and culture in question are those of the academy. Aspects of partnership and other topics covered within these four areas are as follows:

- Leadership: a working definition, relevant theory, leadership, and dyadic LMX partnerships
Dyadic partnerships: team and group theory, and research on dyadic partnerships across sectors

Culture: a working definition and relevant theory, including dimensions of culture, organizational culture, and the relationship between leadership and culture

The academy: the culture of the academy; the role of leadership in the academy; the trends impacting the academy, including collaboration; and the need for research on presidential partnerships within the academy

The process of the literature review entailed a systematic search through the literature using both primary and secondary source material. The search for each topic area began at the macro or general level and then moved to more detail at the micro level in specific areas relevant to the research question. Often the reference listings at the end of articles and books provided a good source of additional literature. The researcher also enlisted the help of a reference librarian, Kent Carrico of Benedictine University, to ensure that the search for work on presidential perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships was exhaustive.

**Leadership**

**Working Definition of Leadership**

There have been numerous definitions of leadership focusing on differing aspects of leadership such as traits or actions. For the purpose of this dissertation, the definition that will be used is that proposed by Northouse: “Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to serve a common goal” (Northouse, 2010, p. 3). This definition has been selected because it is broad enough to encompass a wide
range of leadership activities, behaviors, and interactions. This broadness allows for flexibility in dealing with the complex interplay involved in the dyadic partnership relationship and allows for and can be inclusive of emergent themes and new perspectives.

**Leadership Theory Overview**

Research on leadership has taken place across a variety of sectors including the social sciences, psychology, business, and organizational behavior. Within the context of this broad field of inquiry there have been specific trends in the study of leadership that involve trait-based, relational, and situational or contingent perspectives: “Some researchers conceptualize leadership as a trait or as a behavior, whereas others view leadership from an information-processing perspective or relational standpoint” (Northouse, 2010, p. 1).

These trends have developed both sequentially and concurrently over time with certain approaches gaining and losing appeal as new information or shifts in perspectives occur throughout the disciplines that inform leadership study. Elements of these trends are broadly relevant for this study to the degree to which they have impacted or could inform presidential leadership within higher education. At the broader level such trends include the great man theory, trait theory, and the skills approach. At a deeper level, theories of both transformational leadership and leader-member exchange (LMX) theory are informative for this study because they focus on relational and dyadic leadership.

Finally, it is helpful to look briefly at trends in change leadership and the work done in this area in USHE because one of the motivations for doing this study is the need
for good leadership during the current and ongoing periods of challenge and change forces that are impacting higher education.

**Great Man Theory**

Great man theory is an early theory that is premised upon the idea that the leader is a heroic or great man who is born with certain innate leadership characteristics (Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, & Dennison, 2003, p. 6).

**Trait Theory**

Trait theory developed out of the great man theory and was a fundamental aspect of leadership research in the 1930s and 40s, involving a systematic study of the specific traits associated with leadership. In studies on leadership traits in the first half of the twentieth century a number of different traits emerged across different studies, such that overall findings became inconclusive. Rather than finding universal traits, the research indicated that situations impacted leadership: “It becomes clear that an adequate analysis of leadership involves a study of leaders not only but of situations” (Bass, 1990, p. 76). Specifically, Stogdill (1948) found that there was no consistent set of traits that were associated with leadership across situations (Northouse, 2010). Due to such findings, trait leadership declined in popularity with a shift to a more behavioral approach (Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, & Dennison, 2003). However there has been a resurgence of trait theory beginning in the 1990s with a new emphasis on traits such as social intelligence.

An overall summary of trait theory and the seminal work of specific researchers involve Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), Lord, DeVader and Alliger (1986), Mann (1959),
Within the context of this overall development of research on leadership and leadership trait theory, the work of several specific researchers is of particular relevance to this study. Kouzes and Posner’s research on leadership began in 1983. They have accumulated an extensive amount of data over more than twenty-five years of research. Through their analyses they have isolated five core practices associated with exemplary leadership as well as four core leadership attributes. Their five practices of exemplary leadership include the following: model the way; inspire a shared vision; challenge the process; enable others to act; and encourage the heart. The four core leadership attributes they have identified are honest, forward-looking, inspiring, and competent. A fundamental premise of their theory has to do with credibility as the foundation of leadership, with the attributes of honest, inspiring, and competent as contributing towards credibility. They find that forward-looking is the attribute among the four that differentiates leaders from others (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

These theoretical frameworks provide points of exploration that could be valuable in understanding presidential leadership in the academy. Specifically both great man theory and trait theory are broadly informative for this study because historically there were elements of these theories that characterized higher education presidential leadership and such elements could have continued impact. For example, as described by Bergquist and Pawlak (2008), the early college presidents in the colonial period tended to
demonstrate strong leadership that was informed by their moral character or traits, and this type of leadership still has some relevance in the academy:

…the role of a strong administrator, who rules by moral force and even fiat, continues to influence the professional lives of many leaders in contemporary postsecondary institutions. There is still room in many colleges and universities for a strong president—especially in those institutions that preserve a religious heritage, such as was found in the colonial colleges. This kind of strong collegiate leader gains authority because of his or her quality of thought and character. (p. 21)

By the mid-20th century there was a shift from trait perspectives to emphasis on leadership relative to behaviors, beginning with McGregor’s (1960) work looking at human relationships, output, and performance (Bolden et al., 2003). The skills approach to leadership fits within this framework.

**Skills Approach**

A fundamental aspect of this approach is that while it is still focused on the individual leader, the emphasis is on learnable skills as opposed to inherent traits. Katz’s (1955) work advocated three different leadership skill sets: technical, human, and conceptual. There was a re-emergence of this theory in the 1990s with the work of Mumford and colleagues, who created a skill-based model of leadership (Northouse, 2010, p. 39). This perspective is informative for this study insofar as there is a division of labor in the academy around the skills necessary within the different subcultures (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008), and this study’s findings reinforce the importance of complementary skill sets in successful dyadic leadership partnerships.
Within the overall continuum of developments in leadership theory, there have been additional theoretical leadership trends developing in the mid-twentieth century that are specifically important for this study. These trends include the emergence of theories of leadership that focus on its relational aspects, such as the relationship between leaders and followers. This theoretical perspective is of key relevance for this study because of the study’s research focus on the relational aspect of dyadic presidential leadership partnerships. Two theories from this perspective that are particularly important for this study are those of transformational leadership, which looks at the transformative nature of the leader-follower relationship, and leader-member exchange theory (LMX), which has a dyadic focus.

**Transformational Leadership Theory**

Transformational leadership theory is a theory of leadership that involves emphasis on motivating through a process of relationship. Moving beyond trait theory and theories that focus on the attributes and skills of the leader, transformational leadership deals with the relationship and mutual process that takes place between leaders and followers. As defined by Bass (1985) and others, transformational leadership focuses on

…the leader’s effect on followers and the behavior used to achieve this effect. The followers feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader, and they are motivated to do more than they originally expected to do. The underlying influence process is described in terms of motivating followers by making them more aware of the importance of task outcomes and inducing them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization. (Yukl, 1999, p. 86)
As summarized by Northouse (2010, chapter 9), the theory expands beyond attention to the role of the leader alone and focuses on the nature of mutual transformation that happens between leaders and followers. Within this context, transformational leadership places a strong emphasis on followers’ needs and contributions. The theory can have a moral and ethical element in that “Burns (1978) suggested that transformational leadership involves attempts by leaders to move people to higher standards of moral responsibility” (in Northouse, 2010, p. 187).

Additionally, transformational leadership can have appeal for practitioners on an emotional level: “Transformational leadership is closer to the prototype of leadership that people have in mind when they describe their ideal leader and is more likely to provide a role model with which subordinates want to identify” (from Bass & Avolio, 1988, as cited in Bass, 1990, p. 54).

The theory of transformational leadership has in and of itself transformed and expanded over the years. Initially, as delineated by Northouse (2010), the term was created by Downton (1973) and the foundations of the theory were developed by Burns (1978) as one of two types of leadership—transactional and transformational—that he believed to be mutually exclusive styles. Burns presents a variety of types of transformational leaders including intellectuals, reformers, revolutionaries, and the charismatic hero.

House’s 1976 work on charismatic leadership further informed elements of transformational leadership in that there was similarity and overlap between the two theories. This linkage was extended by Bass “…by giving more attention to the
emotional elements and origins of charisma and by suggesting that charisma is a necessary but not sufficient condition for transformational leadership” (Northouse, 2010, p. 176).

Bass also contributed to the theory by developing the idea that transformational and transactional leadership were not mutually exclusive as expressed by Burns, but rather were each parts of a continuum of leadership styles. Specifically he states that, “Intellectual stimulation, charismatic leadership, and inspirational leadership are major components of transformational leadership, which adds to transactional leadership in generating positive outcomes of the groups and organizations led” (Bass, 1990, p. 221).

Much attention has been paid to the moral element of transformational leadership and the belief that its authenticity derives from its moral grounding. Some theorists of transformational leadership have ascribed a certain defined moral framework to transformational leadership:

Burns (1978), Bass (1985) and Howell and Avolio (1992), among others, have examined the morality of transformational leadership. For Burns, to be transformational, the leader had to be morally uplifting. For Bass, in his early work, transformational leaders could be virtuous or villainous depending on their values. Howell and Avolio felt that only socialized leaders concerned for the common good can be truly transformational leaders. (Bass & Steidlmeir, 1999, p. 186)

In fact Bass and Steidlmeir (1999) take their framework a step further relative to moral parameters in that they differentiate between “authentic” and “pseudo” transformational leadership based upon the ethical and moral concerns of the leader and the relation of morality to the sense of self. They state,
Authentic and transformational leadership provides a more reasonable and realistic concept of self—a self that is connected to friends, family and community…. Authentic transformational leadership is more consistent than transactional leadership with Judaic-Christian philosophical traditions… Followers should not be mere means to self-satisfying ends for the leader but should be treated as ends in themselves. We label as inauthentic or “pseudo” that kind of transformational leadership that tramples on those concerns. (p. 186)

**Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX)**

Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) is important for this research study because it looks at leadership relative to the interaction between the leaders and followers and is the key theory concerning dyads and dyadic partnerships. LMX theory has developed as a social exchange framework for leadership for more than twenty-five years across four different stages. As described by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995, p. 225) these stages include the following:

- **Stage 1**—the discovery of differentiated dyads
- **Stage 2**—the investigation of characteristics of LMX relationships and their organizational implications…
- **Stage 3**—the description of dyadic partnership building
- **Stage 4**—the aggregation of differentiated dyadic relationships to group and network levels

The initial work in this area by Dansereau, Cashman, and Graen (1973) posited a dyadic vertical relationship known as vertical-dyad linkage theory (VDL), whereby “Leader-member exchange implies an informally developed role—one that is negotiated between each individual group member and the leader” (Graen, 1976; cited in Bass, 1990, p. 333). This theory looks at the nature of such an exchange at not only the individual but also the dyadic and group levels around stages of relationship
development. As described by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), the key concepts of this theory involve the idea that,

…effective leadership processes occur when leaders and followers are able to develop mature leadership relationships (partnerships) and thus gain access to the many benefits these relationships bring (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1991). The model as it stands describes how effective leadership relationships develop between dyadic “partners” in and between organizations (e.g., leaders and followers, team member and teammates…) This occurs when the relationships generate bases of incremental influence (Katz & Kahn, 1978) that are necessary for effective leadership. (p. 225)

LMX theory has emphasized the importance of recognizing the formation of “in-groups” and “out-groups” as the relational paradigms that characterize a leader’s investment in their relationships with different types of subordinates. In-groups are those who do extra work and take on more duties, and out-groups are those who work only within their defined roles. As described by LMX theory, leaders tend to be more relationally involved with in-groups. Within the context of this theory, Northouse (2010) provides an explanation of these relational differences as follows:

The differences in how goals are accomplished by in-groups and out-groups are substantial. Working with an in-group allows a leader to accomplish more work in a more effective manner than he or she can accomplish working without one. In-group members are willing to do more than is required in their job description and look for innovative ways to advance the group’s goals. In response to their extra effort and devotion, leaders give them more responsibilities and more opportunities. Leaders also give in-group members more of their time and support.

Out-group members act quite differently from in-group members. Rather than trying to do extra work, out-group members operate strictly within their prescribed organizational roles. They do what is required of them but nothing more. Leaders treat out-group members fairly and according to the formal contract, but they do not give them special attention. For
their efforts, out-group members receive the standard benefits as defined in the job description. (p. 154)

LMX theory, however, involves more than description; it also involves the position that there should be action on the part of leadership to move beyond the restrictions of in-groups and out-groups, towards the creation of all in-groups. For example, the leadership-making model of Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991) recommends that leaders find a way to create relationships with subordinates so that they all have the opportunity to take on more responsibilities and ultimately all groups are in-groups:

Graen and Uhl-Bien advocated that leaders should create a special relationship with all subordinates, similar to the relationships described as in-group relationships…the leadership-making model suggests that leaders should look for ways to build trust and respect with all of their subordinates, thus making the entire work unit an in-group. In addition, leaders should look beyond their work unit and create high-quality partnerships with people throughout the organization. (Northouse, 2010, p. 154)

Within the spectrum of leadership theories, LMX is important for this study on several levels. Firstly, it places emphasis on dyadic partnerships. As stated by Northouse (2010), “…LMX theory is unique because it is the only leadership approach that makes the concept of dyadic relationship the centerpiece of the leadership process” (p. 155). Additionally, LMX has evolved from being descriptive of vertical leadership phenomenon, to the creation of leadership-making models that involve dyadic partnership building with impact at the organizational level. Specifically, the leadership-making model of LMX,
…recognized the utility of increasing proportions of high-quality relationships in organizations and described a process of accomplishing this through dyadic partnership building (dyad-level effect). Finally, current work is focusing on how these differentiated dyads can be effectively assembled into larger collectivities (collectivities as aggregations of dyads). (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p. 225)

This aspect of LMX theory informs this study around findings about how the leadership dyads can extrapolate outwards to teams and macro aspects of the institutions.

LMX theory has played a key role in research on dyadic partnerships across sectors, including the social sciences and business. Within the realm of business, for example, there has been research across a multitude of topic areas with LMX dyadic focus, including: LMX and the creation of creativity, energy, and involvement in work (Atwater & Carmeli, 2009); the longitudinal LMX development process for employees (Liden, Wayne & Stilwell, 1993); and LMX and empowerment with impacts on job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and performance (Harris, Wheeler, & Kacmar, 2009).

There have been studies on LMX and the relationships between co-workers and worker attitude (Sherony & Green, 2002), as well as research on LMX and worker’s helping behavior (Sparrowe, Soetjipto & Kraimer, 2006). There have also been studies on the consequences of poor leader-member exchange, for example the dyadic research of Phillips and Elkins (2000), who look at the potentially negative impact of poor leader-member exchange on retaliation and disruptive behaviors in the work environment.

Within psychology and social science research, there have also been studies on LMX and dyadic relationships. For example, Mawhinney (2005) investigates an operant theory of leadership within the context of LMX and superior-subordinate dyads, and
Hock-Peng, Nahrang and Morgeson (2009) look at LMX and low levels of agreement between leader and member perceptions of the relationship. Implications of their study have relevance for future research on dyadic presidential partnerships in that they find that agreement increases as the length of the relationship and intensity of dyadic interaction increases, and time/longevity is a key emergent thematic factor in their study. The further exploration of the impact of time and length of relationship on a dyadic partnership is indicated by this research.

To date there has been little research on LMX and dyadic partnerships within higher education. The discussion of the findings of this study and their implications for further research on LMX theory are presented in chapters 5 and 6.

**Dyadic Partnerships**

The study of dyadic partnerships relative to aspects of group behavior and other behavior has been carried out across such disciplines as psychology and the social sciences. Within these disciplines, there are several observations about the nature of dyads and dyadic research that are important for this study. The first has to do with the nature of dyads relative to power distribution. Dyads can differ in nature, such that they can involve a vertical superior-subordinate relationship or a more horizontal relationship between equals. Additionally dyads can move in and out of both of these types of relationships, depending upon multiple factors such as the use of expert power or positional power. The power distribution within the partnership became a key finding of this study, particularly with the variance of the distribution. Further exploration of the literature in this regard is presented in chapter 5.
A second key point is that there is a fundamental differentiation in the research related to dyadic partnerships and group/team theory. The specific question involved in this area is whether for research purposes dyads should be considered to be groups/teams or whether they have fundamental characteristics that separate them from larger groups. The position of this research study is that while acknowledging the dissenting opinion of researchers such as Williams (2010), dyads should be considered as separate entities based upon the work of Moreland (2010) and Moreland, Hogg, and Hains (1994). As stated by Moreland et al. (1994), there are significant justifications for separating dyads from larger groups within this context:

A related complication that arose during our literature search involved research on dyads. Some social psychologists (e.g., Shaw, 1981) regard dyads as groups, but others do not (e.g., Levine & Moreland, 1990). Dyads do seem different from other groups in several ways. For example, dyads can be rather ephemeral, forming and dissolving more quickly and easily than other groups (Simmel, 1950). Dyads also tend to evoke stronger emotional reactions from their members than do other groups—love, sexuality, jealousy, and loneliness are rarely studied by group researchers (see Dermer & Psyzczynski 1978; Fitness & Fletcher, 1993; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Jong-Giervald, 1987). Because of their emotional qualities dyadic relationships often seem unique and special, whereas relationships among group members often seem common and prosaic. Finally, some of the phenomena that occur in groups, such as coalition formation, majority/minority influence, or socialization cannot occur in dyads. And many group phenomena that can occur in dyads take different forms. For example, studies of attraction (Hogg & Hardie, 1991), self-disclosure (Solano & Dunham, 1985), bargaining and negotiation (Bazerman, Mannix & Thompson, 1988), and conflict (Shopler, Insko, Graetz, Drigotas & Smith, 1991) have revealed important discontinuities between dyadic and group behavior. (Moreland et al., 1994, p. 531; cited in Williams, 2010, p. 272)
Further substantiation for this position is provided by the comprehensive work of Yammarino (1995) on leadership theory with specific reference to dyadic leadership, a work that provides an exhaustive delineation of the theoretical approaches to dyads and the formation, development, and maintenance of dyadic relationships. This work focuses on four views of dyads: “(dyads within groups, whole dyads, dyad parts, and cross-level dyads) and three genres of leadership models (i.e., instrumental, inspirational, and informal)” (p. 50). Yammarino discusses dyads as an entity that can be studied both independently and within groups, defining dyads as,

…a special case of groups, defined as two individuals (e.g., leader and follower, superior and subordinate) who are independent on a one-to-one basis (see Berscheid, 1985; Hollander, 1985). This notion can include interpersonal relations and dyadic relations both within groups and independent of formal groups. (p. 52)

Thus Yammarino is not denying the existence of dyads within larger groups but also establishes the validity of studying dyads separately, based upon extensive review of both the literature on dyads as well as the literature on leadership theory and dyads.

Yammarino also highlights the complexity involved in studying leadership dyads, such that, “Viewing entities from a group perspective complicates the matter” and “…this issue requires further work before a complete and adequate definition of dyads and groups can be provided” (p. 52).

Given the clear differences between dyads and groups as summarized by Moreland et al. (1994) as well as the comprehensive overview of the issue provided by Yammarino, which acknowledges the complexity of the issue as well as the justification
for research that studies dyads independently, this research focuses on the presidential leadership dyads as an independent unit of analysis that may exist within larger presidential groups or teams.

While separating dyads from larger groups for this research, it is still possible to gain insight into key elements of dyadic partnerships that have been included in the literature on groups in general. For example, in *The Paradoxes of Group Life*, Smith and Berg (1987) look at the paradoxical nature of dyadic relationships and how they inform group behavior from the perspective of early childhood psychological development. Within this framework, the early dyadic relationships with the mother and eventually with the father and siblings are viewed as fundamental influences in the ways that individuals are able to interact both dyadically and within larger groups. The research of Johnson, Cowan, and Cowan (1999) look at this phenomenon from the perspective of children’s behavior in the classroom as reflective of family organization, including the parent-child dyad. Recent work in this area has been done by researchers such as Fonagy, Gergely, and Target (2007), who look at the dyadic parent-child relationship and its impact on the construction of a sense of the subjective self in terms of both psychological as well as neurobiological elements.

There are a number of studies in dyadic partnerships that have relevance for this research and for further research based upon the findings from this study. Such studies focus on topics such as knowledge transfer and learning dyads (Mesquita & Brush, 2008), mentoring (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, & Newman, 1984), and analysis of communication with leader-subordinate goal setting dyads (Watson, 1982).
Roussin’s (2008) work on increasing trust and psychological safety shows that leaders can customize their behavior to increase trust, safety, and team performance more consistently at the dyadic level than at the group level. Roussin’s work has relevance to this study in several ways, including providing support for the focus of this study on dyads based on the idea that the dyadic partnership can be an important element in successful presidential leadership because it allows for key areas for growth and development that are not as easily achieved in larger groups. For example, Roussin finds that,

There is evidence here that discovery in dyads is fundamentally safer than is discovery in groups for leaders and members and that the outcome of dyadic discovery interventions is a safer team-level environment. Subsequently, dyadic discovery is likely a preferred intervention method in most settings. (p. 245)

Additionally, Roussin’s work is relevant to this study because of a key finding of this study about the importance of trust in successful presidential dyadic partnerships.

There are two key works within the literature that are very important for this study. The first is the dissertation work of Mary Leanna Ayers (2003), which looks at dyadic business partnerships from a transformational perspective. Ayers describes this research in her abstract as follows:

There is very little literature in the field of business that addresses the relational dynamics of dyadic business partnerships. This study explored the cross-section of three bodies of literature: (a) marriage and family systems, (b) leadership, and (c) relational development…For this study 7 partners (dyads) in business together were interviewed, all of which self-reported having experienced personal and professional growth as a result of their partnership. The study applied the principles of qualitative research and utilized unstructured in-depth interviews to elicit relational
stories from the business partners. The interviews were transcribed, organized thematically, and then tapered down to 5 dominant characteristics...Those characteristics are: (a) having a shared vision, (b) a defined purpose for the partnership, (c) trust that is experienced at a deep level, (d) appreciating the talents that are brought by each partner to the partnership, and (e) the development of mutual empathy. This study provides detailed accounts of how these characteristics are built and how they interrelate to build transformational relationships. (p. 1)

While Ayers’ study differs somewhat in having a transformational perspective and a focus on what appears to be horizontal dyadic partnerships in business as opposed to leadership superior-subordinate dyads in higher education, there is still relevance. The fact that Ayers was able to isolate characteristics of dyadic growth partnerships indicates that there could be such emergent themes relative to dyadic presidential partnerships in higher education. A more in-depth exploration of Ayers’ work, particularly relative to the interaction of factors, is provided in chapter 5.

Gallup’s work on dyadic partnerships by Rodd Wagner and Gale Muller (2009) in *Power of 2* is significant for this study on dyadic presidential partnerships. Wagner and Muller build upon the Gallup research on employee engagement and productivity that has been informed by the strengths-based psychology perspective of Clifton. Specific examples of this Gallup research include the following:

- *Strengths Based Selling* (2011)
- *Strengths Based Leadership* (2008)
- *StrengthsFinder 2.0* (2007)
- *StrengthsQuest* (2006)
An underlying theme is that to maximize engagement and performance, it is important to focus on developing strengths while managing weaknesses. This Gallup research incorporates a large number of data points over two decades. Wagner and Muller’s (2009) research on partnerships evolved from the Gallup research and incorporated a number of elements: an extensive review of the literature; historical accounts of partnerships; brainstorming and hypothesis generation; boss-partner studies involving more than 34,000 respondents; and three investigative studies between March 2006 and September 2007. Based on the test studies, they created the Gallup Partnership Rating Scales (GPRS), which was tested in a study of 1,086 people in December 2007. The research (pp. 8–10) showed that there are eight elements of a powerful partnership. These elements consist of the following:

- Complementary strengths
- Common mission
- Trust
- Acceptance
- Forgiveness
- Communicating
Unselfishness

While Wagner and Muller acknowledge that this research is still in its initial stages, they also present strong evidence in terms of methodology and number of data points to support the potential significance of their model. While the purpose of this dissertation study was not to prove or disprove the Gallup model, it is important to note the relevance of their model for this study.

There has been a small amount of research into dyadic partnerships in higher education. For example, Darwin and Palmer (2009) study the nature of dyadic mentoring circles in higher education and conclude that in fact alternatives to dyadic mentoring can bring more beneficial results. Graen (1976) looks at the role-making model and leadership in university administration and the extent to which departmental differentiation results in dyadic interdependencies. Vecchio, Justin, and Pearce (2010) examine mediating mechanisms within the hierarchical structure of the superior-subordinate dyad in an educational setting, but the focus of the study is on 179 public high schools as opposed to institutions of higher education. There have been no significant studies of presidential or leadership dyadic partnerships within USHE and this study addresses this gap in the literature.

Culture

The issue of culture is relevant to this study on several levels. Leadership tends to be reflective of the culture in which it resides. For example, at the country level, leadership and culture are completely intertwined. As described by Hofstede and Hofstede (2005), “Beliefs about leadership reflect the dominant culture of a country.”
Asking people to describe the qualities of a good leader is a way of asking them to describe their culture. The leader is a culture hero, in a sense of acting as a model for behavior” (p. 268).

Presidential leadership within USHE is a product of a specific culture and thus is representative of this culture in both perspectives and in praxis. Additionally, the organizational cultures of specific institutions can impact the nature and practice of their leadership. Theories that emerge from this study take into consideration the unique cultural elements that influence and manifest relative to these perceptions, particularly to the role of the president within this culture.

As with leadership, there is no absolute definition of culture. The nature of culture has been studied and defined relatively across a number of parameters, and key scholars in the field have put forth seminal frameworks for understanding and defining culture. Schein (2010) emphasizes the importance of understanding culture at the level of artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and underlying assumptions. This understanding is important not only for functioning within a culture but also for changing cultures and working across different cultures. Schein defines culture as follows:

The culture of a group can now be defined as a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 18)

Hofstede (2010) builds on Kluckhohn’s (1951) definition of culture to describe it as: “…the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one
group or category of people from another” (cited in Hofstede, 2010, p. 9). Hofstede’s cultural framework involves what he calls “three levels of mental programming,” such that human nature is the foundation upon which culture is built, and personality is an aspect of individuation that is inherited and learned (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Hofstede’s Levels of Mental Programming](image)

Adapted from Hofstede, 2010, p. 3.

For Hofstede, values are a core component of culture and can manifest in practice across rituals, heroes, and symbols, as illustrated in Figure 2:
Hofstede’s research looks at comparative data points for cultures along five independent dimensions. These dimensions include the following:

1. Power distance, which is related to the different solutions to the basic problem of human inequality
2. Uncertainty avoidance, which is related to the level of stress in a society in the face of an unknown future
3. Individualism vs. collectivism, which is related to the integration of individuals into primary groups
4. Masculinity versus femininity, which is related to the division of emotional roles between men and women
5. Long-term versus short-term orientation, which is related to the choice of focus for people’s efforts; the future or the present (p. 29)
The cultural framework of researchers Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) is somewhat similar to that of Hofstede but involves seven dimensions of culture that are divided into three categories: relationships with other people, passage of time, and relation to the environment. Within this context, the Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner dimensions of culture are as follows:

- **Relationships and Rules: Universalism vs. particularism**—the universalist approach maintains that what is good and right can be defined and always applies; the particularist approach pays more attention to the obligations of relationships and unique circumstances.

- **The Group and the Individual: Individualism vs. communitarianism**—do people regard themselves primarily as individuals or as part of a group?

- **Feelings and Relationships: Neutral vs. emotional**—should the nature of interactions be objective and detached or is expressing emotion acceptable?

- **How Far We Get Involved: Specific vs. diffuse**—the degree to which we engage others in specific areas of life and single levels of personality, or diffusely in multiple areas of our lives and at several levels of personality at the same time so that every life space and every level of personality tends to permeate all others.

- **How We Accord Status: Achievement vs. ascription**—achievement means you are judged on what you have accomplished; ascription means status is accorded by birth, kinship, gender, age, or connections.

- **How We Manage Time: Attitudes toward time**—concepts of time as sequential or synchronic; past, present, and future orientations
• How We Relate to Nature: Attitudes toward the environment—control, internal
directed, or going along with nature; nature is an external force, should live in balance
and harmony with it. (Summarized from pp. 8–10)

Thus, there is relativism within concepts of culture. This is further illustrated by
The Project GLOBE research, which differs from both that of Hofstede and of
Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner in that it includes nine cultural dimensions and
definitions (House et al., 2004: cited in Resick et al., 2011) An appreciation of cultural
relativism is particularly important for this study because the nature of leadership can be
a cultural phenomenon.

Organizational cultures comprise one of the levels of culture as described by
Hofstede and Hofstede (2005):

• A national level, according to one’s country (or countries for people who
migrated during their lifetime)
• A regional and/or ethnic and/or religious and/or linguistic affiliation level,
as most nations are comprised of culturally different regional and/or ethnic
and/or language groups
• A gender level, according to whether a person was born as a girl or as a
boy
• A generation level, separating grandparents from parents from children
• A social class level, associated with educational opportunities and with a
person’s occupation
• For those who are employed, organizational, departmental and/or
corporate levels, according to the way employees have been socialized in
their work organization. (p. 11)

The study of organizational cultures became popular in the 1980s in the field of
management with the work of researchers such as Kennedy and Deal, and Peters and
Waterman (cited in Hofstede, 2001, p. 71). In their seminal work Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life, Deal and Kennedy (2000), explore the relation between aspects of culture and company strategy and functioning. These aspects of culture include business environment, values, heroes, rites and rituals, and the cultural network (pp. 13–15).

Key research on organizational culture and structure has been done by a number of additional scholars, including Henry Mintzberg, who believes that the majority of organizations create structures and processes that are reflective of core values. According to Mintzberg organizational structures can be understood in terms of their parts, mechanisms, and configurations as follows:

Organizations in general contain up to five different parts:
1. The operating core (the people who do the work)
2. The strategic apex (the top management)
3. The middle line (the hierarchy in between)
4. The technostructure (people in staff roles supplying ideas)
5. The support staff (people in staff roles supplying services).

Organizations in general use one or more mechanisms for coordinating activities:
1. Mutual adjustment (of people through informal communication)
2. Direct supervision (by a hierarchical supervisor)
3. Standardization of work processes (specifying the contents of work)
4. Standardization of outputs (specifying the desired results)
5. Standardization of skills (specifying the training required to perform the work)

In addition, Mintzberg believes that the majority of organizations demonstrate one of the following five configurations:
3. The professional bureaucracy. Key part: the operating core. Coordinating mechanism: standardization of skills.
5. The adhocracy. Key part: the support staff (sometimes with the operating core). Coordinating mechanism: mutual adjustment. (cited in Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, pp. 252–253)

Further influential research on organizational cultures includes the 1992 work of Kotter and Heskett, who look at adaptive cultures and culture change. Current work in organizational culture, as illustrated by *The Handbook of Organizational Culture & Climate* (2000), explores many aspects of such culture, including culture and climate, measurement outcomes, and international perspectives. The research of Cameron and Quinn (2006) on changing organizational culture has added to the field with the use of the competing values framework. Additionally, as outlined at a presentation at the Academy of Management 2011 meeting, which included Kim Cameron, David Hoffman, Neal Ashkanasy, Dan Denison, and others, there is exciting new work being done on organizational versus national cultures as well as organizational cultural domains.

Of particular relevance to this study is the issue of the relationship between organizational culture and leadership. Schein’s (2010) work on organizational culture and leadership has a fundamental premise that leaders, management, and culture are interconnected. “These dynamic processes of culture and creation and management are the essence of leadership and make you realize that leadership and culture are two sides
of the same coin” (p. 3). Leaders can be shaped by culture but there can also be those who shape a culture and create a new culture that can be more adaptive and functional. This idea could have impact for emerging models of successful dyadic leadership partnerships within USHE, particularly in light of the need for leaders who can provide vision and leadership within the context of the change forces facing higher education.

**The Academy**

There has been extensive research on the culture of the academy. This is a unique culture that has developed over centuries, with origins in European models and continued adaptation through the historical eras of American history from the colonial period to the present (Altbach et al., 2005, 2005; Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). Peterson and Spencer (1990) provide a summary of previous research in this field:

While research on culture in higher education is not new, its complex and elusive nature has limited attempts to study it comparatively. Major classic studies are mostly case studies of single institutions, for example, Lunsford (1963), Foote, Mayer, and Associates (1968), Clark (1970), and Riesman, Gusfield, and Gamson (1970). The distinctive nature and unique character of higher education institutions have long been recognized and accepted both within and outside higher education (Veysey, 1965; Martin 1985). A few comprehensive studies of institutions conducted by Chaffee and Tierney (1988), Tierney (1988), and Peterson, Cameron, Jones, Mets, and Ettington (1986) suggest that the culture of an institution is pivotal in determining the success of organizational improvement efforts. (Two recent syntheses of organizational culture research in higher education are by Peterson, Cameron, Jones, Mets, and Ettington, 1986) and Kuh and Whitt, 1988. More-focused reviews are Cameron and Ettington, 1988; Chaffee and Tierney, 1988; and Tierney, 1988). (Peterson & Spencer, 1990; cited in Tierney [Ed.], 1990, p. 5)
A key scholar in the early research in this field has been William Tierney, whose 1988 work identifies a framework that can be used to study organizational culture in institutions of higher education using the following elements: environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership. Of particular relevance to this dissertation is the work referenced above, *Collegiate Cultures and Leadership Strategies*, by Chaffey and Tierney (1988), which looks at strategy, culture, and leadership within the academy. An additional foundational work, *Assessing Academic Cultures and Climates* edited by Tierney (1990), looks at the culture of the academy as assessed by a number of scholars across a variety of parameters, including academic culture and climate; ethnographic auditing; campus climate; student culture; faculty culture; the president and culture; and organizational culture.

Subsequent work on the culture of higher education includes the scholarship of Kezar and Eckel (2002), who look at the impact of institutional culture on change strategies in USHE. Additional themes in the research on the culture of USHE include moving towards a culture of reform (Lynch, 2010); culture and quality assurance (Hodson & Thomas, 2003), and quality management (Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2002); the performance culture in higher education (Taylor, 2007); the clash of academic cultures (Barbier, 2004); conflict between the traditional culture of the academy and change forces of the twenty-first century (Cavanaugh, 2010); faculty cultures (Bila & Miller, 1997), and teaching and learning cultures (Roxa, Martensson, & Alveteg, 2011).

Particularly relevant for this dissertation is the work of Bergquist and Pawlak (2008), who delineate six different cultures of the academy, including collegial,
managerial, developmental, advocacy, virtual, and tangible. This work is important because it provides information that can help presidents to work to minimize conflict across these cultures and create more harmonious and effective institutions.

There are specific manifestations of the culture of the academy relative to Hofstede’s categories of values, rituals, heroes, and symbols that are inclusive of Schein’s descriptions around artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and underlying assumptions. The surface level of the culture is particularly important because much of the educational and scholarly process is intangible, so that degree ceremonies, grants and publications, and sports teams provide evidence of the underlying processes within the culture (Bolman & Gallos, 2011, p. 121). These processes are themselves guided by core assumptions, values, and beliefs. Thus, surface level manifestations such as rituals and ceremonies in this culture are highly symbolic:

Many colleges and universities are richly symbolic institutions, infused with myth, stories, ceremony, and symbols rooted in ancient traditions. Commencements and convocations, academic regalia and archaically named degrees, maces and mascots are among the more visible symbolic vestments that adorn colleges and universities. They are vital because educational institutions survive and prosper only so long as they sustain constituents’ belief and faith in their mission and activities. (p. 121)

Leadership in the academy can also have a symbolic role, not only with participation in ritual and ceremony but also as examples of the core values of the institution. Bolman and Gallos (2011) describe the elements of the symbolic leadership role in higher education as involving a combination of being a role model, aligning vision and action, and reinforcing the cultural narrative of the institution.
Symbolic leaders strive to be highly visible exemplars of their institution’s values and the vision they hope to achieve. They construct a coherent and compelling narrative—a story about the institution’s past present and future... They appreciate the power of a strong and coherent institutional culture—and their role and responsibilities in creating and sustaining that culture. They treasure their institution’s symbolic tapestry and they seek to leverage ritual and ceremony in the service of the institution’s larger purpose... Academic administrators augment their impact when they (1) build on the past to create a vision of the future, (2) lead by example, (3) construct a heroic narrative and tell it often, and (4) leverage the power in ritual and ceremony. (pp. 125–126)

It is also important to note that the presidents and leaders of the academy can have different symbolic roles, given the complex nature of their constituencies and multiple sub-cultures. For students, for example, the president could be a parental figure. For the administration, the president could be symbolic of the captain who steers the ship. For the board, the president could be a symbol of the running of the institution. The nature of the president’s symbolic role reflects the multi-dimensional culture of the academy and also the multiple stakeholders with whom the president must interact. Thus, the unique and complex culture of the academy, inclusive of the subcultures, can involve leadership having to take on more than one symbolic role simultaneously.

An important element of the culture of the academy is its resistance to change. Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) state,

Cultures do not change readily. Cultures in the academic institutions are even more resistant to change than in other sectors of society. There are several reasons why this resistance is so great in academic cultures. First, at the same time that faculty create and teach new knowledge, institutions of higher education exist to maintain some stability, to convey lessons already learned. Second, because faculty often self-regulate professionally, there is a degree of arrogance in their work. They are the experts and already know what is “right.” This is a reason for widespread
lack of support for professional development and resistance to accountability and outside performance reviews. Third, great anxiety is induced by the work in which members of twenty-first century postsecondary institutions are engaged. New knowledge is constantly being generated or encountered, and at an increasingly rapid rate. This causes anxiety. (p. 227)

The cultural resistance to change that characterizes the academy is particularly significant not only for higher education but also for the role of the president at this time. While the culture of the academy and the role of its presidents have been characterized by adaptation through centuries of development, it is apparent that further adaptation will be necessary. USHE is facing forces of change that will drive it into uncharted territory on all levels including the cultural and presidential. As described in chapter 1, these forces include economic shifts, technology development, changing demographics, globalization, shifts in student needs, and increased calls for accountability and transparency (Altbach et al., 2005). These changes highlight the need for effective leadership in USHE in order to navigate such change with a culture that is resistant to change. As described by Bolman and Gallos (2011):

…academic leadership brings challenges and even heartaches, particularly in an era of political controversy, public doubts, technological changes, demographic shifts, mission drift (Kezar et al., 2005), and financial crisis. Higher education administration is demanding work that tests the mind, soul, and stamina of all who attempt it…Colleges and universities constitute a special type of organization; and their complex mission, dynamics, personnel structures, and values require a distinct set of understanding and skills to lead and manage them well. (p. xii)

There has been a great deal of research in the area of higher education leadership, including aspects such as the role of boards, shared governance (Tierney & Lechuga,
leadership is that of the president and presidential role in the academy (Amey, 2006). Ongoing research on the presidency in USHE is being conducted by the American Council on Education. As illustrated by their report, *The American College President, 20th Anniversary* (2007), their research focuses on many aspects of the presidency, including the opinions of presidents on the changing nature of the presidency; profiles of the presidents, including focus on gender and minority issues; and career paths for presidents.

Research on the role of the president relative to learning and social change has been conducted by scholars such as Amey and Brown (2004) and Eddy (2003). Key work in this area has been done by Kezar and others. For example, in Kezar’s work with Peter Eckel (Kezar & Eckel, 2002), there is a focus on the cultural impact on change in USHE. In *Rethinking the “L” Word in Higher Education: The Revolution of Research on Leadership* (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006), the authors provide an update of the 1989 research by Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum. The specific focus of this 2006 work is on the changing nature of leadership and the implications for the leadership role in USHE.

The issue of the presidential leadership role has been researched from a variety of frameworks. A foundational work is Cohen and March’s 1986 *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*, in which the authors reach the following conclusions about the presidential role in USHE: it is a reactive job; it is parochial in that presidents are familiar with their institutions; presidents tend to be academics; the
president is conventional in that he passes through socially conservative filters to get to the position; the position of being president matters to the president in terms of his sense of self-esteem (summarized from pp. 1–2). A key point made by the authors is that the position of president has illusory aspects:

The presidency is an illusion. Important aspects of the role seem to disappear on close examination. In particular, decision-making in the university seems to result extensively from a process that decouples problems and choices and makes the president’s role more commonly sporadic and symbolic than significant. Compared to the heroic expectations he and others might have, the president has modest control over the events of college life. The contributions he makes can easily be swamped by outside events or the diffuse qualities of university decision-making. (p. 2)

A differing but equally important perspective on the presidency is that of Derek Bok (1986), who argues that leaders within the academy can have the power and influence to have impact across a number of areas, including leading change. Bok says:

Is it still possible for academic leaders to bring about significant change? As we have seen, many observers seem to doubt it. According to these critics, whatever power exists in the academy has shifted from presidents into the hands of faculty…For all the talk about loss of authority to the faculty, academic leaders also retain several powers of substantial importance. Typically, they have a unique opportunity to raise funds as well as the authority to allocate resources (at least at the margin) and, in many universities, to veto faculty appointments…The authority retained by presidents and deans enables them not only to shape the academic agenda but to create an environment that promotes innovation and develops support for new ideas. (pp. 192-193)

Additional scholars support Bok’s perspective on the potential for presidential power and impact. Bowen (2011), in Lessons Learned: Reflections of a University President, highlights both the complexity of the role as well as ways in which the
president can have significant impact across a number of parameters within institutions of higher education. In a similar vein, Bolman and Gallos (2011) address the challenges facing the presidency and key lessons that can help presidents to maximize their positive impact as leaders.

*University Presidents as Moral Leaders*, edited by David Brown (2006), looks at the moral issues of the presidential leadership role in this current period of challenges. The topics covered include leadership in a time of crisis and transitions; virtue and leadership; the morality of shared responsibility; and leadership and teaching. Morrill’s (2007) work, *Strategic Leadership in Colleges and Universities*, explores issues of strategic leadership in USHE relative to change in the academy and topics such as governance, finance, and mission and vision. In *Leaders in the Crossroads*, Nelson (2009) looks at the presidency in these times of change around issues of what constitutes perceptions of success and failure in the presidential role. Birnbaum (1992) also researched this aspect of leadership with his important work, *How Academic Leadership Works: Understanding Success and Failure in the College Presidency*. He focuses specifically on understanding the presidency, including the myths surrounding the position and the factors that contribute to effective presidential leadership.

Key themes throughout the research on the role of the presidency have included the complex and changing nature of the role. The role of presidential leadership in the academy has changed as society has changed. There appear to be differing opinions in the literature as to the presidential role in the colonial period. According to Bergquist and
Pawlak (2008) the colonial presidential role involved more direct positional and actual power to govern:

Jencks and Riesman (1968, p. 6) noted that college presidents in early American institutions were “far more domineering than they are today, carrying the business of the college…entrusting very little to committees of faculty member or lever-level bureaucrats, and imposing their personal stamp on the entire college…” Thus, in the early history of American and Canadian higher education, a precedent was set for strong administrative leadership and weak faculty influence. (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008, p. 20)

However, according to Birnbaum and Eckel (in Altbach et al., 2005, chapter 12), the presidential role in the early periods of USHE was relatively weak:

From the colonial period until the Civil War, institutions were for the most part small, simply structured, and controlled by their lay boards of trustees, leading to a weak presidency…The period between the Civil War and World War I was one of expansion and transformation in higher education. New and more complex institutions were created…The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were times of the “great men” presidents who often wielded unchecked authority to create great institutions. (Altbach et al., 2005, 2005, p. 341)

While there may be disagreement as to the nature of power in the periods of the earlier presidency, one thing that is agreed upon throughout the literature is the growing complexity and difficulty of the presidential role within the academy (Altbach et al., 2005; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008; Birnbaum, 1992; Bolman & Gallos, 2011; Bowen, 2011; Brown, 2006; Cohen & March, 1986; Diamond, 2002; Fisher & Tack, 1988; Morrill, 2007; Nelson, 2009). This role has changed with the increasing secularization of USHE and overall diffusion of structural power. Specifically, there are multiple stakeholders that form key constituencies for the
president. An example is that of the student body, who, with shifts in the traditional understanding of in loco parentis (Kaplin & Lee, 2007), have an increasing level of determination over their rights within academia. Additionally, with the increasing involvement of faculty in shared governance as well as significant power invested in boards as well as in external governing bodies and providers of funding, the role of the president has become far more complex.

One aspect of such changes highlighted in the literature is the need for new skills in presidential leadership to address the shifting landscape of USHE. This perspective is summarized by Diamond (2002):

We firmly believe that the effective academic leaders in the years ahead will need a far wider range of skills, expanded knowledge base, and clearer understanding of the change process than ever before. Higher education is changing and so must every one of us who has leadership responsibilities. (p. 24)

A recurrent trend that emerged in a review of the literature in this regard is the increasing emphasis on the need for collaboration across all levels of USHE, including presidential leadership. In Organizing Higher Education for Collaboration: A Guide for Campus Leaders, Kezar and Lester (2009) make the case for the imperative need for collaboration on multiple levels. They argue that research in the business and government sectors support the case for collaboration. Kezar and Lester ask,

Why are so many external constituents interested in having higher education become more collaborative? These external groups (accreditors, the United States Department of Education, state policy makers) are all responding to research conducted in the last thirty years within government and business…Under pressure from difficult financial times, changing demographics and increasing complexity, “siloeed” work with
duplicative activities and a lack of communication and synergy across function was not working anymore...the main strategy for addressing these many new challenges has been through collaboration and partnership. (p. 8)

Within their research, Kezar and Lester detail the specific advantages of such collaboration, which include innovation and learning; cognitive complexity; better service; cost effectiveness and efficiency; and employee motivation (pp. 9–13).

Key research in this area that is important for this dissertation study is the work of Ferren and Stanton (2004). In Leadership Through Collaboration: The Role of the Chief Academic Officer, they look at the need for collaboration in terms of the important function that the chief academic officer (CAO) can play in enhancing collaborative leadership within higher education. When describing the collaborative function of the CAO, the authors state,

Faculty and staff in academic affairs look to the chief academic officer for inspiration and appreciation...In contrast, the president expects support in adapting to external demands and providing practical leadership to move the institutional agenda forward. Increasingly, the president, board, and legislators look to the CAO for ideas on how to do more, better, and with less. (p. 4)

The importance of collaboration between the president and a chief academic officer is supported by the findings of this study on successful dyadic presidential partnerships, as illustrated by one such partnership where the key dyadic partner is the provost.

Additional representative examples of scholarship on collaboration in higher education include that of Hirsch and Burack (2001), who look at collaboration between
academic and student affairs; and Frost and Jean (2003), who highlight trends toward inter-disciplinarity in discourse and interactions across departments, programs, and disciplines. In *Turnaround Leadership for Higher Education*, Fullan and Scott (2009) emphasize the importance of collaboration at multiple levels, including the teaching level.

Within this context of collaboration and collaborative partnerships there is literature on the nature of such partnerships in higher education. For example, Jacoby (2003) looks at multiple aspects of higher education partnerships, including service-learning partnerships; campus learning partnerships; partnerships with students; partnerships with K-12; partnerships with corporate; and partnerships for collaborative action research. The American Association for Higher Education, American College Personnel Association, and National Association of Personnel Administrators put out a joint report in 1998 entitled, “Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning,” outlining the importance of collaborative partnerships in higher education across multiple domains including those of academic and student affairs. However, there is no presence in the literature at this time of research on presidential partnerships in higher education. This dissertation addresses this gap in the literature.

Within this context it is important to acknowledge two research projects that have some similarity in focus or perspective to the research reported here. As discussed previously, the dissertation work of Mary Leanna Ayers (2003) that looks at dyadic business partnerships from a transformational perspective is informative for this study because of the isolation of characteristics of successful dyads in such partnerships. There
are differences in focus between Ayers’ study and this study in that Ayers looks at horizontal business partnerships from a transformational framework and incorporates the three perspectives of marriage and family systems, leadership, and relational development.

Another significant work that is informative for this study is Bensimon and Neumann’s (1993) *Redesigning Collegiate Leadership: Teams and Teamwork in Higher Education*, which explores collaborative issues involved in presidential leadership teams. The research involves interviews with presidents and their team members. A key difference between this work and the present study is that Bensimon and Neumann focus on larger teams and perceptions of multiple team members in addition to presidents. Additionally their research perspective, frameworks, and methodology are different in significant ways. They state,

> The intent of the study was to explore models of teamwork in higher education, taking into account the leadership orientations of presidents and their executive officers. Our interest was to examine how presidents and their designated team members work together; how team members perceive the quality of their working relationships; how presidents select, shape and maintain particularly effective teams; and how teams address conflict and diversity of orientation among team members. Our conclusions are based on interview data collected at the fifteen participating institutions and also on the published research of others and our own experiences as participants in a variety of groups. (p. xi)

Thus, while the Bensimon and Neumann work is important in that it was one of the first key studies to look at USHE presidential leadership in terms of teams, it also provides a good foundation for the further research and exploration on presidential perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships that is the basis of this dissertation research.
This review of the literature has presented an overview of a number of perspectives that provided the foundation for the research process in this study. Further exploration of the literature that took place with reference to the specific data findings and creation of new grounded theory are presented in chapter 5.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Overview
This chapter presents the methodology used in this research study. The presentation of the material in this chapter is organized into sections as follows:

Use of Qualitative Approach
Philosophical Assumptions and Paradigms Underlying the Approach
Research Approach: Grounded Theory
Data Collection
   Collecting Data and Resolving Field Issues
   Recording, Transcribing, and Storing Data
Data Analysis
   Open Coding
   Axial Coding
   Selective Coding
   Challenges and Benefits of the Coding Process
Error and Triangulation
Overall Limitations of the Study

Use of Qualitative Approach
This is a qualitative study that focuses on the individual perceptions of university and college presidents relative to the phenomena of their successful dyadic partnerships. A qualitative approach is specifically suited to this study because it allows for a depth of
focus on the perceptions and understandings of the presidents in terms of their own voices and narratives. Such narratives provide the basis for data analysis and coding that have led to emergent themes and the creation of explanatory theory and modeling.

The key characteristics of qualitative research have been important factors in answering the basic questions of this study. These characteristics as described by McMillan (2008) include natural setting, direct data collection, rich narrative descriptions, inductive data analysis, participant perspectives, and emergent research design. In addition a qualitative approach has helped provide a context for the meanings and themes that emerged from the data. As Miles and Huberman (1994) state, a key feature of such qualitative data

…is their richness and holism, with a strong potential for revealing complexity; such data provide “thick descriptions” that are vivid, nested in a real context, and have a ring of truth that has strong impact on the reader...Qualitative data, with their emphasis on people’s “lived experience,” are fundamentally well suited for locating the meanings people place on the events, processes, and structures of their lives: their “perceptions, assumptions, prejudgments, presuppositions” (van Manen, 1977) and for connecting these meanings to the social world around them. (p. 10)

**Philosophical Assumptions and Paradigms Underlying the Approach**

This study is characterized by both philosophical assumptions and paradigms. In an adaptation of Guba and Lincoln’s (1988) “axiomatic issues,” Creswell (2007) describes five philosophical assumptions with implications for qualitative research practice:

These philosophical assumptions consist of a stance toward the nature of reality (ontology), how the researcher knows what he or she knows (epistemology), the role of values in the research (axiology), the language of the research (rhetoric), and the methods used in the research (methodology). (p. 16)
In this study the ontological assumption is that the research involves multiple perceptions of realities, including not only the realities of the participants but also those of the researcher and the readers of the research (Creswell, 2007). Within this context it is important to note that the study incorporates a grounded theory approach with an emphasis on surfacing and working towards understanding the perceptions of the participants around their realities, as well as recognizing emergent patterns dealing with such realities.

Grounded theory should be used in a way that is logically consistent with key assumptions about social reality and how that reality is “known”…the purpose of grounded theory is not to make truth statements about reality, but, rather, to elicit fresh understandings about patterned relationships between social actors and how these relationships actively construct reality (Laser & Strauss, 1967). Grounded theory thus should not be used to test hypotheses about reality, but rather, to make statements about how actors interpret reality. (Suddaby, 2006, pp. 634–636)

As described by Creswell (2007), the fundamental epistemological assumptions with implications for practice in a study have to do with the relationship between the researcher and what is being researched. This includes the distance between the researcher and the subject of the research, and the degree to which the researcher is in the field and becoming an “insider” (p. 17, Table 2.1). The epistemological assumptions of this research involve a lessening of the distance between the researcher and the participants primarily through the interview process as well as with conversation and interaction outside the interview with the staff of the president. In the interactions with staff during this research, the staff often served as gatekeepers for the president and the
researcher needed to explain the purpose and the protocols of the research to the gatekeepers. In a number of cases the nature of these interactions helped to create a sense of the researcher and the value of the research to the staff. The staff indicated that they had conveyed this information to the president when they presented the request for participation in the research.

The process of these interactions with staff varied. At one school, for example, an instant positive rapport was set up and the staff immediately worked to put the interview on the president’s schedule, subject to the president’s approval. This positive rapport with the staff of this school was reinforced through multiple additional conversations and emails. At another school, it was necessary for the researcher to submit her CV, a copy of the dissertation prospectus, and details of the proposed interview, and then go through a number of interviews with the secretary of that university, who then presented the material to the president for approval. The secretary then conveyed the parameters stipulated by the president to the researcher and there was continued discussion and more interaction between the secretary of the university and the president prior to the president granting approval for participation in the study. In all cases there was a process through which the researcher and the nature of the research became known to the staff of the president and the presidents themselves.

The research process involved both initial interviews and follow-up questions. For purposes of consistency all initial interviews and follow-up questions took place in the same type of setting and used the same type of format where possible. In all cases the interview questions were submitted in advance. The initial interviews were all face-to-
face interviews that took place within the presidents’ offices at their schools. The format of the interviews had consistency in terms of the basic interview questions. However, due to theoretical sampling, the questions changed slightly as the interviews progressed, such that some additional questions were added that had not been put forth to the initial participant. For the sake of consistency these additional questions were asked of the initial participant in the follow-up questions, to ensure that all presidents were asked the same questions. The one exception was the final interview participant who initially put forth a different time frame necessitating a shortening of the interview protocol. During the interview, the time frame was extended and matched that of the other presidents in length, but the order of some of the questions was changed and not all the questions were asked. As part of the consent for this interview, it was not possible to go back and ask this final participant the follow-up questions. However, the nature of the participant’s answers were so clear and detailed that the lack of follow-up questions did not negatively impact the nature of this participant’s contribution to the study overall.

The follow-up questions were asked through a combination of phone interview and email. There was already a lessening of the distance between the researcher and the participant through the interaction in the initial face-to-face interview to the degree that the use of these non-face-to-face methods did not detract from the nature of the responses. All interview questions and interactions as well as follow-up questions were structured to preclude framing. An example of the effort to preclude framing is demonstrated in the letter introducing the follow-up questions (see Appendix A). In this
letter the presidents were asked to address more general questions first and not to read ahead to the more specific questions that might frame their initial answers.

In addition to the research conducted with the presidents, there was time spent by the researcher in getting additional data through a number of methods that included interacting with the staff of the presidents, spending time before and after the interviews at the schools observing the environment, and in some cases perusal of the websites of the schools. However, it is worth noting that there was not extensive perusal of the websites in order to preclude any sense of framing for the researcher. The specific nature of the observations conducted at the schools included looking at multiple aspects of the schools and elements of the culture that were apparent from surface observation, such as symbols, artifacts, and the nature of observed interactions of staff and students.

The actual observation process had some variations. In one school a member of the president’s staff volunteered to provide a tour of the school, which took place after the initial observation phase done by the researcher. In some cases the observations were recorded through handwritten memos and in others through tape recording observations while they were occurring. The purpose of these observations conducted outside the interview included increasing a sense of comfort and trust between the researcher and participants through demonstrating an effort at thoroughness in the research process, gaining greater understanding of the natural environment and context of each of the participants, and providing additional data for triangulation.

The nature of the interviews varied slightly due to time and schedule constraints, and other logistical factors such as a brief interruption that occurred during one interview.
However, there was an overall consistency in the formal distance between the researcher and the participants in the interview setting. A key element that served to lessen the elements of distance between the researcher and the participants was the exploration of the thematic issue of “sameness” that occurred during each interview and that will be explained in detail in chapters 4 and 5.

According to Creswell (2007), axiological assumptions have to do with the role of values in a study, including the degree to which the study is value-laden and has inherent biases due to both researcher and participant interpretations and frameworks. The axiological assumptions within this study involved an intentional positioning of the researcher into the research in the following manner. The researcher acknowledged the potential for bias on her part in terms of variables such as personal values, perspectives, and experience. In addition, the researcher attempted to surface and to acknowledge her own values and biases around the research topic throughout the research process. This effort took several forms that included self-reflection with specific activities such as using a journal or using a memo-writing process whereby the researcher tried to make her own biases explicit; discussions with members of the researcher’s dissertation committee; and discussions with mentors and fellow students during the research process that included issues of potential bias.

An example of this type of discussion occurred between the researcher and two members of the committee prior to the dissertation proposal defense. The researcher had initially intended to do a study that included only one gender, that of male presidents, in order to limit gender variables relative to the exploration of factors that were involved in
successful dyadic partnership. The researcher initially believed this would lead to a purer study with more accurate representation of the factors. But there was strong disagreement from the committee, who believed that this was an implicit form of potential bias and that the study must be inclusive of gender as a potential influencing factor relative to other factors. Through the process of discussion, the researcher realized the nature of the bias and changed the scope of the study accordingly to include both male and female genders.

This type of surfacing characterized each step of the dissertation research including the data analysis and writing of the dissertation itself. The result was that throughout the study, the researcher made every effort to minimize the impact of her own values and perspectives on the research process. Thus, the researcher focused on providing an objective and neutral mental and physical environment for the research where possible. Suddaby (2006) describes the specifics of such a process relative to a grounded theory approach as follows:

…in grounded theory, researchers must account for their positions in the research process. That is, they must engage in ongoing self-reflection to ensure that they take personal biases, world-views, and assumptions into account while collecting, interpreting, and analyzing data. (p. 640)

Creswell (2007) describes rhetoric relative to a study as the language of the research, including the style of writing as well as the use of specific vocabulary (p. 17, Table 2.1). The rhetoric of this research reinforces this focus on neutrality. The research involves the verbatim use of the words of the participants and provides these words in representative context. In keeping with the desired positioning described above, the
research rhetoric avoids the insertion of the researcher directly and thus does not use terms such as *I* unless necessary for context. Apart from the definition of the term *dyadic*, there are no actual definitions of terms such as *partnership* or *successful* posited upfront, but rather such definitions emerged from the study based upon the presidents’ own interpretations of these terms. In each case the study was presented to the presidents with only the term *dyadic partnership* defined as a partnership between two people. The only other stipulation presented to the presidents was that the partnerships being studied were work partnerships. The recommendation given by the researcher in this regard was that as the presidents chose the partnerships they wished to discuss, it was important that they consider working relationships within the workplace as opposed to partnerships involving a spouse or person outside the workplace. Within this context, in each case the presidents chose what they felt, according to their perceptions, were “successful,” *dyadic “partnerships.”* In keeping with the proposed goals of the research, there was no attempt made by the researcher to create an aggregated definition of these specific terms. Rather, the focus of the research was on exploring the themes that emerged as characteristic of or descriptive of the phenomenon taking place according to the perceptions of the presidents themselves. At the time of the writing of this dissertation, the researcher believed that creating such definitions would be limited and premature based upon the number of presidents interviewed to date. The researcher also believed that creating such definitions at this stage would be potentially biasing for the post-doctoral research that the researcher hopes to conduct through additional studies of more presidents.
The methodology involved an inductive-abductive, emerging process characterized by flexibility of design. There was planned openness for modifications and changes as the need became apparent during the research process. Such flexibility is a key element of the constructivist grounded theory approach that was used in the study. As stated by Charmaz (2008), “Constructivists reveal the significance of grounded theory as an emergent method: *The method does not stand outside the research process; it resides within it*” (p. 160).

The inductive nature of the methodology involved forming a hypothesis/theory based upon observations made during the research. This is in contrast to a deductive method that is derived from theory and incorporates understanding of findings relative to existing theoretical frameworks (McMillan, 2008). The abductive aspect of the approach involved a combination of both inductive and deductive approaches that helped to generate new ideas: “The notion of abduction has become incorporated into grounded theory as ‘analytic induction,’ the process by which a researcher moves between induction and deduction while practicing the constant comparative method” (Suddaby, p. 639).

The underlying paradigm or worldview that informs this study from the point of view of the researcher is that of social constructivism. This paradigm involves a focus on the social construct of meaning relative to the experiences and to the historical and cultural contexts of the participants. A key element of the research involves the participants’ perspectives and the researcher’s interpretation of these perspectives
(Creswell, 2007). The social constructivist paradigm impacts the nature of the research in several ways:

…the questions become broad and general so that the participants can construct the meaning of the situation…constructivist researchers often address the “processes” of interaction among individuals. They also focus on the historical and cultural settings of the participants. Researchers recognize that their own background shapes their interpretation, and they “position themselves” in the research to acknowledge how their interpretation flows from their own personal, cultural, and historical experiences. The researcher’s intent, then, is to make sense (or interpret) the meanings others have about the world…the constructivist worldview manifest(s) in…the grounded theory perspective of Charmaz (2006), in which she grounds her theoretical orientation in the views or perspectives of individuals. (Creswell, 2007, pp. 20–21)

With specific reference to this study, this constructivist world-view informed the research in that there was an emphasis on how the university and college presidents construct meaning around their perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships. As mentioned previously, there was also acknowledgement of the researcher’s understanding and construction of meaning during the research process. However, the primary focus was on the presidents’ views and their sense of their own experiences. The role of the researcher was to interpret the narrative of these presidents from the interviews and follow-up questions in such a way that any emergent theory was grounded in the presidents’ own perspectives.

**Research Approach: Grounded Theory**

As stated above, the specific form of qualitative research used for this study is grounded theory. Grounded theory involves the generation of a theory from the collection and analysis of data. As described by Strauss and Corbin (1990),
A grounded theory is one that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents. That is, it is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through a systematic data collection and analysis of the data pertaining to that phenomenon. Therefore, data collection, analysis, and theory stand in reciprocal relationship with each other. One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge. (p. 23)

The grounded theory approach is a good fit with this research because one of the key goals of the study is to generate a theory or model that is grounded in the data and that can be used to explain the phenomenon of successful dyadic presidential partnerships.

The development of grounded theory has involved an evolution of thought and approaches. Grounded theory originated with the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967) in the field of sociology. They believed that in contrast to the a priori, theoretical work done in sociology, there needed to be qualitative research that focused on creating theory based on the interactions and processes of the individuals involved (Creswell, 2007). A fundamental element of the grounded theory of Glaser and Strauss is the incorporation of constant comparison and theoretical sampling. With constant comparison, data are collected and then analyzed, such that the analysis can inform ongoing data collection. With theoretical sampling, “decisions about which data should be collected next are determined by the theory that is being constructed” (Suddaby, 2006, p. 634). Different viewpoints about the nature of grounded theory and its application develop over time. Strauss felt Glaser’s approach was too restrictive in terms of structure and went on to do work with Juliet Corbin (1990, 1998). Constructivist grounded theory developed out of the work of Charmaz (2006), who posited a less structured approach. This study
incorporates the constructivist approach of Charmaz, as opposed to the more systematic approach of scholars such as Glaser, Strauss, and Corbin.

The constructivist approach is better suited to this study because it allows for greater flexibility and adaptability and puts more emphasis on the views of participants than on using a strictly structured process (Creswell, 2007). This approach, for example, allows for greater flexibility in the interview procedures, while providing the opportunity for emergent research design as part of the research process. Such flexibility is necessary for this type of study due to the fact that the participants are university and college presidents who generally have very limited time and availability for participation in this type of research. An example of the benefit of this flexibility is with the participant who initially changed the time parameters of the interview process, necessitating changes in the protocol. Further examples of the need for flexibility in this study relative to the structures of the systematic approach include the difficulty of including the standard recommended number of participants, which can encompass 20 to 60, during the time frame of this study (Creswell, 2007); the difficulty in going back to the presidents for repeated interviews, given the busy nature of their schedules (Flick, 2009); or the difficulty of doing 25 interviews recommended to achieve “saturation” (Suddaby, 2006, p. 639).

Using a constructivist approach allowed the research to move beyond the strict structures of the systematic approach to adapt the methodology to the limitations of the research situation while still producing grounded theory. In addition, the constructivist approach allowed for the surfacing of the biases or frameworks that the researcher
brought to the study. This perspective is important to the integrity of the process for the researcher because it appears to deal most realistically with the actuality of the research situation. The researcher herself believes that it is impossible to remove researcher bias and framing completely and thus to acknowledge these aspects as integral to the process appears to be the most straightforward and honest approach. Charmaz (2008) describes this aspect of constructivist grounded theory as follows:

The most recent version of grounded theory, constructivist grounded theory…retains the original focus on emergence but does so in relation to the conditions of the research and the standpoints and interactions of the researchers. Thus the research product includes more than what the researcher learns in the field. Whether or not researchers are conscious of what they bring to the study or of the conditions under which they conduct it, constructivists contend that all become part of the research process and product. The constructivist position views research as an emergent product of particular times, social conditions, and interactional situations. Constructivists argue that researchers’ perspectives will direct their attention but not determine their research…Unlike the view held by Glaser that researchers can and should remove themselves from the influences of their disciplines and the condition of their research, constructivists aim to make these influences explicit. (p. 160)

Thus, the research design for this study incorporates a flexible, emergent process where the methodology itself is a part of the overall emergence characterizing the research. As already discussed, there was a strong emphasis on the part of the researcher on engaging in reflection and surfacing of her frameworks as part of the process, while acknowledging the embedded nature of such frameworks within the research itself. The use of grounded theory influenced data collection and analysis particularly due to the emphasis on practices such as constant comparison, theoretical sampling, interpretation, and coding. In addition, the use of constructivist grounded theory for this study impacted
the nature of the data collection and analysis because constructivist grounded theory has a distinctive perspective on such practices. These distinctions will be described in greater detail in the data analysis section.

An examination of the use of types of methodologies for similar research provides support for the use of grounded theory. There is a significant gap in the literature around the study of successful presidential dyadic partnerships in USHE. The closest study in subject matter to date appears to be the work of Bensimon and Neumann (1993), which focuses on models of leadership teams and teamwork in higher education. In their study they interview 15 university and college presidents and in some cases members of their teams. While they do not look at partnerships, they do look at larger team functioning. Their data are derived only from the interviews they conducted, not from observation of leadership. They use narrative and case examples from the interviews to show what good team leadership looks like. While they do not use a grounded theory methodology, they do use the interview data to generate ideas and principles for collegiate team leadership.

Grounded theory in a variety of forms has been used for studies in higher education (Clifton, 1982; Kalwant, 2008; Martinez, 2009; Mowbray & Halse, 2010), as well as in studies of leadership in higher education (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). In addition there are specific examples of grounded theory being used in studies of college and university presidents (Barrios Gutierrez, 2010; Kirkland, 1991). Of particular relevance for this study is Keith Cox’s (2005) work on leadership in green organizations that utilizes a combination of grounded theory with appreciative inquiry (AI) questions. Cox’s work provides a good example of the
combination of grounded theory and AI that informs the methodology for this present study.

**Data Collection**

The primary method of data collection was semi-structured interviews conducted individually and face-to-face with university and college presidents. There were also follow-up questions that were addressed through phone interview and email with the presidents. The data collection process involved a number of steps that were influenced to some degree by the need for adjustment as the methodological design process emerged. Within the context of flexibility that was built into the research design, it was possible to revisit certain aspects of the data collection where necessary. For example, in the process of constant comparison or theoretical sampling, it became clear that it was important to add to the basic interview questions. However, the flexibility of the process meant that subsequent to the initial interviews it was also possible to go back and make adjustments to the follow-up questions so that the added questions were also provided to the initial participants as well in order to ensure consistency. Within this context there were several steps that comprised the basic components of data collection. These steps are informed by Creswell (2007, p. 118), who describes data collection as a circle/series of interrelated activities that include the following:

- Locating site/individual
- Gaining access and making rapport
- Purposefully sampling
- Collecting data
Sample Selection

The first three steps that included locating the site or individual, gaining access, and purposeful sampling were impacted by the issue of availability. While it was hoped that those presidents who were approached to be in the study would be receptive, it was important to recognize that university and college presidents comprise a group of individuals who have busy schedules. They have significant limitations on their time for participation in activities outside of their professional responsibilities and thus it was understood by the researcher from the beginning of the study that the presidents who were approached might be unable to participate in the study due to time restrictions.

This was particularly the case in that the researcher did not contact presidents who were known to her in any way. She did not use any connections known to her or the presidents in securing the interviews. The process of approaching the presidents involved cold-calling their offices and speaking to secretaries, assistants, and other staff members in order to try to secure the interviews. One reason the researcher did not use connections to secure the interviews was that she did not want any bias influencing the participants. She was worried that if the presidents felt any pressure to participate due to being approached by someone they knew, this could influence their overall participation. She wanted, in effect, for the presidents who participated to do so because they truly wished to take part in the study, not because they felt pressured in any way. The
researcher went to considerable effort to make this point clear to the staff of the presidents upfront.

Ultimately, given the factors affecting participant availability, convenient sampling was used in selecting participants for the study. The sample size was determined by convenience, as well as concern for the integrity of the study. Based upon recommendations from the committee chair, the target number of five participants was selected as a good starting point that would allow for the complexities of grounded theory research to be approached with integrity of process. The reasoning behind the selection of this number was that it was deemed important to do enough interviews to provide representation of varying perspectives while at the same time not doing too many interviews. The concern with doing too many interviews was that it was considered important to allow time for the detailed analysis and follow-up questions involved in working towards saturation that are important for grounded theory protocol. Given the flexibility of the research design process, it was also possible to include the caveat that additional presidents would be interviewed if necessary. Within the context of convenient sampling, participants were chosen from institutions across the Carnegie classification sectors, with each of the five presidents representing a school from a different sector. For the sake of the study and to protect anonymity for the participants, the five presidents will be referred to throughout this study with alphabetical titles as follows: President A, President B, President C, President D, and President E.

As mentioned previously, the researcher initially had some reservations about including both genders in the study due to her wish to have some degree of sample
homogeneity in order to facilitate the discovery of the nature of phenomenon present in successful dyadic presidential partnerships, without interfering variables. However, after discussion with two of her committee members, the researcher acknowledged the validity of the position that if the sample was to be truly a convenient sample, then both genders should be included. Additionally, the researcher agreed with the committee members that female presidents in the academy should not necessarily be restricted from participation in the study based on their gender. The researcher was aware of her initial bias and once the decision was made to include both genders, the researcher worked to ensure that the initial bias did not influence her research as the study progressed.

The potential participants were identified through the convenient sampling process according to the category of school they represented within the Carnegie classification sectors. Thus, for example, an effort was made to ensure that each president selected came from a different type of school. The way this occurred in practice was that once a president from a certain type of school agreed to participate, no additional presidents from that category of school were approached. Additionally, in order to reduce bias as much as possible, the researcher tried to select schools that she did not know much about and with which she had not had any contact. She also tried to select schools where she had no prior knowledge of the president. This worked successfully with four of the five schools. For one of the schools, the researcher did have knowledge about the school but had no knowledge about the president of that school. However, she felt that it was important to include this fifth school as representative of one of the Carnegie sectors. The researcher had knowledge of many schools within this
sector and so she felt that it would be difficult to find a similar such school where there would be no bias whatsoever.

The contact information for the schools was obtained through going online to the college website and looking up the phone numbers for the presidents’ offices. The standard process that was used to contact potential participants involved the following steps:

1. The office of the president was contacted and the researcher made an effort to speak with the assistant to the president and explain the nature of the study. The request was made that the assistant let the president know about the study and if possible schedule a time for the interview.

2. A follow-up email request for an interview was mailed to the assistant with the request that they forward it to the president. Included in this email were the details of the study as well as the interview questions.

3. After the email was sent, a follow-up phone call was made to the assistant to see if the president had received the email and was open to participating. The researcher also asked if the assistant or president needed any additional information.

4. Following step 3, the protocols varied depending upon the responses. In some cases it was possible to set up the interview fairly easily and in some cases there were requests for additional information and a number of phone calls, conversations, and emails needed to actually confirm a scheduled time. For the schools where the president was not easily available, the researcher made several follow-up calls to see if any available interview times had opened up.
This protocol was used for several reasons: it minimized taking any of the president’s time upfront; it enlisted the support of the president’s assistant or secretary, who are the key people involved in contacting the president and often are the gatekeepers; and it provided all the information in written form, giving the president the opportunity to decide whether or not they were interested.

Collecting Data and Resolving Field Issues

The semi-structured interview process was informed by the appreciative inquiry (AI) approach, which uses positively premised open-ended questions. The AI approach developed out of the work of scholars such as Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) and focuses on the positives within a situation. However, the focus is not just on positives but also on learning. “What gives appreciative inquiry its strength is that it is a method of inquiry involving exploration, questioning and discovery” (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008, p. 220).

The AI approach to questions was used for several reasons: this is a potentially sensitive or personal topic area and the AI approach allows for a delicate handling of the topic in a way that is ethical; the AI approach reinforces a positive framework that encourages participants to be open and candid in their responses so ultimately both the positive and the negative will emerge; the AI approach would potentially leave participants with a positive sense of the interview experience and thus greater receptivity to follow-up questions. In addition, the use of the AI approach is consistent with the overall social constructivist assumptions underlying the study and allows surfacing of
perspectives that can inform the positive storytelling and narrative of individual and organizational constructs.

In essence the models and processes of appreciation are very postmodern. They are based on a social constructivist assumption: the reality that exists in a given moment or situation is created by the individual and organization in that moment or situation. “Organizations can be characterized as a series of concurrent and sequential conversations between people. These conversations (oral and written) may lead to the purchase or distribution of goods or to the initiation of machine-based production processes. However, the goods and machines are parts of the organization, whereas conversations are the essence of the organization” (Whitney & Cooperrider, 2006). An appreciative perspective enables members of an organization to be intentional in their choice of conversations and in the stories they construct about their organization—its strengths, hopes, and future. Our colleges and universities certainly need to have such conversations and tell such stories as they confront the daunting challenges of the twenty-first century. (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008, p. 220)

AI interviewing involves a certain basic protocol where a positive frame is introduced using a lead-in prior to the beginning of the questions. As delineated in The Appreciative Inquiry Summit (Ludema, Whitney, Mohr, & Griffin, 2003), “Well-written appreciative inquiry questions stimulate reflection and learning from experience and bring out the best of people and organization…The Final Interview Guide has three parts to it: opening questions, affirmative topic questions and closing questions” (pp. 103–104). Examples of AI questions that were used for the interviews are contained within Appendix B.

The researcher received mentoring from Dr. Jim Ludema of Benedictine University in the AI interview process through a pilot interview prior to the commencement of the actual interviews. Two additional pilot interviews were also
conducted with other participants. In response to emailed questions, Dr. Ron Fry of Case Western University said that no special data analysis approach is necessary when using AI questions and interview protocols. The interviews were based upon the outlined AI questions with additional questions being asked during the individual interview, depending upon the flow of the interview.

For example, there were follow-up questions asked within each individual interview that were based on varying responses from the participants and which thus differed across the interviews. A specific example of this is that one participant placed great emphasis on the theme of learning throughout the interview. At the end of the interview when the participants ranked factors numerically according to specific themes, the researcher also added the theme of “learning” for this individual participant. As an aspect of theoretical sampling, the specific open-ended research questions were also modified in nature as the research progressed in an emergent fashion.

After the data analysis was conducted following the initial round of interviews, it was deemed necessary by the researcher to go back to the participants for further exploration of the findings that were emerging from the data, consistent with the grounded theory approach. It had been made clear in the initial process with President E that he would not be available for further questions beyond the one interview; thus in keeping within the parameters established by President E, he was not approached for follow-up participation beyond the first interview. Presidents A, B, C, and D were all emailed the follow-up questions that were created by the researcher based upon what had emerged in the initial interviews. All the participants were mailed the same questions
with the exception of some additional questions. In the first round interview process some questions were added between the first and last participant interviews based upon theoretical sampling. Therefore the presidents who were interviewed first in the process did not get a chance to address these added questions. The second round gave the researcher the opportunity to go back and add these additional questions for those presidents who had not had a chance to answer them in the first round. This was an attempt to make sure that all the participants were asked all the same base line questions.

All five of the presidents responded to the second-round questions in different ways. President D sent back all the questions with detailed answers. President B requested a shortened version and answered those questions. Presidents A and C requested that the second round be conducted as phone interviews so their answers were recorded during the phone interviews and then transcribed. Each phone interview took approximately one hour and the presidents answered the questions in great detail. In the interests of time, redundant questions for these presidents were removed. For example, President C spoke at length about idealism in his first interview so less time was spent on this in his second interview and more time was spent on topic areas he had not addressed in depth.

After additional analysis of the second round data, it became apparent to the researcher that it was important to go back to President D for a third round interview. Due to cultural differences, some of her answers seemed very different from those of the other participants and the researcher felt it was important to clarify and make sure that she (the researcher) had understood what President D had said in the first and second
rounds. A third round interview was conducted with President D on the phone and she clarified her responses from earlier rounds and her responses were consistent.

**Recording, Transcribing and Storing Data**

Data were recorded using two digital tape recorders with a manual tape recorder for backup. While it had been recommended for this study that an additional person take notes during the interviews, the researcher felt that this would be logistically difficult. To aim for consistency, it would need to be the same person taking notes, and this was not logistically feasible, particularly given the potential distance involved in going to some of the face-to-face interviews. Additionally, the researcher felt that having an additional person in the room could be inhibiting for both the researcher and the participants during the interviews. Such inhibition could involve both the researcher and the participant feeling they were being observed and thus not acting as naturally as they would without a third party present. Therefore the recording only took place using tape recorders.

Videotaping was initially considered but was not used after the response from the first two presidents who preferred not to be videotaped. There was concern that having a video camera running for the other interviews would introduce a different dynamic into the interview process that would threaten the overall consistency of the protocol and the nature of the data obtained across all the interviews. There was also concern that the negative reaction of the presidents to the request for videotaping could impact the interview process itself, through creating a feeling of defensiveness on the part of the presidents. This was a concern because the presidents who gave a negative response had been informed in the consent form that videotaping was a possibility but they still felt
negatively about it at the time of the actual interview. One president in particular commented about it in terms that made it clear to the researcher that the potential benefits of videotaping were far overshadowed by the potential negative effects of the requests to the presidents.

The transcription process was comprehensive and transparent. It is important to acknowledge that transcription can be an interpretive process. As described by Nagy Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2010),

Transcribing research data is interactive and engages the researcher in the process of deep listening, analysis and interpretation. Transcription is not a passive act but instead provides the researcher with a valuable opportunity to actively engage with his or her research material from the beginning of data collection. It also ensures that researchers are aware of their own impact on the data. (p. 304)

In this study the researcher tried to be as transparent as possible with the data transcription process. She informed the presidents at the beginning of the interviews that she would personally be transcribing the tape recordings for purposes of gaining increased familiarity with the data, having control over insuring accuracy in the transcription itself through repeated checking, and also ensuring the privacy and confidentiality of the data. All data for this project have been stored in secure places within the researcher’s home on both multiple computers and on a back-up hard drive and have also been stored as hard copies.

A secondary method of data collection involved the use of field notes, journaling, memos, and notes on observations on the part of the researcher. This secondary data collection is in the form of written files and tape recordings. The written files are either
handwritten or computer generated. Field notes consist of notes written by the researcher immediately before and after the interview and after other interactions with the participants. Field notes encompass observations made about the campus and culture of the institution as well as interactions with people on the campus and the interview itself. As discussed previously, journaling had been used as a means of self-reflection and as a way for the researcher to surface potential biases or frames throughout the research process. Journaling was also used as a means of providing context for the data and the research process.

Memo writing took place as a part of both data collection and analysis and included a number of topics such as notes about the data, ideas about analysis, diagrams, and coding. While some of these memos are in the form of written pages and computer files, some are also in the form of Post-it-Notes. Charmaz (2008) describes the creation and protocols of such memo writing for both data collection and analysis as an important element in grounded theory research:

Memo writing is about capturing ideas in process and in progress. Successive memos on the same category trace its development as the researcher gathers more data to illuminate the category and probe deeper into its analysis…Through this writing, the grounded theorist’s ideas emerge as discoveries unfold…Several guidelines are important for grounded theory memos: (1) title the memos for easy sorting and storage; (2) write memos throughout the entire research process; (3) define the code or category by its properties found in the data; (4) delineate the conditions under which the code or category emerges, is maintained, and changes; (5) compare the code or category with other codes and categories; (6) include the data from which the code or category is derived; (7) outline the consequences of the code or category; (8) note gaps in the data and conjectures about it. (p. 166)
Thus, while memo writing can be an important part of grounded theory procedure (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), the use of memos in this study was also an element of data collection in its own right. This process was helpful in providing important context and a means of triangulation. Constant comparison and theoretical sampling were used during the data collection process and are discussed in greater detail in the following section on data analysis.

**Data Analysis**

Grounded theory data analysis is based on an iterative process of constant comparison and theoretical sampling that occurs after the development of tentative categories. The analysis can help to facilitate the nature of emergence within the study and ultimately the emergence of theory that is grounded in the data. As described by Charmaz (2008), “Two defining properties of the grounded theory method create the conditions for emergent inquiry: (1) the systematic, active scrutiny of data and (2) the successive development and checking of categories” (p. 161). These elements were a foundational aspect of the data analysis for this study. With each interview conducted with a university or college president, there was an analysis of the interview and then adjustments made towards theoretical sampling for the next interview based on this initial analysis. Additionally, theoretical sampling based upon emergent categories, derived from extensive coding and analysis of the initial interview data and directed the nature and content of the follow-up questions.

Theoretical saturation consisting of approximately 25 interviews and follow-up interviews was not a part of this study. This level of repeatedly going back to the
participants, which is a grounded theory practice whereby interviews continue until no new themes emerge, was not feasible due to the limited availability of the participants given their busy schedules. However, there was a process of working towards a degree of saturation through analysis and coding of the initial data and the follow-up questions to the point whereby there were no new emergent themes apparent regarding the presidents’ initial perceptions of the phenomenon. If it had been possible to go back to the participants with questions about the nature of the interactivity of the themes, that would have been helpful and is certainly recommended as an aspect for future research as described in chapter 6.

The use of grounded theory also impacted the nature of the coding process that in the systematic approach includes open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. According to Charmaz (2008) there are key differences in the grounded theory approach to coding.

Most qualitative researchers code for themes and topics rather than actions and analytic possibilities. From the very beginning, coding for actions and theoretical potential distinguishes the grounded theory method and likely its product…Researchers conduct initial grounded theory coding by comparing incidents or by coding word by word, line by line, or paragraph by paragraph…Coding with gerunds, that is noun forms of verbs, such as revealing, defining, feeling or wanting helps to define what is happening in a fragment of data or a description of an incident. Gerunds enable grounded theorists to see implicit processes, to make connections between codes, and to keep their analyses active and emergent. (pp. 163–164)

While the emphasis within this study had an analytic orientation and emphasized making connections between codes and facilitation of emergence, there was a slight departure from the emphasis on the use of gerunds. There was a process of coding that included
specifically using gerunds but this round of coding was one of the last rounds undertaken in order to avoid potential bias or framing through gerund use. The researcher felt that using gerunds could be a form of bias that is imposed upon the data. In the same way that Charmaz (2008) criticizes the coding approach of Glaser, and Strauss and Corbin, stating that “Each of their respective approaches encourages researchers to force their data into extant categories” (p. 161), for this reason the researcher believed that forcing the use of gerunds could be forcing an action bias that might not exist in the research.

Thus, for this study the coding involved both initial coding with the words that naturally emerged from the data as well as additional coding of the same material using gerunds. The specific details of content analysis and coding for this study were iterative and included the following elements of open, axial, and selective coding.

**Open Coding**

For open coding, the data from the interviews were reviewed line by line in a process of conceptualizing. Strauss and Corbin (1990) describe this process:

…conceptualizing our data becomes the first step in analysis. By breaking down and conceptualizing we mean taking apart an observation, a sentence, a paragraph, and giving each discrete incident, idea, or event, a name, something that stands for or represents a phenomenon. Just how do we do this? We ask questions about each one, like: What is this? What does it represent? We compare incident with incident as we go along so that similar phenomenon can be given the same name. (p. 63)

This idea of both comparing and asking questions is the basis of the constant comparative method and was fundamental to the coding process in this study. Charmaz
also emphasizes the use of questions and recommends several specific questions that could help in open coding and that were used in this study. The questions are as follows:

- What is going on?
- What are people doing?
- What is the person saying?
- What do these actions and statements take for granted?
- How do structure and context serve to support, maintain, impede, or change these actions and statements? (Charmaz, 2004, p. 507; see also Morse et al., 2009; cited in Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010, p. 308)

Within this context of overall questions, the specific types of coding that were done within the open coding process conformed to methods put forth by Saldana (2009) for first cycle coding. There were multiple rounds of coding and then re-coding to work towards as deep and unbiased an exploration of the data as possible. These rounds of coding began at the level of line-by-line coding and then moved to larger blocks of text. The repeated rounds of the coding process took place in order to achieve a fresh perspective by going back and re-doing a specific type of coding without looking at the original coding results. To achieve this goal, the researcher waited at least several days between repeated coding of the same text and covered up the previous coding results so that each process was as fresh and unbiased as possible. The specific types of codes included magnitude coding, simultaneous coding, structural coding, descriptive coding, in vivo coding, and process coding. Saldana (2009) describes these different types of codes as follows:
**Magnitude Coding**

Magnitude coding indicates “…intensity, frequency, direction, presence, or evaluative content” (p. 58). Magnitude coding was used in this study to indicate the degree of intensity of tone in the responses as well as the degrees of disparity for the ranked themes. For the ranked themes, the degree of disparity was indicated by either a “D” for large degree or a “d” for small degree.

**Simultaneous Coding**

Simultaneous coding is the application of two or more different codes to a single qualitative datum, or the overlapped occurrence of two or more codes applied to sequential units of qualitative data…Simultaneous coding is appropriate when the data’s content suggests multiple meanings that necessitate or justify more than one code… (p. 62).

This type of coding was important for this study, particularly as it became apparent through multiple rounds of coding that emergent themes had differing meanings and often manifested simultaneously, such as independent themes, themes that were inter-related and inter-connected, and themes that were subsets of other themes. An example of simultaneous coding from the coding transcript of the interview with President A included complementary strengths, tapping expertise, valuing experience, and complementary, symbiotic relationship.

**Structural Coding**

Structural coding applies a content-based or conceptual phrase representing a topic of inquiry to a segment of data that relates to a specific research question used to frame the interview….The similarly coded segments are then collected together for more detailed coding and analysis. (p. 66).
Structural coding was conducted with the purpose of trying to answer the fundamental research question of what was the phenomenon that was occurring within these successful partnerships. An example of this structural coding from the coding transcript of the interview with President B has to do with the emergent theme of the nature of the role itself and includes the following codes: the role, isolation of the role, role as lifestyle, role as first partnership, and role as decision-maker.

Descriptive Coding

“Descriptive coding summarizes in a word or short phrase—most often as a noun—the basic topic of a passage of qualitative data” (p. 70). An example of this type of code from pages seven through nine of the coding transcript of the interview with President C includes the following words: history, idealism, inspiration, global impact.

In Vivo Coding

In vivo coding “…refers to a word or short phrase from the actual language found in the qualitative data record, ‘the terms used by [participants] themselves’ (Strauss 1987, p. 33)….Vivo coding is one of the methods to employ during grounded theory’s Initial coding” (p. 74). In vivo coding was one of the first methods of coding used in this study. It was used by the researcher to emphasize the power and authenticity of the participants’ own words and vocabulary. It was also used in order to stay grounded in the participants’ ways of framing and verbalizing their narratives and perceptions. The in vivo codes became important basic units in axial coding and the construction of thematic categories in later stages of coding. Examples of in vivo codes from the coding transcript of the interview with President D include the following:
“…I care about their families”
“…a generous, caring community”
“…not a job I do alone”
“…I have never not told someone the truth”
“…trust is reliability over time”

Process Coding

Process coding uses gerunds…exclusively to connote action in the data…Process coding is appropriate for all qualitative studies, but particularly for those that search for ongoing action/interaction/emotion taken in response to situations…Process coding happens simultaneously with Initial Coding and Axial Coding and a search for consequences of action/interaction is also part of the process. (p. 77)

In this study the process coding that involved use of gerunds did take place simultaneously with other coding across initial/open coding and axial coding. However, as mentioned previously, the use of gerunds in such coding took place in later stages of coding to avoid any bias or framing around action in the very first stages of coding. It is also important to note that this type of coding was employed the least. It was not used very much because of the researcher’s concerns about precluding action-bias and any framing. An example of such process coding taken from pages three and four of the coding transcript of the interview with President E includes the following codes: getting a lot done; working together; engaging; leading; demanding; driving; getting roles right; developing intuition; communicating; developing trust; working out difficulties; appointing; developing relationships; working different aspects together; working closely
together; utilizing best capacity and position; developing understanding; adding value; being effective; playing different roles; becoming a partner; being fluid together.

These initial open-coding processes took place both separately and in a mix or match aggregated method as described by Saldana (2009, p. 51). A key point is that there was an iteration and constant comparison taking place between the codes for the individual presidents. Thus there was a referring to the presence or absence of certain codes within the same interview transcript and to the way in which these codes related to each other. There was also the same comparison and iteration between and across the interviews with the different presidents. This iteration took place in the words of the actual codes and in the analytic memos that were written both during and after the coding. Some examples of this iteration and constant comparison as taken from the different transcripts and from the analytic memos are shown below and include excerpts from notes the researcher wrote to herself to follow-up on the comparisons and iterative process through further coding or additional questions to the presidents. The voice of the researcher is also present in the memos, in particular in her self-reflection and positioning in the process. These examples include the following:

- “The idealism, sense of mission…Fit with his wanting to work towards greater good” [note: underlining “Fit” shows magnitude]
- “Key use of the term/idea of ‘relationships.’ It’s non-emotive and different from usage by Presidents B and D and more similar to usage of the term by President A.”
- “In terms of the dyad then being integrated into something larger, how does this work with President D compared to emergent theme from President E?”
• “For Presidents A and E the idea of the team is key. Need to check this out with the others…”

• “Relationship between time and trust—need to follow up on this. For B, C, and maybe D—time is a definite factor—and it is implied with A also—so need to follow up on this.”

• “Hard work is an idea that emerges over and over—that the presidents feel they work hard, probably harder than others and that they also model the behavior. Do they feel they do more of the work in the partnership and in sustaining the partnership or is it balanced?”

• “Sense of humor emerges—as with other presidents—A.”

• “The idea of the role and roles keeps emerging. There is no control in the role, the need to define and clarify parameters and who does what.”

• “Horizontality does not really exist in these relationships for any of the presidents—it’s really has to do with facilitating truth-telling in communication. There is always the caveat that yes it’s horizontal, ‘but.’ Suggestion that this is a vertical power and role relationship with a horizontal communication matrix—develop diagram.”

• “…what to do with differential relationships between categories—such that variability in relationships between categories and sub-categories can be understood. For example, communication and trust relate differently or not as strongly, or not in the same way across the five interviews.”

• “B, C, A all mention needing to be able to work with people you don’t get along with and don’t trust (C). It’s interesting in that the presidents clearly have many types of partnerships but there are a lot of positives associated with the key ones.”

• “So, in this interview was I demonstrating sameness? Did I sense at some level that it mattered a lot?”

Axial Coding

Axial coding within this study involved a higher level of analysis than initial/open coding and entailed looking for categories based upon the open coding. Key differentiating factors in axial coding included relating categories and subcategories as
well as ideas of context, strategies, and consequences. Strauss and Corbin (1990) describe this process in terms of making connections:

Open coding…fractures the data and allows one to identify some categories, their properties, and dimensional locations. Axial coding puts those data back together in new ways by making connections between a category and its sub-categories. In other words, we are still concerned with the development of a category, but development beyond properties and dimensions. In axial coding our focus is on specifying a category (phenomenon) in terms of the conditions that give rise to it; the context (its specific set of properties) in which it is embedded; the action/interactional strategies by which it is handled, managed, carried out; and the consequences of those strategies. These specifying features of a category give it precision, thus we refer to them as subcategories. In essence, they too are categories, but because we relate them to a category in some form of relationships we add the prefix “sub.” (p. 97)

A key element in the process of axial coding was the looking for similarities and differences between and among categories and involved both inductive and deductive thinking. The specific process involved deductively proposing a relationship or category and then inductively comparing the data to see if the proposed relationship is verified. The steps involved in axial coding were complex in that they included coding for initial categories, re-coding for categories several times to ensure deep exploration; comparing the categories between sets of presidents and across all presidents; and trying to determine that categories were in fact specifying features of other categories and that they were independent categories. This process was complicated by the fact that initially categories appeared to differ relative to the features of context, strategies, and consequences.

Additionally, in some instances a distinct category could also end up as a sub-category for another category, and the nature of these sub-categories differed across
presidents. An example of this complexity is the categories of communication, trust, and truth-telling as manifested in the data for President B. For the first three or four rounds of axial coding, it appeared as if trust was the primary category, and communication and truth-telling were sub-categories of trust. In fact, additional coding and deductive and inductive analysis indicated that communication and trust were separate categories and truth-telling was a sub-category of both. The initial rounds of axial coding resulted in approximately 20 to 30 initial categories for each of the presidents. These categories were then narrowed down into approximately 10 categories per president with additional sub-categories. An illustration of this process with President D includes an overview of these steps showing the initial categories and the development and movement into final categories that resulted from intensive additional coding and analysis:

President D initial categories (not in order of salience):

Love, Sameness, Connection, Religious, Community, Core Values, Challenges, Longevity, Positive words, Emotive words, Stages of development, Relationship, Family, Knowing others, Sense/gut/intuition, Roles, Common mission, Learning, Trust, Truth-telling, Woman/Man, Caring, The Heart, Complementary Strengths (implied), Horizontality, Works hard

Some shifts that occurred through constant comparison and re-coding:

1. Separation out of words and tone into a different aspect of analysis, such that the words and tone support categories but are not in themselves a category.

   Additionally, the words and tones are comparative elements across all the presidents and resulted in key differences around gender.

2. Development of idea of woman/man into category of gender—comparison with analysis of data from other presidents reinforced this category

3. Separation out of the category of the heart as a category in and of itself, not only a sub-category
4. Recognition of the complexity around horizontality—that in fact for this and all the presidents, the horizontality often manifested most clearly in communication. So it becomes a sub-category of communication.

President D categories and sub-categories in final rounds of axial coding, prior to analysis of answers to follow up questions—the categories are listed in order of salience (with * indicating sub-categories):

Sameness
*connection, religious, core values, relationship, community, sense/gut/intuition

Community
*caring, love, the heart, longevity, family, interdependence

Relationships
*sameness, trust, valuing people, community, extrapolation outwards of dyad, family

The heart
*caring, love, leading, relating, valuing people, hiring, making decisions from head and heart, speaking from head and heart

Learning
*learning from challenges, life-long learner, learns what is necessary for job, learns from everyone, works hard at learning

Challenges/overcoming challenges/learning from challenges
*learning, hard work, determination, flexibility

The role
*works hard, longevity, caring, models behavior, symbol, multiple roles

Common vision/mission
*relationships

Intuition
*connection, sameness, knowing others, trust

Trust
*sameness, intuition, reliability over time
Communication
  *directness, honesty, truth-telling

Additional sub-themes that are sufficiently salient to merit notice as separate categories while also serving as sub-categories as indicated above:

*Gender (prevalent sub-theme)

*Longevity (prevalent sub-theme—related to the role, time at institution, time in the partnership)

*Religious element (indirect, sub-theme, evident in language and orientation)

*Hard work and determination—implicit

Additional information supplied by the follow-up questions allowed for further modifications of these categories.

**Selective Coding**

The final level of coding was selective coding that involved the highest form of analysis in the overall process in that it pulled together the generated categories to create a core category and hypothesis that was the central phenomenon of the study. This provided the basis for creating a theory grounded in the data. This process involved the need for the researcher to constantly re-think and re-visit the initial coding and analysis. As ideas for pulling together the categories were generated, it was necessary to test them by looking at the data again using these new lenses. An example of this was the category of trust. Initially it looked as if trust was the central phenomenon and all the other categories were in fact pulled together into this core category. However, the second and third rounds of analysis did not support this completely. Finally, after much further
analysis it became apparent that, in fact, the core category and basis for hypothesis was the interrelationship of all the other categories. The emergent idea ultimately was that there is no single category based upon themes within these partnerships; rather it has to do with the ways that all the elements are connected and work together in support of the partnership.

It is important to note that interpretation by the researcher was a key component of the data analysis. There was a concerted effort to think about and work with the data relative to the grounded theory protocols so that there was creativity in the process and not just application of specific steps. Suddaby (2006) advocates such creativity and interpretation as key to successful grounded theory. He states,

The key issue to remember here is that grounded theory is an interpretive process...the researcher is considered to be an active element of the research process, and the act of research has a creative component that cannot be delegated to an algorithm...Successful grounded theory has a clear creative component. (p. 638)

It is also important to note that the researcher’s dissertation committee provided constructive feedback and advice throughout this coding and analysis. An example of this support is the advice of the director of the committee who recommended going back for yet another iteration of coding after a number of rounds had already been completed. The director’s advice was productive in that it was through going back for yet further coding that the researcher realized the nature of some of her bias that was interfering with the process. This bias is discussed below.
Challenges and Benefits of the Coding Process

A key challenge during the coding process had to do with framing and bias on the researcher’s part relative to the Gallup themes. The substantiation of these themes was never a key goal of the study. However, the nature of whether the themes emerged and how they emerged were certainly an element of the study that was being explored, secondary to the emergent themes. The research questions never addressed the Gallup themes except at the end of the interview where the participants were asked to rank their importance to the partnerships. However, it was difficult for the researcher to move away from the Gallup themes. Although she was not aware of it at first, they were a constant refrain in the background. This manifested, for example, in the researcher wondering during coding whether the codes would emerge in support of the Gallup themes or not. This also manifested in that to some degree the researcher was looking for these themes, almost at a sub-conscious level. The researcher became aware of her bias when going back on the advice of the dissertation chair for a fourth or fifth round of thematic coding. When she did this and consciously put the Gallup themes aside for several rounds of additional coding, new themes began to emerge. At this time the researcher realized that there had been some intrusive framing based on her awareness of the Gallup themes and subsequent bias. When she finally was able to code past this bias, she was able to get at the core phenomenon within the study.

An additional challenge had to do with the lack of inter-rater reliability in the coding aspect of the study. Due to the intensive concern for anonymity and privacy on the part of several of the participants, the researcher believed it was not in keeping with
the spirit of the integrity of the study to allow additional people to see the actual transcripts of the interviews. This was particularly problematic in that permission for inter-rater reliability was not asked for prior to the initial interviews nor was it presented during the IRB process after the proposal defense. Thus the researcher did not ask others to code the transcripts as a means of providing inter-rater reliability. However, the researcher did discuss the nature of her coding during each aspect of the process with her dissertation committee members. Throughout the process, the researcher was also diligent in checking with them about the ways in which she was coding overall.

A key benefit of the coding process had to do with the multiple types of coding that were utilized at the open/initial level. These provided more than one way of representing the data and analyzing the data. For example, the use of in vivo coding let the participants’ own words and phrasing emerge as foundational for the creation of further codes and categories, thus keeping the coding grounded in the data. In addition, the rigor of the coding, including repeated iterations of coding and constant comparison during the coding, worked to ensure that the ultimate themes and categories evolved organically as part of a systematic process.

**Error and Triangulation**

As described by Katzer, Cook, and Crouch (1998), error within social science research can derive from observation, communication, and interpretation, and the types of error can include both bias and noise—i.e., random variability. Within this context it is possible that some specific sources of bias relevant to this study involved the following:

- Researcher expectations
• The Hawthorne effect
• The selection process (pp. 57–61)

Mentioning these biases as possibilities is not saying that such biases absolutely did occur. Rather it is acknowledging the potential that the biases might have occurred. However, in several specific areas there was the definite occurrence of bias. The researcher expectations that are known to have initially biased the study had to do with the Gallup themes. Additional expectations that were potentially biasing included bias towards transformational leadership theory, bias towards initial oversimplification and reductionism in category creation for interactivity, and bias of the researcher in liking the presidents.

The Hawthorne effect, whereby the fact that the participants are being studied influences their behavior or attitudes so that they differ in some way from the norm, was a possible source of bias for this study. Because the researcher did not know these presidents and had never interacted with the presidents apart from the research process itself, it was difficult to ascertain whether or not this type of bias occurred.

The selection process was also a potential source of error in that mixing together presidents from across the Carnegie classifications might have provided a case of roles that were too divergent to provide a common basis for comparison in a study with a small number of participants. However, given the nature of the responses from the presidents, in conjunction with the extensive and deep analysis done on the data, it was apparent that there was sufficient commonality of experience and perception across the five presidents to provide a strong basis for comparison.
McMillan (2008) describes additional related areas of bias that include observer bias, the halo effect, leading questions, and interviewer effects (pp. 175–179). All of these could have been potential sources of bias in this study. For example, interviewer effects could have to do with different settings for the interview, different time constraints for the interviews, and the presence of the tape recorders.

Sources of noise for this study could have derived from differences among people and fuzzy criteria, whereby changes in procedures—such as differences between face-to-face and phone interviews or changes in the types of questions asked due to theoretical sampling—might produce differences that result in noise (Katzer, Cook, & Crouch 1998).

Another potential source of error was time pressures. Because of the relatively short time period allotted to complete the study, there was concern as to whether the researcher would be able to go into sufficient depth of analysis. However, the researcher determined that if the time were insufficient, she would extend the study to ensure that true rigor characterized the nature of the process and no short cuts were taken due to time pressures.

A further source of error could have resulted from the limitations of grounded theory research if the researcher were not able to work towards “saturation,” for example, or have iterative interview processes where the participants were interviewed more than once. However, the constructivist approach allowed the researcher to have the flexibility to achieve a degree of saturation whereby no additional themes emerged. Additionally, the gracious and supportive attitudes of the participants towards the research meant that the researcher was able to go back to them for follow-up questions as needed.
There was a potential source of error in not being able to structure the research protocol for this study to include inter-rater reliability. Confidentiality and anonymity were of great concern to some of the presidents, and the ability to ensure that the researcher would be the only one who transcribed or analyzed the interviews potentially helped the interviewer to facilitate the participation of the presidents who had these concerns. While inter-rater reliability would have potentially benefited this study, it was a difficult issue given the high-profile positions of the participants and their understandable desire to keep their responses confidential and to limit access to the data to only the researcher.

Given the multiple potential sources of error in this study, it was important to use triangulation to enhance the credibility of the research. As defined by McMillan (2008), triangulation “…is the use of different methods of gathering data…to compare different approaches to the same thing….,” (p. 296). In this case the use of memo-writing as a secondary means of data collection, as described previously, provided a basis for triangulation. The memos gave context and a different sense of observation than the data that were provided from the transcriptions of the interviews. For example, the memos when combined with the interviews gave a more complete picture of the data from more than one angle.

Another source of triangulation was the interactions and conversations with the staff of the presidents. They provided a sense of the president from an external source apart from the presidents and the researcher. An example of this was information that was freely volunteered by the staff member who gave the researcher a tour of one of the
schools prior to the interview. She told the story of how the president gave money from her own pocket to help a student to attend graduation. This same president spoke in the interview about how important it was to model the behavior and live the values. The fact that a third party had substantiated that the president actually did this, increased the credibility and reliability of the president’s words. An additional example is that one of the presidents was described repeatedly by different staff members as being “a very nice person.” When the researcher arrived at the school, even the receptionist spontaneously made the comment, “Oh, President X is such a nice person.” Later, in the interview the president commented on the importance of niceness in their leadership. The comments of the staff helped support the reliability of the president’s statements.

**Overall Limitations of the Study**

A specific element of limitation was the introduction of bias with the use of the AI approach, which has grounding in positivity. While this bias did potentially inform the interviews, the interview protocols were consistent and so any bias did manifest consistently across all the interviews. The potential for bias using AI questions was determined by the researcher and her committee as being not significant when compared with the potential benefits that could be realized through the use of the AI approach for this type of subject matter with these participants.

A real concern with this research was the extent to which the participants understand what they do within their successful partnerships. However, the focus of the research was on their perceptions of these partnerships, with the hope of surfacing emerging theories. Therefore the actual understanding or lack of understanding of the
participants did not turn out to have been significantly limiting since the emphasis was on perception and ontological relativism.

A related concern was whether it would be more representative of the actual phenomenon to have also interviewed the partners of the presidents to get their perceptions as well. While that is certainly a consideration for additional research, it was determined not to be directly relevant to the scope and proposed goals of this study, which focused on the presidents’ perceptions only. The perceptions of the partners would certainly be a potential point for additional research going forward and is discussed in greater detail in chapter 6.

Time pressure did create some logistical limitations to the study. The heavily scheduled nature of the presidents’ calendars meant that finding the time to be able to go back for the additional rounds of follow-up questions and interviews became problematic at times. For example, for one of the presidents there was the invitation to go back for the second round interview in his office at his college. While this face-to-face interview would potentially have provided richer data, the timing was such that it was difficult for the researcher to make the trip and so the interview was conducted via telephone.

Other potential limitations have been listed in the error and triangulation section above and include researcher bias, potential time constraints, the Hawthorne effect, lack of inter-rater reliability, and potential problems around selection due to the need for convenient sampling.
Chapter 4: Results

Overview

The data are organized into four sections for presentation in this chapter as follows:

Introduction and Context

This section deals with issues that provide context for the presentation of the data findings. These include initial issues of framing and reductionism, issues of complexity, and issues of variability and contradiction in the data. This section also provides a summary of the structure and format of the data presentation in subsequent sections.

Emergent Thematic Factors for Each President

This section provides a broad overview of the collective findings of the emergent thematic factors for all presidents in tabular form. This section also provides separate, detailed findings for each thematic factor for each president. These detailed findings are presented for each individual president in both written and tabular form. There is some minor comparison between individual presidents regarding aspects of thematic factors or word usage, but the primary emphasis of this section is on the presentation of detailed individual findings for each president.

Comparison of Factors

This section presents a summative comparison of the findings of thematic factors across presidents, including salient thematic factors, interactions of salient thematic
factors, and topics such as gender and leadership that may not be primary thematic factors but that are present in the data.

Findings of Disparity and Dissonance and Findings for the Gallup Themes Overall

This section presents findings of disparity and dissonance including disparity both within and across the interviews and with the rankings of the Gallup themes. This section also presents findings for the Gallup themes overall and their salience in the data.

**Introduction and Context**

There are a number of issues such as bias, framing, reductionism, and contradictions in the data that impact the findings. While these issues are discussed briefly in chapter 3, they are presented in greater detail in this chapter to provide context for the data findings. These issues include initial framing; bias and reductionism; subsequent bias and framing and reaching saturation; bias concerning leadership theory; and variability and contradiction in the data. Additionally, the way in which the data were analyzed is explained in greater detail to clarify decisions made by the researcher regarding the salience and primacy of the thematic factors.

**Initial Framing, Bias, and Reductionism**

The analysis of the data involved an iterative process that incorporated several stages. Such iteration allowed for surfacing by the researcher of her own bias and framing. In the initial stages, bias involved the presence or absence of the Gallup themes and more significantly the expectation that the thematic factors that were characteristic of the successful dyadic partnerships were in fact separate factors. Consistent with this bias, as thematic factors emerged they were automatically put into separate categories.
However, after detailed analysis and working towards saturation consistent with the grounded theory process, a key theme emerged: that the phenomenon of successful dyadic partnerships involves an interaction between the thematic factors. The thematic factors interact in ways that involve multiple layers of complexity and ambiguity characterized by a dynamic and fluid process.

**Initial Oversimplification and Reductionism in Creation and Categories**

There was an additional initial bias on the part of the researcher towards oversimplification and reductionism of the interaction between factors. This bias manifested in the researcher’s working to fit the data into created categories. Initially it appeared that the nature of the interactions between thematic factors could be comprehensively described in terms of the two distinct categories of interrelatedness and interconnectedness. These categories were created by the researcher as representative of the observed interactive processes between thematic categories. The distinctions made by the researcher between interrelatedness and interconnectedness were attempts to provide clarification in the tone, degree, and classification of the nature of the interaction between thematic factors. Within this context the researcher differentiated between interrelatedness and interconnection as follows: the *interrelatedness* of the factors referred to the ways in which they can be component aspects of one another while potentially also existing as independent factors in their own right. The *interconnectedness* of factors referred to the ways in which different factors are active and work together in a certain way in the partnership. This interconnectedness does not
refer to the way in which the factors might be aspects of one another, but rather the way in which they come together around an element of partnership.

These ideas of interconnectedness and interrelatedness can be illustrated using the thematic factor of trust, which is a salient thematic factor in the phenomenon of successful presidential dyadic partnerships. While trust exists as a separate factor, there are also ways in which trust is both interconnected with and interrelated to other thematic factors. Trust is interconnected with the thematic factor of communication in that the type of communication that takes place has a component of trust to it and manifests as trust being integral in the way that the partners communicate. This can be seen in the importance of the trustworthiness of the communication such that there is the need for the partner to be a truth-teller, and the need for the partner to be able to be loyal and trustworthy in communicating bad news. Yet trust is also interconnected in this regard as well. Trust can be connected to communication in these partnerships in that trust and communication work together to facilitate the president and their partner being able to engage in an interaction that supports partnership. An example of this interconnectedness is that the more the partners communicate with each other through direct, transparent communication, the more they trust each other. The more that they trust each other, the more open they can become in their communication. The act of trusting can facilitate communication. The act of communicating can also facilitate trusting.

However, as the researcher engaged in further analysis of the data relative to these categories, it became clear that the categories, while to some degree descriptive of what appeared to occur in the phenomenon, were not comprehensive. Rather, attempts by the
researcher to put the data into these categories became an overly reductionist and biased process. The data did not fit neatly into any such categories. The only representative statement that can be made at this time about the core phenomenon is that it is characterized by a level of complexity and ambiguity that is not easily reducible into discrete categories. Thus, while there are certainly elements of interrelatedness and interconnectedness with some of the key factors, this is just part of what appears to occur in the ways in which the factors are interactive. This example of bias and reductionism serves to highlight the actual complexity of the phenomenon and the need to address the phenomenon within a context of complexity. Thus, the researcher does not wish to force the data or findings from the data into neat categories and believes that it is premature and dangerous to try to do so. Rather, the researcher wishes to reinforce that there is definitely an interactive process occurring between the thematic factors but the nature of the interaction is as of yet difficult to define. Further research is recommended in this area and the recommendations are presented in chapter 6.

There is a caveat that with the presentation of the findings, there has been some characterization of the interactions within a limited scope. For example, there are some clear cases where some thematic factors exist independently but also as sub-themes or sub-categories of other factors. However, this is just one element of the ways in which these thematic factors interact and therefore the explanations that are provided should be viewed as occurring within an overall backdrop of complexity.
Findings of Later Bias and Framing and Reaching Saturation

At a final stage of the research process, after all interviews, transcriptions, coding, and analysis were completed, the researcher made a remark to her dissertation chair to the effect of, “There is a representative remark made by President ___ but I don’t want to include it because it makes them look bad.” Both the researcher and the dissertation chair saw this remark as a red flag indicating bias and framing on the part of the researcher. Through reflection and discussion, the researcher realized that after several rounds of interviews and follow-up questions that involved a level of personal interaction between the participants and the researcher, the researcher was losing objectivity to the point where it could negatively impact the research study. The researcher felt a genuine sense of liking and respect for each of the presidents and found herself wanting to portray them in a positive light. She realized that the more interviews and interactions she had with the presidents, the more she liked them. At this point she felt that she had reached saturation in terms of both the initial scope of the study and the protocols of constructivist grounded theory. No additional significant thematic factors were emerging apart from indications of a separate phenomenon of disparity and dissonance. This additional phenomenon, while potentially impacting the study, was not the specific focus of the study and could be viewed as an area for future research. The researcher believed she had also reached a point of saturation in terms of the nature of her feelings in the study and the way they were beginning to impact her ability to present her findings in some type of neutral fashion. The nature of these observations is discussed further in chapter 5 of this study. However, it is important to note that the researcher went back over her findings and tried
to remove any overtly positive bias in their presentation. She also made an effort to ensure that she presented all data and all findings regardless of how the presidents appeared as a result.

Findings of Bias Regarding Leadership Theory

In the initial review of the literature presented in chapter 2 of this study, there were two leadership theories that seemed to have potential relevance: transformational leadership theory and leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. Transformational theory seemed to have potential relevance because it focuses on the relationship and process that take place between leaders and followers. LMX theory seemed to have potential relevance because it looks at the interaction between leaders and followers in terms of a social exchange framework and is a key leadership theory for dyads and groups. During the process of reviewing the transcripts and texts from the interviews and follow-up questions, the researcher found that she was framing questions with a bias towards transformational leadership. For example, in the interview with President C, there was the following exchange that shows this bias:

President C: So when I talk about a partnership it’s beyond what you get out of it and what I get out of it, there also has to be in my mind some societal good, too.
Researcher: So an ideal partnership, so you’re putting a real ethical and sort of moral component to it, almost in terms of like authentic transformational leadership or something like that…Where there has to be a component of the good…
President C: Um hm [indicates he is listening but not necessarily agreeing]
Researcher: Or something to it in a partnership for it to be ideal
President C: Otherwise I can define a partnership as you and I getting together and deciding how we’re going to rob a bank. That doesn’t mean, I don’t, I don’t view that as an ideal partnership…
Researcher: But then there’s an element of synergy to the good, or is it transformation, I don’t want to put words in your mouth, I’m trying to understand.

President C: I don’t think it has to be transformational. I just think it has to serve the public good.

When listening to the tape and reviewing this transcript it became apparent to the researcher that she was trying to lead President C towards saying that the partnerships reflected an element of transformation that would be in keeping with the moral or authentic aspect of transformational leadership. Fortunately, the researcher did not ask such biased or leading questions throughout the majority of the research process. However, she did have a similar leading question with President D. Prior to asking about what gives life and vitality to the partnership, the researcher brought up the issue of transformative love, which appeared to frame President D’s answers as follows:

Researcher: What is the core factor that gives life and vitality to your dyadic partnership?

President D: I guess it’s that we love what we do, and we love each other and we have this common purpose that is transformative, ultimately, that it’s really, it’s not about me and it’s not about them, it’s about all of us together…

Researcher: Do you feel in like with Sonia or Walter, or, that there is a transformative synergy that occurs in the partnership? Has there been…

President D: Oh yeah.

Researcher: A sense of it being more than, like a moment that you can think of, or times when really you did feel it was more than the two of you, there was some…

President D: Absolutely…I mean, there’s just a, there’s a powerful energy that I think shapes who each one of us is and can become. And I would like to think that I contribute to their becoming better as much as they contribute to my becoming better.
This level of overt bias with leading questions and framing statements is not characteristic of the research process overall. However, it is important to surface this bias around leadership theory on the part of the researcher because it seemed to significantly impact the answers. With President D, the impact was that there was potential framing towards transformational terminology. For President C, while there was similar framing on the part of the researcher, President C pushed back and said the partnership was not about transformational leadership. It is thus difficult to conclude that transformational leadership is a type of leadership that the presidents overtly state is occurring in their partnerships, because the only times transformational leadership ideas were discussed in the interviews and follow-up questions were times that the researcher introduced aspects of the concept through her framing and leading questions. The one exception to this is with President D, who has a theological approach towards transformation, based upon love. This does not mean that there are not elements of transformational leadership in the partnerships themselves, but rather that the presidents did not present their perceptions using this leadership terminology.

There was no overt framing or bias on the part of the researcher concerning LMX theory. The only time ideas relative to this theory emerged happened when President B volunteered a response that seemed to refer to in-groups and outgroups in her follow-up questions. This did not occur as a result of framing. When she was asked directly about the nature of the dyad extrapolating outwards, she says in response,

Actually such partnerships can interfere with the group dynamic if you do not manage this relationship well. And from a work perspective, your
partner has to be transparently worthy of your special affection or she is perceived as your “blind spot.”

**Findings of Variability and Contradiction**

It is important to note upfront that there is variability and contradiction in the findings. The presentation of this variability and contradiction and the nature of its manifestation are part of the findings of the research. There is variability in both the interview protocols and in the data findings.

**Variability in the Interview Protocols**

As already mentioned in chapter 3, there is variability in the interview protocols in the questions asked across the interviews. One aspect of this variability has to do with the nature of the questions and the use of theoretical sampling. In the initial round of interviews, open-ended, semi-structured AI questions were used and thematic factors emerged. There was theoretical sampling in that adjustments were made and new questions were added throughout the first-round interviews as the interviews progressed across the five presidents. In the second round follow-up questions and interviews, the questions that had been added as part of theoretical sampling were also asked of those participants who had not been asked those questions due to being the first participants interviewed. This was done so that there was some consistency in the interview and question protocols. However, the variability in the subsequent round of interviews included using direct, sometimes close-ended questions as opposed to the open-ended questions of the first round; using questions that were not always AI questions; and using specific and individualized questions for specific presidents to seek clarification of
certain data points from their individual interviews. Thus, the follow-up questions differed from president to president.

All presidents were sent the same follow-up questions initially but there were subsequent modifications. For example, President B did not have time to answer all the follow-up questions and requested that a fewer number of questions be selected and sent. President D, on the other hand, answered all the emailed questions. It is possible that the variability in the questions also impacted the nature of potential variability in the responses so that presidents responded differently to different types of questions. The most extreme example of the nature of the questions potentially impacting the nature of the response is with the questions dealing with the Gallup rankings that are discussed later in this section.

There was variability in the structure and format of the interview for President E. He initially indicated limited time availability of a half-hour for the initial interview and no option for follow-up questions or interviews. None of the other presidents had any such restrictions. On the recommendation of her committee and additional external experts in qualitative doctoral research, the researcher conducted the interview with President E with limited availability, using a different interview format in which some of the six questions were eliminated in order to stay within the half-hour time frame. However, during the interview process, President E decided to extend the interview time and it ended up being similar in length to the minimum time spent with other presidents in their initial interview. However, the format was different for President E in that the order of the questions was different. For example, in order to preclude framing, the
ranking of the Gallup factors was designed to be at the end of the interview so that mentioning the Gallup factors would not influence the presidents’ thinking. For President E, the Gallup factors were ranked at the end of 30 minutes according to the initially agreed time limit, and then the interview was extended by President E. However, the nature of the subsequent answers made by President E does not indicate any differences or biases relative to the Gallup factors being discussed in the middle of the interview. For example, in the second part of this interview President E discussed the nature of conflict resolution in the partnership. Further examination of the inclusion of President E in this study is presented in chapter 5.

There is also variability with the nature of the content for President C when compared with the other presidents. He did discuss his dyadic partnerships in detail; however, he also emphasized the role of his wife as a key dyadic partner. Both of the work-related dyadic partnerships discussed by President C were with partners who were outside his college. Although the focus of the interview was supposed to be on dyadic partnerships in work relationships, President C gave many examples that reference his relationship or partnership with his wife. He is included in the study but with the initial caveat that the nature of the findings from President C are within a significantly different context than are those for the other presidents because of the use of external partners as well as the inclusion of his wife. The nature of these limitations for President C is discussed in further detail in chapter 5.
Variability and Contradiction Within the Data Findings

There was not a great deal of variability within the findings; however there was contradiction in terms of two issues: the issue of friendship for Presidents A and C, and the issue of the nature of trust for President C. In each case this variation is presented in the findings. Variability manifests in two key ways in the data findings: direct contradictions made by the presidents within an interview, where they make statements that seem to indicate opposite or divergent meanings; and direct contradictions made by an individual president within his or her different interviews, so that they say one thing in one interview and an opposite thing in a subsequent interview.

A key area of variability and contradiction is with the ranking of the Gallup themes. Each president contradicted himself when ranking these themes. For example, the presidents might say one or another thematic factor is important throughout their interview. This same thematic factor may also emerge at the coding and analysis level as important in their successful dyadic partnerships. However, each president shows contradiction with at least one such factor when it comes to ranking themes. This also happened in the pilot interviews conducted prior to the presidential interviews. This contradictory finding is discussed in greater detail within this chapter. Discussion of the possible implications of this variability is presented in chapter 5 and includes the following: the possibility that the presidents are not aware at the cognitive level of how they feel affectively; the possibility that the presidents answered the cognitive questions in a way that was felt to be psychologically consistent—i.e., they feel they are the type of person who should value forgiveness so they rank it higher; the possibility that they
compartmentalize their thoughts; the possibility that it is a combination of the preceding factors or perhaps a further factor that is not yet determined.

Resolution of Contradiction and Variability in Presentation of Findings

When analyzing the findings, all the contradictory and varying data were analyzed comprehensively with the goal of trying to clarify and if possible to find resolution of the contradictions. The approach used by the researcher was to review the transcripts, coding, and analytic notes and make sure there was in fact a contradiction. If there was a contradiction, the researcher would often discuss it with a member of her dissertation committee and ask for advice. Additionally the researcher would ask follow-up and clarifying questions of the presidents in second- and third-round interviews. When the presidents appeared to come to a final conclusion on a contradictory point, this was considered by the researcher to be a mitigating or resolving factor. However, in all cases, the contradictory nature of the responses is presented here.

An example of such contradiction is that one president said in an initial interview that friendship with a key partner was possible during the working relationship. In a later interview this same president said that wasn’t exactly what was meant. When the nature of the conflictual statements was presented to the president and further clarifying questions were asked, the same president said that such friendship was in fact not easily possible and working in a dyadic relationship with a good friend could present difficulties. A further example dealing with the issue of friendship is shown by a different president who contradicted himself within one interview. He initially said that friendship was not possible, then said it was, then said it definitely was not. Generally, as
the interviews with each president progressed, there was a sense of greater openness with some of the presidents in subsequent interviews.

**Salience and Primacy of the Thematic Factors**

The emergent factors are presented in order of salience, such that the most salient factors are considered to be the primary emergent thematic factors. These factors are presented first. They are followed by the presentation of sub-thematic factors that did not seem to the researcher to be as primary or as emergent. The final factors that are presented are those that are present only in response to direct questions in the follow-up interviews. These final factors are mitigated in terms of salience because the follow-up questions could be more framing or biased in that the follow-up questions were based upon the emergent factors from the initial interviews. The purpose of these questions was further exploration and clarification of what had already emerged. These final factors are referred to as *emergent thematic material* to differentiate them from the more salient factors in the presentation of the findings.

The degree of salience is stated directly in the findings and is also indicated by the ordering of the thematic factors and the use of symbols such as asterisks. In this context, an asterisk (*) indicates sub-thematic factors that emerged but that were not as salient as key thematic factors and that might not manifest so much as individual factors but as relative to interactivity with other factors. A double asterisk (**) indicates thematic material that was not in the initial interview narrative but that emerged in the direct responses to the follow-up questions. The order and degree of salience and primacy of the thematic factors were determined by the researcher based upon the following criteria:
what the participants said about the salience; the salience in terms of how predominately and to what degree of intensity the themes emerged through coding and analysis; and consistency in salience between what emerged from coding and analysis and the responses given by the presidents to direct answers to questions. For example, the emergent thematic factors of trust and communication were present throughout President E’s narrative at the coding and analysis level and were also the factors he listed as most important to his dyadic partnership in his specific answers to direct questions. In deciding upon salience, there was thus an iterative process of constant comparison for the researcher that involved going back and forth to ensure the decisions she made about thematic salience and primacy were consistent with the words, thoughts, voice, and tone of the presidents.

As mentioned previously, on a few infrequent occasions, there were some contradictions between the emergent thematic factors and some comments made by the presidents. On one occasion, with President D, this influenced relative salience and primacy of the factors. Prior to the follow-up questions, sameness was in “first place” as the key emergent thematic factor for President D based on the coding and analysis as well as the verbatim answers to the core interview questions. After the follow-up questions, sameness was moved to a “tied first place” position with community as salient themes. Then, in the follow-up questions, when asked directly about sameness, for example, President D’s own words showed that there was less emphasis on it in her mind at the surface level. However, throughout the prior analyses, the researcher found it very dominant in her narrative. As an example of this variation in President D’s own words,
in the second-round follow-up questions when she is asked about sameness relative to trust, President D says,

Researcher: How important is sameness to you in initial trusting—e.g., a sense of the key partner having similar core values, or a similar purpose, or sameness in background?
President D: Shared values, a commitment to common purpose, care for and about people….all important. I don’t think this derives in any necessary way from sameness in background.

However, within the interview, when talking about an initial point where she seems to really trust her key partner while working through something together, President D says,

So she, she really helped me through that. We were here on Saturday mornings, we were here late at night doing the files and everything but it was a great experience for me and she and I obviously had a lot of similar background…But similar commitment and she was just my right-hand person.

Such variability in the data findings is presented in this chapter in order to be true to the data at the level of verbatim words and emergent themes and meanings. When variations exist, they are presented. Additionally, there is some discussion of the nature of the salience and primacy of the thematic factors in the summary and contextual comments of the factors for each president.

**Presentation of Word Tone and Usage**

The idea that “words create worlds” is important in this research. The data analysis involved very careful coding with attention to the exact and specific word usage for the presidents. The presentation of the findings includes the nature of the tone and word usage for each president. The way that each president speaks and the specific types
of words they use inform, reinforce, and serve to delineate the nature of the emergent thematic factors. This connection between word usage and thematic emergence is discussed in detail in this chapter. Additionally, excerpts from the transcripts of the interviews and from the text of the second-round emailed questions show that the presidents’ voices have been included throughout to provide specific examples and supporting material for the data findings. Such examples include verbatim quotations from the interview transcripts and the texts of the follow-up questions and interviews.

Any potentially identifying information has been removed from the quotations and supporting material, including information such as names of people or places, geographical data, or biographical data. For example, a president’s institution might be referred to as “University X.” Different names have been substituted for the names of the partners in those cases where a president refers to their partner by proper name. For reasons of confidentiality, only limited excerpts from the transcripts are provided. Large amounts of such text are not included in their entirety in order to protect the anonymity of the presidents, their partners, and their institutions. It is important to state upfront that while even large amounts of text did not seem in any way potentially identifying, it was still important to the researcher to preclude any possibility of identification occurring and thus the decision was made to limit the inclusion of large blocks of text, particularly when such blocks of text did not intrinsically provide any further level of substantiation. It is important to mention that great care was taken so that quotations and excerpted statements were presented within the context in which they were spoken so that the
presentation of the words spoken by the presidents is representative of and consistent with their stated meaning.

**Format and Structure of the Presentation of the Findings**

The findings section of this chapter includes an initial overview with tables that summarize the gender of the presidents; gender of the presidents’ partners; information on the presidents’ partnerships; word tone and usage for the presidents; and an overview of the emergent thematic factors for the presidents, presented in order of salience. Additionally, there are findings of the emergent thematic factors presented in detail for each president in another section, and summative and comparative findings in the final sections. These findings are presented with both tables and written summary, and with contextual comments and verbatim examples from the transcriptions of the interviews and follow-up questions. The tables are summative overviews and the written sections provide deeper and more detailed findings.

**Introduction of the Emergent Salient Factor of Situational Use of Power (SUP)**

Situational use of power (SUP) is one of the most salient thematic factors and is one of the three thematic factors that is common to all five presidents, with the other two being trust and common mission. All the factors including trust and common mission may differ slightly in terms of meaning and nuance for each president, and no aggregate definition for these terms is provided apart from the presidents’ definitions. However, it is important to provide clarification for the meaning of the SUP factor as it emerges
within this study because the term itself does not necessarily have a generalized meaning within common usage.

The SUP factor describes the way in which power is diffused across the partnership relationship. Generally, within the culture of the academy, presidents have a great deal of hierarchical and positional power. While power also resides within the board, with other parts of the administration, and with internal stakeholders such as faculty and students, the role of the president is one that is extremely powerful. It emerges within this study that the issue of power extends to the presidential partnerships and at the end of the day it is up to the president to decide what the power relationship looks like within the partnership.

The way that this use of power on the part of the president emerges as a thematic factor is as a situational use of power—SUP—where the president decides in a given situation in a partnership that type of power he feels will work best. He can make this decision based upon a number of factors that include but are not limited to what will work best for his needs or his partner’s needs or the needs of the institution or needs of specific constituents.

This ability to use their power wisely is an element of the SUP thematic factor, particularly regarding the move from vertical to horizontal power. While within the overall university structure, the positional power is strongly invested vertically with the president and that power to some degree is present at all times within the partnerships, the president can decide within any given situation within the partnership dynamic to move from a vertical to a horizontal power structure. An example of this occurs most
commonly in these partnerships with communication. In order to do their jobs well as presidents, all five of the participants mentioned the need for honest, open, and transparent communication where the partner functions as a truth-teller. They also talked about the need for this communication to take place horizontally, in a peer-to-peer manner, so that both sides feel comfortable speaking the truth to each other. In this sense, there are spaces within the partnership where the presidents choose to move out of verticality into a more horizontal power distribution with the partner. There still remains a vertical, positional relationship but the horizontal nature of the communication involves a more even distribution of power across both partners during this process. Ultimately the presidents move out of this horizontal power space back into the vertical structure.

For example, both presidents A and B, when talking about this horizontality immediately include the caveats that say that while communication may be horizontal, ultimately the other person works for them. President A talks about this by saying, “but she’s on my team” referring to his partner Laura in this regard. An example of one of the times he says this is as follows:

President A: It’s been a good fit because we’re both at a point in our career where we can speak pretty honestly to each other, in other words she tells me what she thinks I tell her what I think, so it’s a peer-to-peer relationship in that regard.

Researcher: It’s more like horizontal as opposed to…

President A: Well, yeah, clearly in the institution she’s on my team but our ability to relate is more as we can speak to each other openly as peers might, so there’s not the formality or sometimes the distance that can be inherent with a supervisor type relationship. It’s really refreshing because we can tell each other what we think. And in addition to that we get along personally so we can make each other laugh when appropriate, so that ability is also nice too.
A further example of this use of caveat regarding verticality for President A is the following:

Researcher: Would you describe your communication with your key partner as taking place horizontally or within a vertical dynamic?
President A: I think it’s primarily within a horizontal dynamic. In other words, you’re working with each other and you seek to understand each other as peers. Now this is a vertical dynamic, right; Laura reports to me, so depending upon how you mean your question, it is a vertical dynamic.

President B frames the dynamic by saying she will listen to her partner Emily, and they will have this horizontal communication but at the end of the day the president is the final decision-maker. In most of the partnerships researched in this study, the power does reside with the president and it is his or her choice according to the situation at hand, how they will create the power structure within the partnership. This phenomenon is inclusive of the partnership that President E has with the chair of the board, in that President E feels strongly that the president has a lot of power in this relationship. When talking about the partnerships he chose to discuss in the interview, he says,

President E: So, first one is with chair of the board. So I would say that for a president who wants to be ambitious about getting a lot done, working with the board and having the board’s support in general is exceedingly important. That only happens if the board is seriously engaged and that in turn only happens if you have a chair of the board who can actually work with you. Now, the relationship between the president and chair of the board is a complicated one…Because the board hires the president. But after that the president’s a leader and driving the whole agenda. So a key part of this relationship is getting the roles right at various moments.
Thus, even in a situation where it might seem like the president does not have as much power, President E perceives it differently and his perspective throughout his narrative has to do with the power of the president as the key driver in accomplishing the vision and mission of the university.

President D is very aware of this situational use of power (SUP) and she, more than any of the other presidents, works to make the power dynamic within her partnerships as horizontal as possible because this is consistent with her collective and community-oriented world view. She says in this regard,

President D: You know, I think positional power is hard power and you have it by virtue of a title and a place on an org chart. I think that the more important and more powerful power is soft power and it’s the power of influence.

However, in situations where it is necessary, President D uses her vertical power. She might do it in the nicest way but she will do it. For example, in her narrative she describes her response to faculty inquiry about a decision she made as follows:

President D: I said, "because I’m the president"…. And I never say that, you know, but they were laughing.

A key exception is with President C. Both of the key dyadic working partnerships he chose to discuss in his narrative involve partners who are external to his institution and involve partnerships where there is equality in the power distribution. In these partnerships the manifestation of power is a horizontal one, but these partnerships are not typical of the dyadic partnerships addressed by this study overall, which involve those between the president and their key working partner within their institution.
Another overall example of where there is a situational choice by the presidents to move to a horizontal matrix with the partner within the overall vertical power structure occurs with complementary strengths and expertise. In situations where the partner has far more expert knowledge than the president, the president may choose to delegate power to the partner in that area within the partnership. An example of this is President A’s discussion of how he defers to Laura in areas having to do with academic governance, where she has more expertise. He says,

President A: The provost is vested with authority to make academic decisions and the president really isn’t, so I think here again, trying to think of a specific example, even in our current planning around preparing for the “X” regulations as an example, you know I’ve got certain ideas about how I think we should do it but largely I defer to her ideas. I interject them but ultimately she’s responsible for making sure that we’re compliant with “X” regulations…So, I have to have that discussion and ultimately we agree and generally that’s the way she wants to do it.

The findings for SUP are presented in greater detail within the sections providing the data findings for each individual president, including the presentation of the horizontal and vertical aspects of their situational choices about how to use power in the partnership.

**Findings: Overview**

The purpose of the following five tables is to provide an initial overview of the general findings for the presidents. These findings are discussed in further detail in the next section. Additionally, there are key interactions between thematic factors as well as complexity in meaning that are not represented in these initial tables but that are presented in detail in the next two sections of this chapter. Thus there are key
relationships and connections between themes that are not represented in this table. The purpose of these initial tables is only to provide an overview prior to the presentation of findings in greater detail that are provided in the next section for each president and in the section after that comparatively across presidents.

Overview of Gender and Partnership Information

Demographic gender information is provided for the presidents because gender emerged as a salient thematic factor throughout the research findings. Of the five presidents who participated, three were male and two were female, as follows:

**Table 1. Gender for the Five Presidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A (male)</th>
<th>President B (female)</th>
<th>President C (male)</th>
<th>President D (female)</th>
<th>President E (male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A breakdown of the partnerships by gender is provided in Table 2. This table shows that there is diversity in the gender of the partnerships. Presidents B and E are the only presidents to have solely same-gender partnerships as their key dyadic partnerships.

**Table 2. Gender of Presidents’ Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of partner (s)</th>
<th>President A (female)</th>
<th>President B (female)</th>
<th>President C (male) (primary partner)</th>
<th>President D (female) and</th>
<th>President E (male) 2 male partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The following overview of the details of the partnerships for each president includes the gender for each president and for the partner; the name of the partner when the president speaks of the partner by name; the position of the partner(s); and the duration of the partnerships. The names of the partners have been changed to protect the anonymity of both partners and presidents.

Table 3 shows that there is a variety in the nature of the partnerships across a number of parameters. While there are some partnerships that might have been anticipated due to their positions within the culture of higher education, there are also other key dyadic partnerships that are not positional. President A, for example, has a key dyadic partnership with his provost, and President E has a key dyadic partnership with the chair of the board. Both of these partnerships could be seen as traditional dyadic partnerships for presidents within the academy. However, President E also has a key dyadic partnership with a vice president, and President C has two dyadic partnerships that are external to the institution. The female presidents, B and D, have key dyadic partnerships with vice presidents. There are differences in the durations of the partnerships, with the female presidents B and D having the longest lasting partnerships.
### Table 3. Partnership Information for the Five Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>President A (male)</th>
<th>President B (female)</th>
<th>President C (male)</th>
<th>President D (female)</th>
<th>President E (male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key partner</td>
<td>Laura (female)</td>
<td>Emily (female)</td>
<td>Thomas (male)</td>
<td>Sonia (male)</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Senior VP</td>
<td>Consultant, international initiative</td>
<td>VP, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of partnership</td>
<td>over 1 ½ years &amp; ongoing</td>
<td>18 years &amp; ongoing</td>
<td>15 years &amp; ongoing</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>1–5 years &amp; ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Partner</td>
<td>Mentions partnership w/ the role &amp; w/ partnering institution</td>
<td>Superintendent of schools</td>
<td>Walter (male)</td>
<td>VP (male)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Superintendent of schools</td>
<td>Associate VP, HR</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of partnership</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>17 years and ongoing</td>
<td>1–5 years &amp; ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of Word Tone and Usage for the Presidents**

There are significant differences in the word tone and usage of the presidents throughout their narratives. These differences in word tone and usage both impact and are reflective of aspects of the emergent thematic factors. Specific details on the word tone and usage for each president are provided in depth in the next section.
Table 4 shows some key areas of similarity in word tone and usage, particularly across gender lines. There are strong similarities between presidents B and D, who are female presidents. There are also similarities between presidents A and E, who are male presidents. The word tone and usage of President C is most dissimilar from the other presidents. While he is similar in some ways to the other male presidents, A and E for example, in his use of the word “team” in dealing with relationships, he also differs from all the other presidents. He is most reflective and careful about his word choices and the tone of his speech is very deliberate. Additionally his use of storytelling and humor is more pronounced than with the other presidents. The overall differences between President C and the other presidents will be discussed in further detail in chapter 5.
Table 4. Overview—Word Tone and Usage for the Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President A (male)</th>
<th>President B (female)</th>
<th>President C (male)</th>
<th>President D (male)</th>
<th>President E (male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word tone overall</td>
<td>Cognitive approach to understanding and sense making</td>
<td>Both cognitive and intellectually oriented as well as affective and emotional—Most similar to President D in this regard</td>
<td>Highly reflective and deliberate in his speech</td>
<td>Both highly cognitive and intellectually oriented as well as highly affective and emotional in tone. Most similar in this regard to President B</td>
<td>Highly cognitive, rational, approach to understanding and sense-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both rational, neutral and balanced tone and use of dynamic words and words that convey nuance</td>
<td>Warmth in tone—similar to D</td>
<td>Uses storytelling extremely effectively</td>
<td>Warmth in tone—similar to B</td>
<td>Builds mental constructs and models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collegiality and niceness</td>
<td>Use of psychological frame of reference</td>
<td>Use of humor</td>
<td>Also cognitive approach to understanding and sense-making, most similar to President E in this regard</td>
<td>Most similar to D in his abstraction and sense-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of storytelling</td>
<td>Most similar to A in non-emotive tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word tone: religiosity or spirituality</td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>Present—specifically Catholic</td>
<td>Present as non-denominational Spiritualty</td>
<td>Present—Ecumenical</td>
<td>Not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gratitude expressed has religious tone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christian and Catholic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word usage</td>
<td>Neutral, collegial, polite, engaged, open, clean—no excessive use of modifiers</td>
<td>Family, emotional and personal development terms</td>
<td>Balanced, neutral, careful and deliberate use of specific words</td>
<td>Positive modifiers, family, emotional and personal development terms</td>
<td>Clarity and conciseness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word usage</td>
<td>Eloquent, dynamic; action words that convey nuance in combination with rational words and phrases that balance overall tone Sense of humility in his word usage, somewhat similar to D in this regard Sense of gratitude in his word usage—with use of the word “fortunate”—differs from gratitude as expressed by B and D</td>
<td>Reference to literature—Most similar in this regard to President D</td>
<td>Uses words engagingly in storytelling Some use of financial terms</td>
<td>Reference to literature—Most similar in this regard to President B Sense of humility in word usage, somewhat similar to A in this regard</td>
<td>Strong, action words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word usage: relationship</td>
<td>Team Most similar in this regard to President E</td>
<td>Relationship, family Most similar in this regard to President D</td>
<td>Team Relationship, family and community terms Most similar in this regard to President B</td>
<td>Team Most similar in this regard to President A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word usage: exactness and precision</td>
<td>Careful and exact Most similar to B in this regard</td>
<td>Careful and exact Most similar to A in this regard</td>
<td>Highly precise, reflective as to exact word usage and meanings, deliberateness in what he says</td>
<td>Highly precise, speaks about word choice Most similar to E in this regard</td>
<td>Highly precise, speaks about word choice Most similar to D in this regard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the Emergent Thematic Factors for the Presidents

The emergent thematic factors for each president are presented below in three tables that provide an overview of all the presidents and all the thematic factors in order of salience. There are three groupings of factors. The most salient emergent factors are presented in the first table, Table 5. The second group of factors is presented in Table 6 and these factors are marked with a single asterisk (*). These are sub-thematic factors that are less salient. The third group of factors is presented in Table 7, and these factors are marked with a double asterisk (**). These factors are thematic material that did not emerge in the open-ended initial interviews but rather in the direct responses to the follow-up questions. The detailed explanations for the findings in this table are provided in the following section.

Tables 5–7 show the differences in the actual emergent thematic factors for each president and they show that these factors manifest with different degrees of salience. For example, the most salient thematic factor is different for each president. For President A the most salient factor is complementary strengths. For President B the most salient emergent factor is the role. For President C it is idealism, while for President D it is sameness and for President E it is trust. The presidents can have common thematic factors that have different degrees of salience. For example, complementary strengths is most salient for President A and sixth most salient for President B.
Table 5. Overview—Most Salient Thematic Factors for Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
<td>The role</td>
<td>Idealism—serving the greater good</td>
<td>Sameness Community</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community (Both factors equally salient)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common vision/mission</td>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>The heart</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time—investing time in the partnership</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
<td>Challenges/overcoming challenges/learning from challenges</td>
<td>The role/boundaries/job of the president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and boundaries</td>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
<td>The role</td>
<td>The overarching goal (common mission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of data</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>Common vision/mission</td>
<td>Challenging self and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The same theme can have different meanings and manifestations for the different presidents.
### Table 6. Sub-thematic Factors in Order of Salience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Trust</td>
<td>*Gender</td>
<td>*Knowing self and partner/communication</td>
<td>*Gender</td>
<td>*Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Idealism</td>
<td>*Boundaries</td>
<td>*Complementary strengths</td>
<td>*Longevity</td>
<td>*Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Team</td>
<td>*SUP</td>
<td>*Difficulty of forgiveness</td>
<td>*Religious element</td>
<td>*Valuing the truth-teller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SUP—horizontality in communication within an overall vertical structure</td>
<td>*Sameness</td>
<td>*Importance of partnership with spouse</td>
<td>*Works hard and determination</td>
<td>*SUP—horizontality with caveat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*Religious element</th>
<th>*SUP—horizontality</th>
<th>*Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Works hard</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Works hard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| *Ability to know self and other and convey key aspects of self iteratively |

### Table 7. Themes in Direct Response to Follow-up Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality and distribution of power (horizontality aspect)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intuition— with trust, with boundaries</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complementary strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deep personal friendship not easily possible within working dyadic partnership</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Deep personal friendship available within working dyadic partnership** | **Importance of partnerships, work of president can’t be done alone** |

| **Deep personal friendship possible with key dyad** | **No sense of isolation** |
Table 7 shows that there are emergent thematic factors from the follow-up questions for only two presidents—C and D.

**Summary**

This section has provided important context and format information for the presentation of the data. It also provides an overview of the partnerships, including the gender and names of the partners, the positions of the partners, and the durations of the partnerships. Additionally it provided an overview of the data findings for word tone and usage, and emergent thematic factors by president. The next section provides further details about the thematic factors and how they manifest for each president as well as how they compare across presidents.

**Emergent Thematic Factors for Each President**

Section one of this chapter provided an introduction, context, and overview of the thematic factors. This section goes into greater depth and provides detailed findings of the emergent thematic factors in the presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships. There are also some comparisons presented between presidents for certain aspects of word findings and usage, and for thematic factors; however the summative nature of these comparisons is presented in the next section. The findings are presented separately for each president and presented within a format that includes the following:

- A table that summarizes information on the president and their key dyadic partnerships
- A written summary of the most salient thematic factors
- A table that shows the thematic factors of the salient thematic factors and the interactions of the factors
Findings for word tone and usage

Detailed findings for each thematic factor, including the nature of the interactions for that factor

Detailed findings that include both tables as well as summary and contextual comments for the key factors

The findings are presented in alphabetical order as follows:

- Findings for President A
- Findings for President B
- Findings for President C
- Findings for President D
- Findings for President E

Findings for President A

Table 8. Key Information about President A’s Partnership with Laura

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of President A:</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key dyadic partner:</td>
<td>Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of key dyadic partner:</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of key dyadic partner:</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time of the partnership:</td>
<td>Over one and a half years and ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salient Factors

The thematic factor that is most salient for President A is that of complementary strengths, as gleaned from the findings of the interview and follow-up questions. This emerges as the key factor in his successful dyadic partnership with Laura. It is interactive with other factors such as communication and trust. Tables 9 and 10 provide an overview
of the thematic factors that emerged for President A. They are presented in order of salience as follows:

**Table 9. President A’s Thematic Factors in Order of Salience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of salience</th>
<th>Thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient factor</td>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient factor</td>
<td>Communication (open, honest communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient factor</td>
<td>Common vision/mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient factor</td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient factor</td>
<td>Time—investing time in the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most salient factor</td>
<td>Roles and boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh most salient factor</td>
<td>Importance of data (also aspect of communication)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10. President A’s Sub-thematic Factors in Order of Salience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Sub-thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient sub-thematic factor—eighth factor overall</td>
<td>*Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient sub-thematic factor—ninth factor overall</td>
<td>*Idealism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient sub-thematic factor—tenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient sub-thematic factor—eleventh factor overall</td>
<td>*SUP—horizontality in communication within an overall vertical structure; complementary strengths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Word Tone and Usage**

Throughout both the initial and follow-up interviews President A speaks with a tone of rationality and collegiality. He is precise and clear in his word usage and there is a consistency in his thoughts and the manifestations of his thoughts through language.
For example, this consistency is demonstrated through his concurrent rationality in tone and his belief in the importance of data. He states in this regard,

> It’s nice in a university environment because people expect strong arguments. You know, they expect you to have a point of view. It also requires you to spend a lot of time with data because you have to have…data has to help tell the story and you’re trying to get to the truth of anything, right. You’re trying to get to the bottom of an issue, you have to have data. You can have a lot of hypotheses but if you don’t have the data, chances are you’re going to be wrong often.

The overall tone of his speech is collegial, respectful, polite, engaged, and open. There is also an aspect of transparency to his speech in that there is triangulating material from additional sources reinforcing that he is who he says he is. For example, in terms of his leadership and partnership he says that he values collegiality and treating people well and with respect. One element of his view of collegiality has to do with niceness. An illustration of triangulation regarding the consistency of what President A says and what he does is that without any prompting or being asked, more than one person at his institution referred to President A as a truly nice person. For example, when the receptionist asked the researcher the purpose of her visit and discovered she was going to speak with President A for a research project, the receptionist spontaneously said, “Oh, you will really like speaking to him—he is such a nice person.” There is also triangulation in that President A treated the researcher with collegiality characterized by respect throughout all interactions. When asked about this collegiality in his initial interview, President A states,

> I think that’s the way I grew up. I don’t know anything really different. I do know that the times I’ve been not nice I generally regret it and they’re
not that many. So generally it’s important to treat people with respect anyway. You’re not going to get very far if you don’t. There are certainly places that run on principles that this is not a nice environment, don’t expect it to be… But I just like to be nice. I like that kind of environment. I prefer a collegial environment. Obviously it’s got to be able to get things done. I’ve always found in my life that the happier the environment is, well the more fun it is for everybody and I think the better chance of accomplishing something.

His emphasis on niceness and collegiality shows consistency in that through coding, re-coding, and analysis, collegiality emerges as a thematic factor for this president in his dyadic partnership. For example, he uses the term “collegiality” a number of times when speaking about how he relates to others and to his partner. Thus, niceness and collegiality are evident at levels of third-party triangulation, at the surface level in the interviews in what is said, and at the thematic level revealed through coding and analysis.

A further example of such consistency with President A is in his use of humor. He discusses humor as an aspect of his collegial relationship with his partner: “And in addition to that, we get along personally so we can make each other laugh when appropriate so that ability is also nice too.” He also uses humor in his discourse during the interviews. His use of humor is different from that of presidents B, C, and E, who use humor in humorous stories to illustrate an occasional point. However, at times President A has an element of humor in his tone without using stories.

President A has a balanced tone that involves an eloquent, dynamic use of words in combination with rationality and logic. For example, he combines words such as “joy,” “excellent,” “dynamic,” or “critical” with rational words and meanings such as
“which is of course her role;” or “but also really necessary;” or “you get to the best result.” Two separate illustrations of this balance in President A’s speech include the following:

So I think part of the joy of an academic environment but also really necessary in any organization is that you can discuss things, you can debate things, you can share ideas you can challenge ideas. And I enjoy that, she enjoys that, and I think you get to the best result.

And I think Laura has done an excellent job in applying these principles to what…is a pretty dynamic, diverse, adult-centered institution. And so I really trust her guidance on those issues, which is of course her role, but it’s timely for us and it’s also critical to make sure we have the confidence to know that we have the right academic governance structures and policies in place.

Examples of Word Usage
A key phrase for President A that occurs throughout his narrative and also is reflective of his most salient thematic factor is “tapping expertise.” He uses this to express the thematic factor of complementary strengths across a number of parameters such as hiring people for their expertise, having them on teams for their expertise, and communicating with them to learn from their expertise. A statement that is typical of President A in this regard is “part of a president’s job is you have to create an environment where you tap people’s expertise.”

With one exception President A does not use emotive words or words with a warm or affective tone. This exception is his usage of the word “nurture,” which occurs several times throughout his interviews, as follows:

“And you have to nurture that vision.”
“And then you have to nurture an environment.”

“But I think you could nurture a sense of listening.”

This is such an exception to his general tone of speech throughout the interviews that his use of the term “nurture” stands out.

Generally President A uses the term “common vision,” but the term “common mission” is also used interchangeably with “common vision,” particularly in the follow-up interview. The words “partnership” and “relationship” are used interchangeably, and there is no emotionality in the use of the word “relationship.” The word “team” is also used consistently to describe his relationships and is in itself a significant sub-theme, again showing the consistency of his word usage and his emergent thematic factors. For example, he says about his dyadic partner, Laura, “She’s on my team.” Further examples of his use of the word “team” which reflect his core beliefs are as follows:

“I am the first one to believe that strong teams are better than any particular individual and that it’s really your job as a leader to develop a strong team.”

“If you don’t have a team where you seek out their counsel and seek out their opinions, then you have to ask yourself, have you picked the right people. Because in my experience, the team is generally the best place to get answers because you’re bringing people around you who know more than you do.”

There is a sense of humility in President A’s word tone and usage, which is reflected in the way that he gives credit to others and shows gratitude. Examples of such gratitude can be seen in his use of the word “fortunate” as follows:
“I’m also fortunate there to have a very good partnership.”

“And I’m in the fortunate position of generally trusting my entire team.”

There is a marked difference in how President A uses the word “fortunate” in this regard and how the female presidents make similar statements but use the word “blessed.” This will be discussed further in the section on gender differences in this chapter.

In contrast with the other presidents, President A’s tone is balanced and neutral. While focused and driven, his use of action words is not as strongly emphasized as with President E. While idealistic, his actual words do not reflect this idealism as strongly as do those of President C, who consistently uses terms like “passion” and “the greater good.” His words are as not strongly affective and emotive as those of the female presidents (B and D). His words generally are neutral and balanced in tone, and precise and consistent with his thoughts and thematic factors. He uses words cleanly and without excessive application of modifiers, while still conveying nuance.

**Details of Thematic Factors for President A**

The following provides details concerning the component aspects and elements of each thematic factor, as well as how each thematic factor is interactive with other thematic factors.

**Thematic Factor of Complementary Strengths**

Aspects and Elements of Complementary Strengths

- Tapping people’s expertise (key phrase)
- Complementary strengths—he has financial and business; she has governance
• Complementary, symbiotic relationship
• Most values her experience, expertise, and complementary strengths
• Hires for such skills and expertise
• Defers to her opinion in her areas of expertise

The Interactions of Complementary Strengths with Other Factors
• Relationship between complementary strengths and trust: they need to trust the partner in this area and the partner can also increase trust by demonstrating expertise in this area over time
• Complementary strengths and communication
• Complementary strengths and boundaries—role parameters based upon expertise
• Complementary strengths and SUP—horizontality

Summary and Contextual Comments on Complementary Strengths
This is the most salient thematic factor for President A when speaking about his key successful dyadic partnership. He believes that experience and expertise, particularly in complementary areas, is crucial in the success of the dyadic partnership. This emerges consistently throughout his narrative. For example, when he speaks about what he values most about Laura, he references a complementary strength: “I think what I value, the single most thing that I value the most is the experience she brings in academic governance.” When President A first describes his partnership with Laura, he mentions the complementary nature of the relationship:

I’ll use my most recent experiences. So across the hall is Laura, she’s the provost of X University… and she came from a set of experiences spent most of her career in traditional education so she was at the University of Y system, University of Z system, and the president provost partnership is a very important one for obvious reasons. It’s hard to run the institution well unless there’s a good partnership there…So it’s been a
complementary, symbiotic relationship in a lot of ways. One is that I bring a nontraditional and she brings a more traditional background. She brings a strong academic portfolio, I bring probably a stronger business portfolio just in terms of business of the institution…It’s been a good fit because we’re both at a point in our career where we can speak pretty honestly to each other. In other words she tells me what she thinks, I tell her what I think, so it’s a peer-to-peer relationship in that regard.

This salience is also shown in the follow-up questions when asked what his advice is to other presidents about creating successful partnerships. He says,

You want to identify people with complementary skills, assess your strengths and their strengths, your weaknesses and their weaknesses, that’s number one. Number two, you should both provide and expect directness and openness. Number three, you should enjoy the process of thinking and discussion that helps guide decision-making. So those three things are those that I rely on most heavily and certainly have in the case of this particular partnership.

He feels that there is a connection between complementary strengths and trust. When asked about this in the follow-up interview, he says,

Yes, I would reference back to trusting each other’s judgment so it’s helpful to have a complementary set of skills. Certainly in the case of Laura and me it’s true and especially once you begin to trust by experience someone’s judgment that’s very helpful because you know you can count on someone.

President A hires people for their expertise and complementary strengths. He says,

But I think number one you need to hire people who are experts in whatever responsibility you’re trying to vest them with, whether it’s campuses or whether it’s online instruction or whether it’s curriculum or whatever the role may be; obviously you’re looking for people who have a lot of expertise.
He often speaks about learning from others in areas of complementary strengths, and as mentioned above, uses phrases such as “tapping their expertise” or “tap their expertise” in this regard. An example of such usage is when he says,

We don’t know everything about everything and a university is a very diverse organization that deals with a broad range of issues on any given day. And so you really want to tap their expertise. You want people to know more than you do.

There is an element of interaction for President A between the thematic factors of complementary strengths and boundaries when the boundaries are based on expertise and are reinforced by the positional structure in the organization. There is also an interaction between communication and complementary strengths in that it is through communicating that you can “tap their expertise” and benefit from their complementary strengths. Thus, as he talks about communication in his narrative, he goes into detail as to how he communicates and works to draw out people’s ideas, which is part of how he utilizes their complementary strengths. There is an interactivity between complementary strengths and SUP in that President A chooses to move to a horizontality in deferring to Laura in his decision-making in her areas of expertise.

Thematic Factor of Communication

Aspects and Elements of Communication

- Importance of direct communication
- Being able to relate to each other directly
- Direct communication can involve discussion, argument, and debate and that’s good; need open, honest discussion
• Importance of listening—key point
• Importance of asking questions
• Asking opinions
• Need to be a good listener
• Listening closely
• Non-verbal communication: tone, words, eyes, noticing non-verbal signals, reconciling dissonance between non-verbal and words
• Learning about listening
• Working to draw people’s opinions out
• Drawing out what they’re thinking
• Open and honest communication
• Honest, two-way conversation
• Share ideas
• Having facts provide basis for direct communication

The Interactions of Communication with Other Factors

Connection between communication and being able to relate to each other directly

Honesty and trustworthiness are important in having open, honest conversation

Communication and SUP, there is horizontality—President A and Laura speak as peers, within an overall vertical structure

Connection between communication and data

Communication as key part of his leadership (implicit)

Interaction between truth-telling and trust

Interaction between direct communication and trust
Summary and Contextual Comments on Communication

Communication is the second most salient thematic factor for President A. The type of communication that characterizes his successful dyadic partnership includes direct, honest communication that is data based and that incorporates the possibility of discussion, confrontation, and argument if needed. For example, when asked what gives life and vitality to his partnership, he says,

So I think that what gives the most life and vitality to the partnership is that ability to speak pretty directly about issues and things we need to do. So whether it’s part of strategic planning, as I mentioned, academic governance, the operational issues and other day-to-day issues, budgeting, those are all areas where you got to have a good argument sometimes. And these are very productive, positive discussions.

Honesty and truth-telling is a fundamental element of this communication, particularly in being able to work towards resolutions of issues. He says in this regard,

Honesty and trustworthiness so you can have an open honest conversation and you can complete one without it lingering without there being hard feelings. There are going to be times when you throw in the towel, there’s going to be times when they throw in the towel but you got to be able to work that way on any given issue.

For President A, there is interactivity with SUP in this regard in that he chooses a horizontal or peer-to-peer aspect to the communication with Laura, and he says, “It’s a peer-to-peer relationship in that regard” and “We can speak to each other openly as peers.” However it is important to note that this horizontality is stated with a caveat by President A more than once, in which the overall verticality of the dynamic is stressed. He says in the follow-up questions in this regard that,
Researcher: Would you describe your communication with your key partner as taking place horizontally or within a vertical dynamic?

President A: I think it’s primarily within a horizontal dynamic; in other words you’re working with each other and you seek to understand each other as peers. Now this is a vertical dynamic, right; Laura reports to me, so depending upon how you mean your question, it is a vertical dynamic.

This caveat regarding communication as a horizontal matrix within an overall vertical dynamic also occurs strongly as an emergent element with presidents B and E. There is an interaction between communication and the thematic factor of importance of data, in that data facilitates directness: “You have to be direct and generally it’s easier to be direct when you have the facts.” Data also facilitates confrontation and its resolution.

The thematic factor of communication for President A involves active listening. He emphasizes listening not only to words, but to tone and non-verbal communication as well. He also emphasizes working to “draw people out” so that there is the space and environment for communication. His approach to this reflects his “niceness” and collegiality in that he communicates from a place of respect. He describes working “to draw people out” in this way as follows:

Ask them a question about something they’re working on particularly or something they’re not working on particularly. Both are valuable. Ask somebody their opinion about something they heard in a meeting. Ask somebody’s opinion about how do you think so and so is doing. Shift the locus of attention away initially so that folks can get comfortable in the environment. So you don’t put them on the spot right away. Those are all just human interactions that you want to be conscious of. Allowing privacy when privacy is necessary. Having groups get together when groups are necessary. So I think it’s just a balance of spending time with people and making sure that you try to draw out what they’re thinking.
There is an interactive element between the thematic factors of communication and complementary strengths in this regard in that by listening to people and communicating with people, President A is able to “tap their expertise.” There is also a strong thematic element of communication relative to common mission in his narrative. An illustration of this interaction is shown in his statement about his decision-making:

There’s certainly times when I need to make a decision but I think that it’s more effective and fun to discuss these things together and empower people to make the decisions. I found if you communicate your philosophy and your mission well, then most of the time they are going to make very good decisions.

There are also interactions between the thematic factor of trust and aspects of communication such as direct communication and truth. For example, when asked about the connection between truth-telling and trust in the follow-up interview, President A says, “Absolutely, I think honesty is the first requirement…what I am saying is that if you feel a person is being straight with you, it’s a lot easier to go on and solve problems together.”

**Thematic Factor of Common Vision/Mission**

*Note: Generally the term “vision” is used, but at times it is interchangeable with the term “mission.”*

**Aspects and Elements of Common Vision/Mission**

- Ideal partnership involves a common shared vision (also sense of roles and boundaries)
- Having same strategic vision—need to bring in people whom you share a vision with
• Crafting the vision together
• Wants people to have vision and opinions, ultimately a shared vision
• President’s job to provide updated vision

Interactions of Common Vision/Mission with Other Factors
• Interaction between communication and vision—the vision needs to be shared through communication and communication is also involved in the vision process
• Interaction between common vision and the role
• Interaction between common vision and trust

Summary and Contextual Comments on Common Vision/Mission
Common vision/mission is a salient thematic factor for President A, as is illustrated by description of the ideal partnership: “I think the truly, the ideal partnership is when you have a common shared vision of something and you have a clear understanding on who is going to do what.” An element of this, relative to his partnership is his idea of working with the dyadic partner to craft the vision together: “The ability to craft a vision together and go execute it is one of the most rewarding, enjoyable things that you can do in professional life in my opinion.” This thematic factor is interactive with the factor of communication. President A believes that it is important that the common vision is communicated so that everyone is working together towards one goal. He says, “In order to kind of send the same message to the institution, to have the same strategic vision so we feel like we’re all going in the same direction. You know, that’s really critical.”

Common vision is particularly important to President A in terms of his perceptions of his role because he feels that it is the president’s job to update the vision
based on input and communication from his dyadic partner and team. Thus the thematic factor of common vision is interactive with communication in that he feels it is important for people to discuss and provide input to the vision. He states,

And I think you’re also looking for people who have opinions, who have a vision for where they want to go and you have to nurture that vision. At the end of the day the president needs to provide the institution with a vision that’s at a minimum updated to fit current circumstances. All institutions have a vision, they all need updating. They all need updating because the environment changes and that’s the primary job of the president but you also need to bring in people who you share a vision with and who can help drive that for the organization and contribute to it, modify it, and improve it. And then you have to nurture an environment where people feel free to discuss it, consult it, where they know if they have an opinion they can share it without fear of public criticism, retribution and the like. So otherwise you stop that sort of thinking out and that’s not what you want to do.

There is a clear relationship for President A between common mission and trust. For example, in the follow-up interview when asked about whether sameness increases trust in a partnership, he says,

I think clearly having the same sense of mission, that’s important especially in a higher ed institution or really any organization that you’re on the same page in terms of what you’re trying to accomplish and I think that’s very important. There are lots of other values or purposes that people bring to a relationship or job so I think there are some very specific ones that maybe are more pertinent and that’s one that I would point to.

Thus, President A manifests ideas of sameness and affinity very differently from Presidents B and D, who see it in terms of personal resonance and an emotional sense of connection. President A, on the other hand, recognizes a sense of affinity but does not see it as necessary in the partnership and sees crucial “sameness” as encompassing ideas
of common mission as opposed to more emotive aspects of the term. This is reinforced by a key comment made by President A. When asked if he would describe his relationship with his partner as a deep personal friendship or something other than friendship, he says,

President A: I think in the work place environment it’s really something other than friendship.
Researcher: What is that…how you would describe it?
President A: I would go back to the shared sense of mission.

Thematic Factor of Collegiality
Aspects and Elements of Collegiality
- He and Laura relate to each other collegially
- Respect is an element of collegiality—“Starts with the ability to respect the other person.”
- Communication is an element of collegiality
- Includes give and take and human interaction
- Includes humor
- Prefers collegial environment
- Friendship not easily possible with key dyad

Interactions of Collegiality with Other Factors
- Collegiality and investing the time to get together
- Implicit relationship between sameness, affinity, sense of comfort, and collegiality—however, need to be able to deal with all sorts of people in order to be a good partner
- Interaction between collegiality and team
- Interaction between collegiality and communication
Summary and Contextual Comments on Collegiality

This thematic factor of collegiality reflects President A’s beliefs about how to relate to others and is also reflective of who he is and how he is present in the dyadic partnership relationship. Collegiality was an explicit theme and also an emergent theme. President A talks about it at the surface level of his narrative, but it is also apparent at all levels of coding and analysis of the data. For example, the words “collegial” and “collegiality” re-appear throughout the in vivo coding. The elements of collegiality such as respect and humor recur throughout the descriptive coding. This consistency of the collegiality theme is representative of the overall consistency between words and meanings throughout President A’s interviews. There are strong interactions between collegiality and thematic factors such as communication and investment of time in the partnership. For example, when describing collegiality, President A says,

"Collegiality starts with the ability to respect the other person….It starts with the ability to have a conversation, you know, listen, giving and taking…includes the human interaction that’s really required. You have to find that time to get together. Even if it’s on the phone you have to carve out that time."

There is an element of affinity or sameness that helps with collegiality, although this is not necessary and not always present: “There are other differences like culture or other things and so I don’t think you can expect to have the same kind of personal affinity.” However, as with common vision/mission discussed previously, sameness in this regard is not a dominant theme the way it is for presidents B and D. Also, there are contraindications around sameness for President A in that he explicitly states that part of being able to be a good partner has to do with dealing with people who are not the same:
Researcher: Anything else that’s the personal side of it that you think informs a good partnership?
President A: That’s a really good question, but people are all so different and I think one of the demands on anybody who tries to manage in this day and age is that you’ve got to be good at dealing with all sorts of people…You’re not necessarily going to hit it off with every personality you come across and you shouldn’t expect to but I think you can really have a good professional relationship…I think you can still have a really good professional dynamic around people that you met for the first time and just started working with.

Within this context, with specific reference to a core partner or dyad, he says that there are certain factors that are necessary that are not about sameness: “But you definitely want to have those other things we talked about. The ability to listen, share ideas, be direct, and share a few laughs, feel that sense of comfort…and trust.” Thus, while affinity is important in a partnership, sameness is not. He reinforces this in the follow-up interview in his responses as follows:

Researcher: Is affinity or sameness necessary in the deepest partnerships?
President A: Affinity, yes, sameness no.
Researcher: What is affinity for you?
President A: Affinity I think is a sense of something shared, but certainly not to the extent where I would describe it as sameness.

Thus it is important to make the distinction between President A’s manifestation of the element of affinity within collegiality as not being the same as the way in which the theme of sameness manifests relative to affinity for Presidents B and D. For President A, collegiality also has to do with the creation of an environment where people come together as a group and can communicate and contribute from their areas of expertise and work things out together. This is connected to his ideas of leadership and
his belief that the job of the president is to get input that allows him to work on the vision. So, just as complementary strengths and communication in the dyadic partnership facilitate the job of the president, so too does collegiality. When asked to describe some of the aspects of partnership in this regard he says,

President A: Working in the case of the provost as I described. Certainly working in the case of the team that I enjoy working with here. By and large you asked how you create some of these things. One of the things that’s easy to overlook is just going away as a group. Getting out of the office spending a day and a half it doesn’t take a lot and letting people talk. So, when you do that you start to realize, gee, ok, I could modify my view or he or she could modify their views but we’re not that far apart and we want to achieve the same thing. So I guess it’s a long way of answering your question but those are the key elements of any partnership, which I think we do right here and right now at University X.

Researcher: So when you go away and you let people talk where are you as a leader in that?

President A: I’m listening…What does your job become? Your job becomes you’ve got to back and synthesize what you’ve heard. Assuming that you agree with it. If you didn’t agree with it, it’s a different problem. But assuming you agree with it you’ve got to go synthesize and modify a vision for where you want to go. Which we have been doing consistently here for the past couple years. So in this day and age it’s a quarterly or semi-annually type event because the world changes so quickly, at least for a leadership team in that kind of discussion. It’s a day-to-day event as you deal with different kinds of issues but you have to tap people’s expertise.

It is important to note that President A talks about the difficulties of having a deep, personal friendship with his key dyadic partner. When asked, “Is it possible to have a deep personal friendship with the key partner while you are working together in the partnership?” President A says, “I think it’s difficult.” While there was some ambiguity around this in the initial interview, President A provides a definitive response in the second interview that it is a very difficult thing to maintain and nurture. This is
very similar to the view of President C. It is also similar to the view of President B, who explicitly says that the key dyadic partnership is not about personal friendship although it involves a deep and committed relationship.

**Thematic Factor of Time—Investing Time in the Partnership**

**Aspects and Elements of Time—Investing Time in the Partnership**

- Lack of time, not enough time
- Need to invest time in the partnership
- Need to invest time in team and larger team
- Need more time—partnerships take time
- “You have to find that time to get together. Even if it’s on the phone, you have to carve out that time.”
- Investing time on the team and team-building

**Interactions of Time—Investing Time in the Partnership with Other Factors**

- Time and communication—investing time in communication and discussion
- Need to spend time for collegiality

**Summary and Contextual Comments on Time—Investing Time in the Partnership**

This is a thematic factor that occurs with all the presidents, although it is less salient for President C. This is potentially reflective of the high value these presidents place on the dyadic partnership because time is a very precious commodity with university and college presidents. With President A this is an emergent thematic factor in that he feels that investment of time in the dyadic partnership is essential for its success, and the partnership is important for the success of the organization. This view is reflected in his answer to the question of, “If you had three wishes, so you could develop
or transform your dyadic partnerships in any way, what three wishes would you make to
heighten their overall health and vitality?” In response to the question, President A says,

President A: Probably more time because each of these partnerships take
time and if you’re going to have good, healthy [relationships] and several,
you’re going to need the time for them because they all take time…

Researcher: What does that look like when you invest it?

President A: It looks like an hour a week where you’re just carving out the
time to go through the issues of the day and anything else. And that’s the
first part. Then you also need to do the time for some of these other
things: team building, going off, talking about the bigger issues together,
and it just can be very hard to carve that out. And so if you could change
one thing if you had, the more time….None of us get that but what we
could do is we could delegate better. You could say these things I can do,
I’m not going to try to do, because I am going to focus on these
partnerships, which is how you’re going to be successful, how you’re
going to project success on the organization.

As discussed previously, the investment of time is also interactive with communication
and collegiality.

Thematic Factor of Roles and Boundaries

Aspects and Elements of Roles and Boundaries

• Importance of getting the roles right—people need to understand who is going to
do what

• Don’t want people bumping into each other—need for boundaries between
president and partner (similar to Presidents B and E)

• The positional roles reinforce the boundaries

Interactions of Roles and Boundaries with Other Factors

• Intuition and maintaining separate roles—getting a sense of the other person and
who is doing what. Intuition involved in terms of “getting a sense” for both

• SUP—positional verticality and reinforcement of the boundaries
Summary and Contextual Comments on Roles and Boundaries

For President A, the idea of the importance of people understanding the roles and boundaries recurs throughout his narrative. It is part of his answer to the question about how he sees the ideal partnership, in which he says,

I think the truly ideal partnership is when you have a common shared vision of something and you have a clear understanding on who is going to do what. In any team environment there’s always overlap, there’s always people bumping into each other because of this or that reason, if for no other reason than the external environment has changed and what used to be a clear channel and path now has become muddy. So the ideal partnership is one where you share those two things, so if you share a vision and you know you’re going down the same path and if you share a clear sense of who’s doing what, what everybody’s role is, then you’re not bumping into each other. You’re not creating the frustration that often comes with that for both parties.

Within this context, the vertical nature of the relationship with the positional allocation of power reinforces the boundaries for President A. When asked about this in the follow-up interview, he says, “In this particular case, there are pretty clear defined roles for a chief executive versus a chief academic officer, so to some extent they’re customary and understood.” Communication is interactive with this in that it can help to facilitate clarity around the roles and boundaries. When President A is asked, “Does communication help with this?” he says, “Yes, I think it’s critical because there will always be grey areas, so being able to identify them and reference them back to the primary roles and know who does what, that’s important.”

Roles and boundaries are also reinforced by complementary strengths and people having specific areas of expertise. President A says in this regard, “And there are certain
areas where you don’t even touch. The provost is vested with authority to make academic decisions and the president really isn’t.”

While President A is similar to President E in talking about intuition as “getting a sense of the partner” and who is going to do what, President A explicitly says the boundaries themselves are not highly intuitive areas: “I think because the rules between the provost and the president are pretty clearly understood, it’s not highly intuitive.”

**Thematic Factor of Importance of Data**

**Aspects and Elements of Importance of Data**
- Need clear and accurate data
- Need common set of data

**Interactions of Importance of Data with Other Factors**
- Having data is helpful as a basis for direct communication
- Interaction between data and communication—facilitates directness and conflict resolution

**Summary and Contextual Comments on the Importance of Data**

Data are important to President A in his leadership and in his partnership. Data facilitate directness of communication, and having a common set of data is essential in people working together. When asked about his three wishes to develop or transform his partnerships, his first wish was for more time to invest in the partnership and his second wish had to do with data as follows:

President A: Clear information, a common set of information that everybody saw regularly and had a chance to comment on. Sometimes getting clear information is the hardest issue you face…And you’re having a conversation and you’re trying to get to the bottom of something and you have three different sets of information and three people have three different opinions because of it. So if you can take the time and you get
on a common set of information all other things can happen, all other things can follow.

*Thematic Factor of Trust*

Aspects and Elements of Trust

- Laura has proven herself in the role so he can trust her
- Trusts her guidance, and his trust is based on her expertise and proving herself

Interactions of Trust with Other Factors

- Trust and expertise, complementary strengths
- Trust and communication
- Trust developing over time

Summary and Contextual Comments on Trust

The thematic factor of trust, while emergent for President A, is not as salient as with some of the other presidents such as presidents C and E. However, his attitude towards the importance of trust is implicit throughout his narrative and it does consistently emerge through coding and analysis. For President A, trust in his key dyadic partnership has to do with his partner’s expertise and proving themselves over time. He trusts Laura’s guidance in her areas of expertise, and there are strong interactions between trust and complementary strengths and communication within his narrative. For President A, trust develops over time and can occur in a matter of months. When describing the development of trust, he says,

> It’s just a matter of experience, I would say it’s a mutually reinforcing set of positive experiences—so as trust develops over the course of time, and you find you can mutually trust each other’s honesty and judgment.
Thus, his perception of the development of trust is very similar to that of President E.

There are also some similarities with President C’s perception of trust as developing over time. However, President A’s perceptions around trust differ greatly from that of presidents B and D, who talk about an instant sense of trust and connection.

*Thematic Factor of Idealism

Aspects and Elements of Idealism
- Focus on having impact and making a difference in people’s lives through higher education
- Believes people in higher education generally want to do something good

Interactions of Idealism with Other Factors
- Idealism and common vision/mission
- Idealism and collegiality—he believes in treating people well and that includes collegially

Summary and Contextual Comments on Idealism

The thematic factor of idealism emerges throughout President A’s narrative, but it is often implicit and revealed through coding and analysis. The nature of this idealism has to do with caring about making a contribution and wanting to make a difference through higher education. For example, when asked about what attracted him to University X, he says,

I really felt they had a lot of good stuff going on in terms of a place where you could make a contribution but also ultimately where you could make a difference, you know, for people’s lives in education, and I’ve done [that] most of my career, that’s what I’ve spent most of my time doing. So I felt they had a lot of the technology, the people and the scale in order to really make a difference.
His idealism also manifests in the recurrent subthemes that emerge in larger contexts, where he makes consistently positive statements about the motivations of people who work in higher education. For example, he says, “but generally people come with a desire, especially in education, with a desire to make a contribution and do something good.” He speaks about this in reference to a partner or colleague who is determined to make a difference in their organization: “It’s important to have determined colleagues….By that I mean someone who wants to make a difference in the organization that they run.”

The implicit but recurrent nature of President A’s idealism is similar to all the other presidents except for President C. While presidents A, B, D, and E have their individual sense of the idealistic elements that inform their leadership and their partnerships, President C manifests this very differently. President C’s idealism is a primary and salient thematic factor and is explicit in terms of his partnerships rather than implicit.

*Thematic Factor of Team

Aspects and Elements of Team

- Team runs the university
- At the end of the day, it’s his team
- Team has expertise, can give answers and advice
- Team is best place to get answers because team knows more than you do
- Want both old and new faces on the team—diversity of opinions and thought
Interactions of Team with Other Factors

- Importance of team, which has expertise, complementary strengths
- Team and communication

Summary and Contextual Comments on Team

A primary aspect of President A’s approach to leadership, partnership, and relationship has to do with the idea of the team. The collective aspect of the team is important to him and informs his approach to important responsibilities such as decision-making. For example, when asked what he feels makes him a good partner, the idea of team is very important:

Because I’m humble, I think that’s part of it, in the sense of I am the first one to believe that strong teams are better than any particular individual and that it’s really your job as a leader to develop a strong team. It’s also philosophical in the sense that I’m not looking to make all the decisions, I don’t pretend, and this could be the part of me that I came from outside this particular role. I came from more of a business role than a higher ed administrator. But I think it’s really more a matter of personal philosophy that I believe in delegating, I believe in empowering people. I think that makes for a successful organization. And there’s certainly times when I need to make a decision but I think that it’s more effective and fun to discuss these things together and empower people to make the decisions. I found if you communicate your philosophy and your mission well, then most of the time they are going to make very good decisions.

This collective approach also informs his idea of the importance of dyadic partnerships for presidents. He says,

In the chief executive role you can’t do it all yourself; at times maybe the less you do yourself the better. The more you can lead or share leadership with others, I think ultimately the more effective you’re going to be and so these sorts of partnerships and this one in particular we’re talking about are a means to that end and I think it’s important to look for ‘em. They make you more effective and more fun.
Findings for President B

Table 11. President B’s Partnership with Emily

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender of President B:</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key dyadic partner:</td>
<td>Emily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of key dyadic partner:</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of key dyadic partner:</td>
<td>Senior Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time of the Partnership:</td>
<td>18 years and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Partnerships:</td>
<td>With the role and with a partnering institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Nature of the Partnerships Discussed by President B

President B differs slightly from the other presidents in the nature of how she selects her key dyadic partnership for discussion. Her primary focus throughout the interview is on the partnership with Emily and when she selected this partnership for discussion, she describes it as follows: “I would use my senior vice president as the significant partner, the most enduring partnership that many people would say is the leadership spine of the institution.” However, in the beginning of the interview, President B first discusses two other partnerships that she feels are important: a partnership with the role of the presidency itself and also a partnership with a key institution that is associated with her school. She describes the partnership with the role of the presidency itself:

I think when you’re in the role of a president, it’s not a job, it’s a life style. And so whether you’re conscious of it or not, in some sort of way, that’s your first partnership, if you want to use language, with the role….And I think that, just off the top of my head, one of the things about leadership and the presidency is that it can be an isolating role just by the nature of how you give people confidence in who you are, that you’ll be fair, that you’ll be consistent… it’s hard to manage special relationships. So that if you think of your first relationship, if you want to call it a partnership with your role, that can be important.
She describes the partnership with the key associated institution with the following words:

One of the most critical partnerships that I would have to acknowledge is with the [key institution]…that partnership, that mutual trust, that sense of mutual respect and understanding is very important….So the moral of that piece of it is that depending upon how you define partnership, there are pieces of that as a president you are in relation to things and roles and community that, if you think of them as partnerships and in partnerships there is a give and take, it can help you as a president sort of position yourself. For me I do think there has been a give and take in how I lead, fill my role as president over time and surely the relationship—and how we’ve worked collaboratively, the [key institution] and I—has been essential to my success as president.

Findings of the Thematic Factors of Successful Dyadic Partnerships

The key thematic factors in President B’s successful dyadic partnership that emerged from analysis of President B’s interview and follow-up questions are her sense of the role and the nature of her interactions in the role with her partner Emily, and the elements that comprise her relationship with Emily. These elements include their mentor–mentee relationship as well as Emily’s role as a truth-teller and the resilience of their relationship through changing dynamics. Additionally the thematic factors of their complementary strengths in service to the common mission of working for the school are important in the success of the partnership. The following tables provide an overview of the thematic factors that emerged for President B. They are presented in order of salience as follows:
Table 12. President B’s Thematic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient factor</td>
<td>The role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient factor</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient factor</td>
<td>Mentorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient factor</td>
<td>Time and longevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient factor</td>
<td>Resilience—also, subtheme of the role, subtheme of relationship, aspect of elements of partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most salient factor</td>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh most salient factor</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth most salient factor</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth most salient factor</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth most salient factor</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. President B’s Sub-thematic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Sub-thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient sub-thematic factor—eleventh factor overall</td>
<td>*Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient sub-thematic factor—twelfth factor overall</td>
<td>*Boundaries—emergent theme, (interactive with the role, relationship, and communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient sub-thematic factor—thirteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*SUP—vertical/horizontal elements (interactive with the role, relationship, communication and boundaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient sub-thematic factor—fourteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Sameness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient sub-thematic factor—fifteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Religious element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most salient sub-thematic factor—sixteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Works hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh most salient sub-thematic factor—seventeenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Ability to know self and other and convey key aspects of self iteratively—aspect of role, relationship and communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word Tone and Usage for President B

President B uses words and sentences that are warm and interactive in tone. She tells stories that illustrate her point and she is engaging and at times uses humor. In this
regard she is very similar to presidents C and D in the way they use stories and humor. President B speaks with eloquence and uses intellectual terms such as “raison d’être.” President B also makes reference to academic and management literature and styles. For example, she references Myers-Briggs categories when talking about college presidents and says, “Have you ever read anything that Jim Fisher wrote?” In her reference to literature, she is similar to President D. President B uses a cognitive tone in her reference to certain intellectual frames such as psychological and personal development aspects of mentorship and gender aspects of leadership.

A key word for President B when talking about many aspects of her partnership is the word “resilience.” Her use of the term “resilience” is similar in context to the way in which President D speaks about “challenges.”

A consistent term that President B uses to describe the partnership is that of the mentor-mentee relationship. This idea of mentorship is an emergent thematic factor throughout President B’s narrative and her word usage supports this factor. For example, an element of this thematic factor is the changing nature of the mentor-mentee relationship and how Emily, the mentee, is now moving to almost an equal level. She uses this mentor-mentee term for the relationship to convey the idea of the changing and non-static aspects of partnership.

There is a strong similarity overall between the word tone and usage of President B and President D, the other female president. Specifically, President B uses many of the same words and types of words as President D. This word usage differs markedly from the word usage of the male presidents. President B uses terms throughout her narrative
that are expressive of gratitude and also of a religious element. These are the same words used by President D and include “privilege,” “blessed,” and “gratitude.” An example of this usage is her statement, “You know, I am really blessed in my relationship with Emily.”

President B is also similar to President D in her use of emotive words, family terms, and personal development to describe her key partnership. When using family terms President B speaks about her relationship with her partner as a mother-daughter relationship, in which Emily is the daughter. For example, when asked what three wishes she would choose to develop or transform the partnership she says, “I would hope for what every mother hopes of a daughter every once in a while, that as she grows up she still keeps me in the loop.”

She also uses family terms to describe the partnership in that she speaks about it as deeper than a friendship and more like a marriage in some ways. She says, “What makes this relationship work for the institution is the relationship, the marriage, I mean it’s like a marriage…I mean, her husband, it’s a kick, he always says, ‘She’s married to you.’”

President B uses personal development terms that are similar to those used by President D, but President B puts more of an emphasis on the use of the word “grown-up” whereas President D uses the term “maturity.” Some examples of President B’s use of personal development terms include the following:

“I have been a mentor to her and we have sort of grown up together running the institution.”
“What she didn’t see is how I was growing up and needed more space.”

“But I will still always be the grown-up that helps her balance that.”

“But she’s the grown-up; she has to forgive me.”

President B uses words that are emotive and reflect her strong personal involvement in her partnership and the caring nature of the partnership relationship. Some examples of this use of emotive words include the following:

“If I’m in a painful administrative moment, a hard decision or something, Emily feels that deeply in a different way.”

“It’s a good thing I love you, it’s a good thing I love you.”

“So it has been, it is, a very intimate, rich, mutually supportive, resilient partnership, but its reason for being is not friendship, although it’s maybe closer than friendship or more enduring, it’s reason for being is the ability to serve the institution.”

Details of Thematic Factors for President B

The following provides details concerning the component aspects and elements of each thematic factor, as well as how each thematic factor is interactive with other thematic factors.

**Thematic Factor of the Role**

Aspects and Elements of the Role

- The role as key partner
- The role as a lifestyle
• Works hard, immense capacity for hard work, is driven

• The need for good fit with the role, the institution

• SUP—vertical elements of the role—boundaries, responsibility—ultimately vertical

• The role as isolating, loneliness of the role

• The ultimate and final decision-maker

• The one with the final responsibility

• Boundaries

• The role makes the decisions

• Models the values and the mission

• The role changes and you change in the role

• Need to be stable and healthy in the role

• The job of the president

• Knowing self and taking care of self in the role—this helps prevent worry on the part of others, lets them focus on their roles

Interactions of the Role with Other Factors

• The changing nature of the role over time

• The changing nature of the role and the relationship with the partner, and the mentor-mentee aspect of the relationship

• The role and longevity within one institution

• The role, boundaries, and communication

• The role, time and resilience in the partnership

• The role and communication—there is communicating of the decisions as part of the role [the role makes the decisions]

• The role and knowing self and communicating self to the other
• It is helpful to the president to have a partner who knows them well—i.e., through communication of the self to the partner

Summary and Contextual Comments on the Role

The idea of the role is a key thematic factor for President B, as is illustrated by her choosing the role itself as an example of one of her partnerships. The role is fundamental in terms of how she relates to and is in relation with her partner across a number of aspects. One such aspect has to do with the role as the ultimate decision-maker and as ultimately responsible: “It’s the role that is making that decision, you know—how you make it, how you communicate it.” The partner needs to be able to understand this decision-making aspect of the role:

The thing I think is unique to a partnership in the context of leadership is that you can share almost everything but you can’t share—nor would it be appropriate for you as a leader to do so—ultimate responsibility. So I am never far away from knowing what’s happening at this institution because no matter, whatever happens, I am ultimately responsible. She shares much of that institution perspective with me, but she’s not ultimately responsible and that’s the way the relationship operates. She’ll never fully understand that until she sits in, because in the darkest moment, the person who has to make the decision is the president.

President B says that Emily is good at respecting this aspect of the presidency in that she communicates and is supportive:

She treads with me in conversation and in sort of collaborative problem solving up and to that point where the final decision is mine. Emily has a wonderful way of respecting that in a way. She will give me her best advice, she will debate an issue with me, she is very data-driven, but my decision has 100% of her support whether she might have done it differently. And that happens I think out of her trust and respect for my ability as a president. I think it also comes out of many years of working together and her understanding of the role.
The nature of the role such that the final decision rests with the president contributes to the sense of isolation of the role: “and the harder the decision, the lonelier that ultimate moment is…at a certain point when you’re in a leadership role you’re finished consulting and you have to make your decision yourself.” This is particularly the case with difficult decisions: “because in the darkest moment the person who has to make the decision is the president.” This isolation of the role involves a sense of separation from others: “There is always some element of separation between a president and all of his or her relationships. It’s just the nature of what it is.” This separation and isolation increase the importance of the dyadic partner, who not only can lessen the sense of isolation by being in relation to the president but also can serve as a truth-teller who communicates important information to the president. President B warns that other presidents who don’t have such truth-tellers for partners can be in dangerous positions:

You know, it is a great help for the resilience of a president to have people around her that can be supportive and contribute and you need to be open to that. I mean, if you find a president (probably a he) who doesn’t feel he has a close partnership in the presidency, then that person is in a dangerous position because at some point somebody’s going to need to tell them the truth and they’re not going to have somebody in a position to be able to do that.

When asked what it is that she feels makes her a good partner, President B’s answer reveals that it is about hard work, integrity, and being trustworthy and also being able to use humor. There is also an indication that she feels she carries the weight of the partnership more than Emily. She says,

Researcher: What do you feel makes you a good partner?
President B: That I work harder than anybody else in the room…
Researcher: Is that what makes you a good partner?

President B: Well, yes, because I think partnership in the context of the role is carrying the load. I mean, I guess the other thing that I would say is, it gets back to why are we doing all this, that Emily can trust that I will make the best decision that I can make on behalf of the university. I’ll do it with integrity, I’ll do it with balance, and I’ll be very thoughtful and discerning about that. I guess the other thing I would say, I’ve got a good sense of humor and in difficult moments or in exhausting moments I can break the tension with a good sense of humor…

There is a vertical dynamic that emerges from the data in terms of the role of the president, which can impact the nature of the boundaries between the president and her constituents, and the president must be able to manage the boundaries:

Where presidents do live in a space that’s somewhat removed. That, you have, it’s about boundaries to a certain extent. You know on the one hand you do manage that boundary that separates the institution from it’s public and the like, but you also manage your own boundaries. You have to have a strong constitution, you have to have a strong physical constitution for these jobs because, again, as I always say to folks as I talk to them about leadership, it’s not the responsibility of the faculty and staff to be worried about my mental, physical, emotional health. I need to find ways of stabilizing that because if I sound or behave or look like I’m not together, it sends ripples of worries through the institution.

Thus one aspect of this for President B is that you have to live in the role in a healthy way, “You have to have enough internal stability to live in the role in a healthy way,” and take care of yourself so your constituents can focus on their jobs. In terms of boundaries overall, President B feels that in a long partnership like the ones she has with Emily, the boundaries can widen and this has to do with trust and thinking in the same way: “In a long term relationship, boundaries widen with trust. The boss is still the boss, however, but you can get more work done because now two people think like you think.”
An important idea that emerges in terms of the role is that the role changes over time and the partnership also changes and in such situations resilience through the changes on the part of both the partners is very important for the partnership. President B talks about such changes throughout her narrative. An example of her words in this regard is in her response to being asked to describe her ideal partnership, where she says,

I think that changes as the role changes and as the demand of the market changes and as you change in the role so that one of the reasons that Emily and I are such good partners is she and we are resilient together. Both of us are different now than we were when we started. You know, when we started out … we were both figuring it out together, you know. She had strengths, I had strengths, over time and maturity the relationship, the trust has gotten deeper, but we’ve been in different places and needed different things of each other.

Other aspects of the role and partnership include the role as lifestyle and the need for the partner to keep up with the fast pace and rhythm of the president in this role; and the role as clearly visible and the difficulties in managing the role and the partnership to avoid appearances of favoritism. President B speaks about this idea of avoiding favoritism, given the position of the role and the nature of the dyad as radiating and extrapolating outwards:

Actually such partnerships can interfere with the group dynamic, if you do not manage this relationship well. And from a work perspective, your partner has to be transparently worthy of your special affection or she is perceived as your “blind spot.”

**Thematic Factor of Relationship**

Aspects and Elements of Relationship

- Importance of mentorship, and female mentorship
- The pattern of mentorship, and female mentorship
• The changing and at times transitional nature of the mentorship relationship
• The deep and committed nature of the relationship—like a marriage, like a mother-daughter relationship (implied)
• The changing nature of the relationship
• Stages of social development and the relationship
• Not personal friendship
• Ultimately involves a vertical element
• Boundaries, and separation from others
• Honesty of the relationship
• Humility in the relationship
• The partner needs to be a truth-teller
• Knowing self and conveying self (ability to know self and other and convey key aspects of self iteratively)
• Being known by partner—helpful to the president to have someone who knows them well
• Sense of humor
• Relationship and leadership—her relationships are an important part of how she leads
• Issues of forgiveness
• SUP—vertical and horizontal elements
• Being the grown-up in the relationship
• Carrying the load of the partnership

Interactions of Relationship with Other Factors
• Importance of knowing self, a self-consciousness, knowing strengths, weaknesses, what you need in terms of partnership
• SUP—there is both vertical relationship and horizontal communication

• The changing nature of the relationship over time

• Relationship between investment of time over the years and honesty of relationship

• Relationship and leadership—her relationships are an important part of how she leads

• Relationship and trust and complementary strengths

• Relationship between knowing of self and communicating it and trust (Emily knows how the president thinks so the president trusts Emily to do things in the way the president would want.)

Summary and Contextual Comments on Relationship

President B’s relationship with her partner, Emily, is characterized by a number of factors including a personal and family element, where they are like mother and daughter, or in a relationship that is so close it could be seen as similar to a marriage. However, while they are in a deep and emotionally committed relationship, they are not personal friends. President B says in this regard the following:

And I would also say that although Emily and I do not spend personal time together, you know we don’t go out shopping, we’re not personal friends in that way, informally…But I would tell you that we have a very deep, committed relationship.

President B’s relationship with Emily changes over time and involves shifts in how they know, understand, and relate to each other. This is illustrated by the mentor-mentee relationship that is in transition in that now Emily is moving from mentee to peer. A key characteristic of this relationship is resilience throughout the partnership, including through the changing dynamics. The relationship is also characterized by complementary
skills that increase trust, and a knowing of self and communicating that knowledge in a way that increases trust. An emergent factor in the nature of the relationship has to do with issues of forgiveness and that while President B says that doing things right is important, it is also important to recognize that “one of the dangers is that you can’t, you can’t live that role with the role that you are perfect or that the person you present has to be perfect at all times.” While she acknowledges the need for forgiveness, she herself, like presidents A and C, finds forgiveness difficult. She says, “I’m not as good at that.” An overarching element of the relationship between President B and Emily is their common mission and their resilience in working together towards that common mission.

Thematic Factor of Mentorship

Aspects and Elements of Mentorship
- There is a pattern of female mentors and mentees—she was mentored by female leaders and she is mentoring Emily
- The relationship is in transition
- Legacy
- Developing Emily—working on areas of weakness such as fundraising

Interactions of Mentorship with Other Factors
- Mentorship and sameness
- Mentorship and SUP—transitioning to more equality in the relationship
- Mentorship and boundaries and communication—need to be kept in the loop
Summary and Contextual Comments on Mentorship

Mentorship has been an important element of President B’s partnerships. She has been mentored by others and she is mentoring Emily. She says,

Part of the reason I’m here is that I had some very strong mentors and the women in my life who were in higher education became presidents, and their investment in me and mentor/mentee relationship, partnership was critical to how quickly I went up the ranks and the level of my aspirations.

She talks about her mentor and their relationship in her narrative and also talks about the nature of how she is mentoring Emily. One element of this is that she is helping Emily to develop in areas where she does not have certain strengths. She is also giving Emily responsibilities and opportunities that support her learning. The mentor-mentee relationship she has with Emily is in transition and they are working out Emily’s moving from mentee to peer and full partner in the running of the institution. This mentoring relationship has been an important element of how she and Emily partner and work together.

Thematic Factor of Time and Longevity

Aspects and Elements of Time and Longevity

- Many years at same institution
- Many years in this partnership
- Emergence of the relationship over time

Interactions of Time and Longevity with Other Factors

- Trust over time
- Knowing over time
- Resilience over time as the relationship changes
• Relationship between the investment of time and the honesty of the relationship
• Relationship between trust and time
• Relationship between knowing and being known, and time and trust

Summary and Contextual Comments on Time and Longevity
For President B the idea of longevity is important in her role and in her partnerships. She has served a long time as president of her institution and she had been in the partnership with Emily for a very long time, 18 years. She says in this regard, “And the interesting thing for us, you know and I think it would surprise me if in your study you find a working relationship that is longer than ours.” President B emphasizes time and longevity throughout her narrative in terms of time at the institution; time investment in the partnership and emergence of the dyadic relationship over time; trust over time; growing in the partnership and their roles over time; expanding boundaries over time; and the changing relationship over time. There is a relationship between investment of time over many years and the honesty of the relationship: “the honesty of it …comes out of the investment we’ve both made in it over many, many years.” There is also a strong relationship between complementary strengths, time, and trust in the relationship between President B and Emily: “She had strengths, I had strengths. Over time and maturity the relationship, the trust has gotten deeper.”

The issue of time and longevity also occurs in the thematic factors for the other presidents. With presidents A, D, and E there is emphasis on investing time in the partnership. However, President B is most similar to President D around this theme.
Both of these women presidents emphasize longevity more than the men do, particularly the longevity they have with their institutions.

**Thematic Factor of Resilience**

Aspects and Elements of Resilience
- Resilience is a key component of the enduring nature of the partnership
- Resilience manifests in working together in the common mission
- There is resilience through changing nature of each of the women as they grow in their roles
- There is resilience in terms of their learning together
- There is emotional resilience in being willing to work things out
- Resilience in the role of leadership, including consistency in showing up every day, prepared and able to take care of self and lead

Interactions of Resilience with Other Factors
- Resilience through time
- Resilience through changing nature of the mentorship dynamic
- Resilience and relationship
- Resilience and common mission

Summary and Contextual Comments on Resilience

Resilience is an important thematic factor in President B’s dyadic partnership.

This resilience has many components but is generally characterized by a determination on the part of both partners to be able to work in the partnership through multiple challenges. These challenges can occur as situations that need to be dealt with in common service to the mission of the school. They can also occur internally within the partnership as the roles, needs, and dynamics within the relationship change over time. An example of this
is how President B talks about the resilience that characterizes the way they are both dealing with their changing mentor-mentee dynamic. She says,

But some of that is the resilience you have in those changing relationships. You know she is not my mentee anymore. She is a really full partner and I can see that she will do not only some things differently but she’ll do some things better.

President B also talks about how resilience can manifest in the way that the partners work to overcome their personal issues in the partnership to better serve the common mission:

But the reality is, both she and I, because it’s a partnership in the institution, our first priority is the institution. Even though we care deeply for each other we’ll work through a tension between the two of us because what brings us together and what is the raison d’etre to the partnership is not our mutual satisfaction, that’s an outcome. But the reasoning for the partnership is in service to the institution…So it has been, it is, a very intimate, rich, mutually supportive, resilient partnership, but it’s reason for being is not friendship although it’s maybe closer than friendship or more enduring. It’s reason for being is the ability to serve the institution.

President B talks initially about how her first partnership in a sense is with the role, and she discusses resilience implicitly in this regard in terms of her understanding of the job of the president. She says in this regard,

You show up every day so that people depend on it. You appear and behave and respond consistently depending upon who it is coming in. You’re receptive, you’re stable, people attribute their decision-making to you and then therefore they go about their work without being distracted, that’s my job. You know my job is creating the context within which the core mission of the institution, the teaching and learning, can go on undistracted.

This is connected to her role in her partnership with Emily because it is clear that she tries to behave this way with Emily, providing her the stable and safe space for Emily to
grow and develop. Thus, the teaching and learning she refers to above also takes place within the mentorship space. When talking about issues of development and learning, she says this about Emily: “I will still always be the grown-up that helps her balance that.” Thus, President B’s leadership approach that incorporates resilience is mirrored in her partnership.

Thematic Factor of Complementary Strengths

Aspects and Elements of Complementary Strengths

- She believes in having complementary strengths as element of partnership
- She and Emily have complementary strengths
- Awareness of one’s own strengths and weaknesses is important so you can get what you need in partnership

Interactions of Complementary Strengths with Other Factors

- Trusts Emily’s skill set—it complements hers
- Helps with the role—with her getting her work done (implicit)

Summary and Contextual Comments on Complementary Strengths

The thematic factor of complementary strengths emerges consistently throughout the narrative in terms of the importance of the partners having complementary strengths. A key element of this is the knowing of your strengths and weaknesses. President B talks about her partnership with Emily in this regard:

The relationship is I wouldn’t exactly call us opposites but you know that one of the things I believe in strongly from a leadership perspective is that you not only want to know your own strengths you want to buffer your own weaknesses or less developed areas with people who have strengths…so we are a good pair, we are also a good pair in that I am the strategic, vision person; she’s the tactical operating person.
When asked what advice she would have for other presidents about forming and maintain good partnerships, President B talks about knowing of self and complementary strengths, saying that presidents should have “a self-consciousness, in other words you have to be conscious of your own strengths and weaknesses and what you need.”

**Thematic Factor of Common Mission**

**Aspects and Elements of Common Mission**
- Both serving the mission of the school
- Common mission is raison d’etre for the partnership
- Helps hold the partnership together; they will work things out to serve the common mission
- Serves the larger good
- Core factor that gives life and vitality is interdependency in service to the common mission

**Interactions of Common Mission with Other Factors**
- Common mission and resilience
- Common mission and relationship

**Summary and Contextual Comments on Common Mission**

The common mission is the reason for the existence of the partnership and it helps to hold the relationship together. Both the partners are working together to serve the mission of the school:

But the reality is, both she and I, because it’s a partnership in the institution, our first priority is the institution. Even though we care deeply for each other we’ll work through a tension between the two of us because what brings us together and what is the raison d’etre to the partnership is not our mutual satisfaction, that’s an outcome. But the reasoning for the partnership is in service to the institution.
President B also talks about this in terms of an interdependence, that the core factor that she thinks gives life and vitality to her partnership is “an interdependency in the service of the mission of the place.”

Thematic Factor of Trust

Aspects and Elements of Trust
- The partner needs to be a truth-teller
- Trusts Emily to make good decisions
- Trusts Emily’s expertise and integrity
- Trusts herself (implicit)
- Trusts that Emily will be supportive and loyal

Interactions of Trust with Other Factors
- Relationship between trust and time
- Relationship between knowing and being known and time and trust
- Relationship between trust and expertise of the partner
- Relationship between trust and integrity of the partner
- Relationship between trust and knowing and being known by partner, so trusts partner will make decisions president would approve of because she knows what president wants and how president thinks

Summary and Contextual Comments on Trust

There is a strong interaction for President B between trust and time. She states,

The honesty of it and that comes out of the investment we’ve both made in it over many, many years. Always the complementary skills, that she has skills, financial skills and acumen that I trust. She’s a woman of great integrity and that I trust too. So that it’s a healthy relationship.
There is also an interaction between complementary strengths and trust, within the context of time. She says in this regard, “She had strengths, I had strengths. Over time and maturity, the relationship, the trust has gotten deeper.” This is very similar to the perspective of President A for whom there is strong interaction between complementary strengths as demonstrated over time as a way of generating trust.

There is interaction between knowing and being known over time, and trust. Specifically, she feels that over time Emily has come to know her in a way that means she can anticipate what President B would want and how she would do things, and this increases President B’s trust in her in that she trusts Emily will make the right decision—the decision President B would make. There are elements of loyalty and Emily “having her back” inherent in this aspect of knowing. She says,

You know and truthfully she has my back and that can be, in preparing for something, in fully understanding a situation and that has matured over many years. I mean at this point there’s enormous value in the fact that there are some things I don’t even see because she says, “I know B would never accept that,” and it could be something like “Oh my God, change the colors of the chairs in the auditorium.” And that helped, when you have someone that knows you that well. It’s not only supportive but it’s efficient sometimes you know, and ninety-five percent of the time I am confident that she will make the decision that I would have made and so I can trust that. The underbelly of that over the many years that we have been together is that every once in a while I say, “Emily, just keep me in the loop.”

Thematic Factor of Communication

Aspects and Elements of Communication

- Has both direct and indirect aspects
- The need to be kept in the loop
• The partner must be a truth-teller
• Need for boundaries
• SUP—horizontal aspect of communication
• Importance of honest communication
• Communicates the decisions

Interactions of Communication with Other Factors
• Need to be kept in the loop and communication and boundaries
• Communicates the decisions and the role

Summary and Contextual Comments on Communication

Communication has a number of aspects for President B. It is not as salient as other themes but it is still important to her sense of leadership, partnership, and how she partners. The communication with Emily can be both direct and indirect. An example of the indirectness is the way in which they are managing the mentor-mentee transition. President B says, “I would say one of the interesting things that we’re negotiating now and when I say ‘negotiating’ I mean sort of benignly and not outspoken is that transition from mentee to peer.” However, the communication between President B and Emily is also characterized by directness that includes truth-telling. This truth-telling is important for the president and can involve Emily having to tell her unpleasant or unwanted truths:

Emily will tell me the truth. She will tell me the truth when I don’t want to hear it. And over time I’ve learned that that’s an important characteristic in some of the people close to me. She will tell me the real truth, she will come in and say, B, this is…you know, things that I don’t want to hear but I need to hear.
An aspect of communication in the partnership is that President B listens to Emily. She takes her input into account and is willing to consider her perspective: “I then assess that, it’s her truth and it’s her perspective and it isn’t always 100% the way I need to go, but at least when she’s saying something, I listen and it helps me assess a situation.” This communication includes the space for dialogue, discussion, and debate, although the final decision is that of the president:

She treads with me in conversation and in sort of collaborative problem solving up and to that point where the final decision is mine. Emily has a wonderful way of respecting that in a way. She will give me her best advice, she will debate an issue with me, she is very data-driven, but my decision has 100% of her support.

A challenge for President B in communicating with Emily has to do with the changing nature of the role. With Emily taking on more responsibility, President B is concerned that she is not always being kept informed. This has to do with the nature of the shifting boundaries in the mentor and partner role. This is conflictual for President B because being informed is important to her leadership. She says,

President B: …but I still like to be in the loop.
Researcher: Even with the small stuff.
President B: Exactly, because it’s the nature of how I lead.

**Thematic Factor of Leadership and Summary and Contextual Comments**

President B is the only president who discusses leadership explicitly within her narrative as a specific topic area, and the theme of leadership also emerges through coding. She discusses her attraction to the leadership aspect of the presidency, stating,
I’ve always been attracted to leadership, too, so it was the leadership and the challenge of the presidency that’s attractive because for me leadership is this puzzle… I think it’s the human puzzle that attracts me to leadership.

This emphasis on the human element in leadership is reflected in her leadership style. She is relationship based in her leadership and says, “I started out as a dean of students. My relationship with my constituencies is an important part of how I lead.” Within this context, her leadership partnership with Emily is “the leadership spine of the institution.”

A key part of her leadership has to do with modeling behavior and values so that she speaks and acts in alignment with the common mission:

When you step into a position like this, it’s been my challenge and also been my privilege to make sure that it continues to resonate with the mission of the place and I’m a part of carrying that to the future—that it’s well articulated. It’s not only what we say, it’s we walk the talk, it’s how we hire, it’s the choices we make about curriculum, it’s all those things.

Thematic Factor of *Gender and Summary and Contextual Comments

Gender is a recurrent theme throughout the narrative of President B at both the surface level and also the coded and analytic level. President B is in a pattern of female mentorship within her partnership with Emily. She was mentored by a woman and is mentoring a woman. She discusses this dynamic throughout the interview with reference to her own mentor as well as her relationship with Emily. She also discusses the nature of how women lead differently from men:

I think you don’t want to stereotype things, but everything that we know about women in leadership, without assuming every woman, says that we lead differently, that we lead more with relationship-centered, with the heart so to speak, and that is a great strength.
There is an awareness of gender and gender issues with President B, which is also a sub-theme for President D but which does not occur throughout the narratives of any of the male presidents.

**Thematic Factor of *Boundaries Summary and Contextual Comments***

Boundaries are important for President B in terms of the role of the president in that, Presidents do live in a space that’s somewhat removed. It’s about boundaries to a certain extent. On the one hand, you do manage that boundary that separates the institution from its public, but you also manage your own boundaries. You have to have a strong constitution.

Boundaries are also an issue in the partnership with Emily in that at times as the mentor-mentee relationship shifts, President B feels that Emily is overstepping her boundaries. This is reflective of the unique aspect of the leadership partnership discussed by President B, whereby there can be tension between the partners in that they are never fully equal; the vertical institutional structure means that the president is the ultimate decision-maker and has ultimate responsibility within that role. Thus, she has concerns when Emily doesn’t keep her in the loop and doesn’t provide her with necessary information. This need for communication and information is also an element of her leadership because she feels the responsibility of her role strongly.

**Thematic Factor of *Situational Use of Power (SUP) and Summary and Contextual Comments***

For President B, there is a horizontal element to the communication, and there appears to be a space in the changing mentor-mentee relationship where there is horizontality with Emily as an equal partner. However, President B reiterates many times
that the role is ultimately one where the president is the final decision-maker and has the final responsibility. It is a vertical role. President B also talks about the loneliness and isolation of this verticality. A question for further exploration is whether this verticality, in conjunction with the impossibility of friendship in the role for President B and other presidents, increases the ultimate sense of isolation. There is a bittersweet element in that the closest relationship with this dyadic partner and truth-teller is not at the end of the day a friendship. Rather, the vertical element re-asserts itself and they are out of the horizontal matrix and back within their vertical roles.

This situational use of power (SUP) with a vertical/horizontal dynamic is discussed by all the presidents. For presidents A, B, and E, when they mention horizontality, there is always a caveat in which they assert the ultimate vertical nature of the role. President D is very different in this regard in that she comes from a collective and emphasizes horizontality in creating and maintaining community. President C is different in that his key partnerships are external to the institution and there is equality and horizontality in the power distributions of the partnerships. In fact, in referencing one key dyad, President C presents himself as often the less powerful partner.
Findings for President C

Table 14. President C’s Partnerships with Thomas and the Superintendent of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of President C:</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key dyadic partners:</td>
<td>2 partners: Thomas and Superintendent of Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Gender of key dyadic partners: | Thomas is male  
Superintendent of Schools is female |
| Position of key dyadic partners: | Thomas is a consultant for international initiatives  
The Superintendent of Schools is the Superintendent in the area where President C’s college is located |
| Length of time of partnerships: | Partnership with Thomas is 15 years and ongoing  
Partnership with Superintendent was 2 years |

Note: President C differs from the other presidents in that both his key dyadic partnerships are with partners who are external to his school.

Thematic Factors of Successful Dyadic Partnerships

The key emergent thematic factors in President C’s successful dyadic partnerships that emerged from analysis of President C’s interview and follow-up questions involve the need for overall consistency in the partnership, with his sense of idealism around serving the greater common good. This serving the greater common good is part of his sense of the common mission of the partnership and involves effectiveness in impact towards the greater common good. The partnership must also include trust and must have an element of fairness in both partners having their needs met, particularly in terms of their sense of satisfaction. The following tables provide an overview of the thematic factors that emerged for President C. They are presented in order of salience as follows:
Table 15. President C’s Thematic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient factor</td>
<td>Idealism—serving the greater good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient factor</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient factor</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient factor</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient factor</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. President C’s Sub-thematic Factors and Emergent Thematic Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Sub-thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient sub-thematic factor</td>
<td>*Knowing self and partner/communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixth factor overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient sub-thematic</td>
<td>*Complementary strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor—seventh factor overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient sub-thematic</td>
<td>*Difficulty of forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor—eighth factor overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient sub-thematic</td>
<td>*Importance of partnership with spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor—ninth factor overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most salient emergent thematic</td>
<td>**SUP equality and distribution of power (horizontality aspect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material—tenth factor overall</td>
<td>manifests differently from other presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient emergent</td>
<td>**Intuition—with trust, with boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thematic material—eleventh factor overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient emergent</td>
<td>**Deep personal friendship not possible within working partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thematic material—twelfth factor overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word Tone and Usage for President C

President C’s narrative is characterized by a rational and reflective tone. He thinks carefully before speaking and chooses his words deliberately. For example, several times during the interviews he asked for clarification around a question or word meaning and was careful to explain his ideas and perspectives with exactness and precision. Additionally, President C has both word tone and usage that reflect his
primary salient theme of “idealism.” The key word for him in this regard, which ties together his narrative, is the word “passion.” At times he also uses the word “passionate.” An example of this word usage is the following:

The idea of returning to the X area was also critically important as well, so it was both a combination of a geography—returning home, if you will—and aligning with a pretty good liberal arts school, which was my passion.

As further examples, when asked what makes him a good partner, he says, “I think Thomas would say that I too am trustworthy, honest, a man of my word. I think he’d say I’m passionate about this international stuff.” Another representative statement of his use of the word “passion” is, “I think that a partnership without a goal that you’re passionate about is not a very exciting partnership.”

President C’s idealism is also reflected in his repeated use of the words “the greater good” and “the societal good.” For example he says, “When I talk about a partnership, it’s beyond what you get out of it and what I get out of it. There also has to be in my mind some societal good.”

There is a slight spiritual undertone to his narrative; however, it only manifests through his word usage, not through explicit religious statements. This tone is very different from that of presidents B and D, who have overt religious statements and references. With President C the spiritual tone comes out in word usage that includes terms such as “lift up,” and “spirit.” When asked for confirmation about this in the follow-up interview, President C said this was consistent with his perspective, stating: “I
think that I’m a very spiritual person.” Some representative examples of this usage include the following:

“I think those are the three things that I would lift up and say those are the things that I value.”

“I wish I had started here or a school like this because it just brings out my spirit more. “ [said in a meaningful tone]

“And that spirit of community activism, social engagement, is still here, so kids are really involved.”

At times throughout his narrative President C uses terms with a slight financial connotation, which reflects the grounded and balanced way in which he speaks and his rational perspective. Some examples include the following: “There’s got to be a societal gain against something greater then the individual’s,” and “Each partner has to receive an individual benefit.”

Overall, President C’s tone is reflective, cognitive, and balanced with a strong rational element. His words are neutral and reflect no overt emotionality or affect such as that evidenced in the narrative of the two female presidents, B and D. While he is idealistic, this idealism has a cognitive not affective tone and comes through as based on a rational approach to doing good and making society better as part of his legacy. This idealism informs the content of his interviews. An element of his specific goals concerning his idealism has to do with global and international educational initiatives.

He also is invested in improving the community where his school is located. When talking about his key successful dyadic partnerships, many of the examples
President C provides have to do with his partnerships in these arenas. President C is engaging and is a good storyteller and uses humor and storytelling in his narrative.

While there was some establishment of sameness in the beginning of the interview on the part of the president and the researcher, this was not a key thematic factor in the same way that it was with President D.

**Thematic Factors for President C**

The following provides details concerning the component aspects and elements of each thematic factor, as well as how each thematic factor is interactive with other thematic factors.

**Thematic Factor of Idealism (Serving the Greater Good)**

Aspects and Elements of Idealism

- The importance of serving the greater societal good, the common good
- Community activism, social engagement as part of mission
- There must be an ethical or moral component to an ideal or successful partnership
- Passion—this seems like a component of his idealism as well as a separate theme

Interactions of Idealism with Other Factors

- Connection between his idealism and mission of the school
- Connection between common mission and a successful partnership—that it must serve the greater societal good
- A sense of a relationship between passion and idealism in that they are aspects of each other

Summary and Contextual Comments on Idealism

The most salient thematic factor for President C in his successful dyadic partnership is his sense of idealism in that the partnership must be in service to something
greater than the individual gain of the two partners. Ultimately, the partnership must be in service to the greater good. For President C, while he is committed to furthering the mission of his school, this idealistic view of the greater good radiates beyond the mission of the school, to include a greater good for society. When asked about the ideal partnership, he mentions this factor: “I just think it has to serve the public good.”

This idealistic emphasis is very different from that of the other presidents. While they all have an element of idealism and work towards a common mission that is about betterment, President C is the only president to explicitly state that this is part of what for him constitutes a successful dyadic partnership. If there is not this element of the greater good, then President C doesn’t think it’s a successful partnership. While this idea of the common good is manifest for President C at the abstract level, it is also an intrinsic part of the partnering.

A component of his idealism is the idea of there needing to be an ethical element to the partnership:

Researcher: So an ideal partnership, so you’re putting a real ethical and sort of moral component to it…where there has to be a component of the good, or something to it in a partnership for it to be ideal?
President C: Um hm. Otherwise I can define a partnership as you and I getting together and deciding how we’re going to rob a bank. I don’t view that as an ideal partnership.

One aspect of this greater good for President C has to do with having global impact and increasing global citizenship for his students. This is his focus with his key partnership with Thomas in that their mission together is about such international initiatives. He describes Thomas initially in this way:
An active entrepreneur who has been my partner in helping us make international connections and shaping my institutions into partnerships with other colleges and universities throughout the world and bringing students from different countries to the United States.

The sense of personal satisfaction that President C derives from the partnership concerns providing the opportunity for global education. When asked what core factor gives life and vitality to the partnership, he says,

Well, I think there are two things in my mind...one is that you are successful in something bigger than yourself. And then secondly, that might be a way of looking at it externally but that you also derive. I don’t want to say, personal reward. I’ll say personal satisfaction from what you’re working on. So in the case of working with someone who’s helping connect me to the world, I think what we’re actually doing is we’re providing an opportunity for better education in the classrooms of the university that I’m working for. Because I really think that we have people from the United States in class sitting next to people from China, and India and England and Sweden and South America, that when ideas are shared and debated and discussed, real learning takes place...So I think that in the work ... I’m passionate about it because it really adds to the vibrancy of the learning experience for our students overall....I derive personal satisfaction in addition to knowing it’s helping my institution, it’s helping students. I derive personal satisfaction because it’s my legacy, you know, I view it as my legacy.

The second dyadic partnership with the superintendent of schools, which he discusses briefly in the initial interview, has to do with the goal of improving the educational opportunities for teaching and educational administration throughout the area where his college is located. Thus, both dyadic partnerships he discusses involve an alignment between his partnership and his idealistic goals.

There is a key interactive aspect between the thematic factors of his idealism and his sense of common mission in that what motivates him and is important to him in
serving the greater good must also be part of the common mission of the partnership. President C defines the success of the partnership by how well it helps achieve this common mission of the greater good.

It is also interesting to note that both of the partnerships that President C chooses to discuss in his interviews are with partners who are external to his institution and whose work is focused on the areas of his idealism, such as global and international educational initiatives and community. It is possible that his idea of successful dyadic partnerships having to be about the greater good is also reflected in which partnerships seemed, as he says, “the most ideal” when he was choosing what he wished to discuss during the interviews. Thus, even his choice of which partnerships to discuss and how he defines an ideal or successful partnership are reflective of the strongly idealistic nature of this president.

**Thematic Factor of Common Mission**

Aspects and Elements of Common Mission

- Must serve the greater societal good—this must be part of the partnership effort
- Partnership must be effective—have impact towards greater societal good
- Common mission in working towards greater societal gain more important than individual’s gain
- Legacy
- Being successful in something bigger than yourself
- Diversity, heterogeneity, global focus—all important as aspects of his mission and legacy
- Improving his immediate community as aspects of his mission
Interactions of Common Mission with Other Factors

- Common mission and idealism
- Common mission and trust
- Common mission and passion
- Common mission and dyad radiating out

Summary and Contextual Comments on Common Mission

For President C, there is a fundamental interaction between his idealism towards the common good and his idea of the common mission of his partnerships because the common mission for him is ultimately about the greater good. This interaction is illustrated when he talks about his sense of the common mission in terms of his partnership with the superintendent of schools and trying to find ways to help the community:

So all the families who can have options have taken the other option. All the families who don’t have options are involved in the public school district, so what in the midst of that despair, what I’m trying to do (and others it’s not just me…), is to try to create those positive outcomes, and model these positive outcomes to leverage them and create something greater. And that’s really the nature of it.

President C is the only president to emphasize consistently working towards a common mission that is not directly related to their school but which is about the community within which the school resides. His sense of common mission also incorporates a sense of global community as shown by his working with Thomas on multiple initiatives having to do with global learning. There is also an element of effectiveness in having an impact and working towards the common mission that is important to President C’s idea of partnership. He says, “I’ll just use the word
‘effective.’ The partnership’s effective, you’re accomplishing a goal you want to accomplish, and so you’re overall effective.”

**Thematic Factor of Trust**

**Aspects and Elements of Trust**

- Need mutual trust in a partnership
- Trust can develop a number of ways—instantly and over time
- Instant trust has a strong intuitive element
- Trust has been instant with his key dyadic partners
- He is slightly risk averse in some aspects of trust, such as hiring based upon intuition, due to experience
- In addition to instant trust, partners might need to prove themselves—earn trust in a sense through behavior (“Never know how much you can trust someone”)
- “Once you know, you know”
- Can involve falling on sword for person
- Can involve trusting them to represent you
- Can involve trusting them to do what you can’t do—such as communicate with foreign institutions on your behalf
- Trust can be based on alignment with common mission and purpose
- Involves fairness—that the person will also make sure your needs are met
- Toughest partnerships are those without trust

**Interactions of Trust with Other Factors**

- Instant trust and intuition
- Connection between trust and commitment—that the person will fall on sword for you
• Trust and fairness

• Connection between trust and alignment of purpose and commitment centered around truth

• Connection between trust and alignment around common mission

• Connection between trust and the common mission of greater societal good—alignment of mission

• Connection between trust and complementary skills—trusting them to do what you can’t do

• Trust and time

Summary and Contextual Comments on Trust

Trust is an important thematic factor for President C within the phenomenon of his successful dyadic partnerships. When asked what he values most about his dyadic partnership experiences, trust is one of the elements he mentions first:

President C: I’ll focus on that one that I value the most. I feel that there’s mutual trust, which I don’t think you can create a partnership without. I think that a partnership without a goal that you’re passionate about is not a very exciting partnership. So if you take mutual trust, you are involved in a partnership to accomplish a goal which you’re passionate about. And then lastly I’ll just use the word “effective.” The partnership’s effective, you’re accomplishing a goal you want to accomplish, and so you’re overall effective. I think those are the three things that I would lift up and say those are the things that I value.

Researcher: Trust, goal, and effectiveness.

President C: Right.

He also volunteers the idea that for him the most difficult type of partnerships are those without trust: “The tough ones are the ones in which there isn’t trust.”

There is a certain complexity to the thematic factor of trust in President C’s narrative, particularly with the way in which trust can develop. President C feels that
trust can develop both instantly and over time: “I think it comes both ways.” However, with reference to his key dyadic partnerships, he says the trust has always been instantaneous, within basically a first meeting, and has a strong element of intuition involved in the trusting. “I think both with Thomas and with the school district superintendent, there was an instant connection and that allowed us both to be open.”

When asked about the role of intuition in this instant, initial trust, he says it’s very important:

Researcher: How important has intuition or “trusting your gut” been in feeling an initial sense of trust with your key partner?
President C: Very much so. You know Thomas and I developed a relationship pretty quickly fifteen years ago. I had never been engaged in international recruiting and he had not done much at all in that regard. Through my openness to other cultures and wanting to have the campus enhanced with people from around the world and his connections, we thought that we had some commonality there and were willing to trust the fact that neither one of us had years and years of experience but we could well work together.

There is also an element of “sameness” in this initial trusting in his key dyadic partnerships “in terms of what we’re passionate about.” He describes feeling this sameness of passion the first time he had a meeting with the superintendent of schools:

We began talking about how we could both support one another. We just found ourselves really believing that we were both passionate about making an impact on our institutions, finding a kindred spirit, if you will, who actually had resources available to help the other. In my case I had faculty who could help lead professional development opportunities for her faculty and staff, and she had grant moneys available that would help spur the re-vitalization financially of our institution, and we were able to put together a pretty nice plan in which we both were able to win and that was all designed within a one hour meeting. It was phenomenal.
President C says that there is this initial sense of trust that has a highly intuitive aspect and is influenced by sameness in passion, but that partners also need to prove themselves over time. This is particularly the case when working with international partnerships in other countries:

You know, there’s just a pattern of behavior of getting to know someone there. I think there is something to be said about the three cups of tea thing that Greg Mortensen talked about in his book, which I actually enjoyed whether it’s fiction or fact, and going through the different opportunities before the bond is truly there, so it does take some time but I think once you know, you know. Once you know, you know.

It is important to note that there was initial contradiction between the first and second interviews in President C’s presentation of this idea of instant trust that has to do with intuition. In the first interview President C does not talk about an initial instant of trust upon meeting the partner, but rather describes an instant when trust happened with an assistant. However, he says, “And there wasn’t, there was not that kind of moment with Thomas or the superintendent; it was just over time I just felt that their purpose and my purpose, their commitment and my commitment were always centered around truth.” This contradiction was addressed by President C in his second-round interview when he answered clarifying questions. His statements about instant trust having to do with intuition as definitely having occurred with both Thomas and the superintendent are the most representative of his final comments in this regard.

The details of his trust relationship with his key dyadic partners include elements of being able to rely on someone and also being able to know they will understand your
best interests and make sure your needs are met. For example, when describing the nature of the trust with Thomas he says,

Relying on someone to communicate my story, to communicate the story of X College or Y University before, to communicate my passion is really trust. And, there’s, you know, ultimately it’s thinking that someone will always have, I’ll never say that they will never have their best interests over your best interests, but they will understand your best interests and make sure that while they’re getting their satisfaction need out of it, they’re making sure that you’re getting yours as well.

So for President C there’s an element of knowing and understanding a person that is involved in someone being able to act in a trusted way for them and with them.

President C also describes trustworthiness in terms of an alignment of common vision, mission, passion, a sense of truth, and the greater good. Additionally, there is specific interaction between trust and other thematic factors such as truth-telling and direct communication. When asked what are some factors that increase trust in a partnership, he says, “Whatever commitments are made by each party are kept.”

President C tells stories showing how partners demonstrate their trustworthiness and there is an element of loyalty that emerges in his narrative. After telling a story about how someone was willing to “fall on their sword” for the president, he says,

But it was at that point in time I knew I had a trustworthy partner in my office out front that would protect my back, so, even when I left, I mean that was a big story…as I was leaving University Y, that was my idea of commitment…that was an interesting story, a true story.

There is an element of risk aversion around trust in some of President C’s discussion. He says at one point: “Never know how much you can trust someone.”
When asked if he has good intuition, he says, “I like to think so, but sometimes I get proven wrong, but that’s okay.” He also says that while he has hired based upon intuition, that hasn’t always worked for him:

I’ve been burned on that too so I actually do a lot of research on hires…The one difficult thing is I know what connects with me, with others, but that doesn’t always mean it connects with the institution that you’re bringing them into.

The fact that he has had some negative trust experiences in the past could provide context for why his trust process involves both instant trust and trust developing over time, with the development stage as part of risk-mitigation. The multi-stage trust process in dyadic partnerships exhibited by President C, incorporating an initial trust based on intuition and a sameness of values (or in President C’s case, passion), then followed by an extended period where trustworthy behavior is demonstrated over time, is very similar to the partnership trust process of the two female presidents, B and D. However, President C’s partnership trust process is different from that of the other male presidents who do not speak about instant, intuitive trust, but rather trust based on demonstrated judgment over time (President E) or trust based upon demonstrated expertise over time (President A).

**Thematic Factor of Fairness**

**Aspects and Elements of Fairness**

- Each partner needs to receive an individual benefit
- The type of benefit can differ for the partners
- Mutual satisfaction essential in a partnership
Both sides need to get something out of it—both partners need level of personal satisfaction

Interactions of Fairness with Other Factors

- Fairness and trust
- Both sides need to get something out of it and then also needs to produce societal good—related to idealism and common mission

Summary and Contextual Comments on Fairness

President C is the only one of the presidents to emphasize fairness as a primary thematic factor in his successful dyadic partnerships. For President C, this fairness has to do with an element of reciprocity such that the needs of each of the partners within the partnership are met. While this is salient for President C, it is less so than the idealism of the greater good and the common mission. For while there needs to be fairness and both partners need to get something out of the partnership, this is less important than the common good. President C’s emergent theme of fairness has a reciprocal aspect in that each partner needs to be looking out for the other partner to know about what they need for satisfaction and to make sure they get it. When describing his ideal dyadic partnership he says,

So I think that there are always three things that have to happen, however you want to define it. I think that each partner has to receive an individual benefit...And they might be quite different from the other’s individual benefit. I’m not speaking to what Thomas receives out of our relationship, but, you know, in his case it might be the financial compensation that comes with connecting the colleges and universities that he serves to other parties and that’s fine. My benefit is not a financial benefit but it’s a personal satisfaction benefit so those are two different things but regardless, each individual has to receive some benefit from it. In my own mind to make it ideal, I think there’s got to be a societal gain against something greater than the individual’s to make it a partnership; that I would call ideal and maybe that’s just my own thinking.
President C also talks about this idea of reciprocated fairness in terms of his partnership with the woman superintendent. He says,

So, as opposed to pointing at one another, what I shared with her is why don’t we find a way to work together. And you’ve got to get something out of it and I’ve got to get something out of it. And overall it’s got to be something that then produces a good for our community....So you’ll get something out of it, we’ll get something out of it, and as we become better at producing managers, leaders, and teachers, your teachers and administrators are more effective, then this disparaged school district is going to be better, and our community is going to be better.

Ultimately, for President C, the idea of fairness is interactive with his idealism and sense of common mission in that ultimately for him, partnership comes back to being about the greater good: “I recognize that the other party has to have some level of personal satisfaction, but for me it has to provide personal satisfaction and ultimately it has to be for what I view as the greater good.”

Thematic Factor of Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation

Aspects and Elements of Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation

- Partnerships happen at a number of levels—partnership with superintendent impacts the community
- Partnerships with other schools impacts the community
- Presidency not a one-person job

Interactions of Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation with Other Factors

- Connection to common mission
- Connection to serving the greater good and impact
Summary and Contextual Comments on Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation

This is an emergent thematic factor for President C. The nature of this radiation is interactive with his idealism and common mission, in that the way this outward radiation happens has to do with the dyad, meaning there is impact through partnering at the institutional and ultimately societal level. An example of the emergence of this theme in the initial interview is when President C talks about a project he is doing that involves partnering with several other universities and colleges to increase higher education access in his community. He says, “And it could be a one-on-one but it’s still always going to then radiate out.” In an answer to a direct question in the second interview on this thematic factor, he says,

Researcher: Do you feel these dyadic partnerships are foundational for larger relationships such as triads and teams—i.e., does the success of the partnership extrapolate outwards?
President C: Yes, I think the answer to that is absolutely yes. I flash back to a situation that presented itself at University Z, back in the 90s, in which the then president who’s not there any longer put together a team to try to accomplish something and included on the appointment for the team myself and two people that I had worked with very, very closely and I would call them key internal partners along with other members as well and just to have the three of us together bringing the others along it just seemed to be something that was very helpful to the larger team.

Thematic Factor of Knowing Self and Partner/Communication

- Connection to communication—be able to convey what you need
- Connection to fairness—being able to convey what you need so partner can help make sure needs are met in fair way

Summary and Contextual Comments on Knowing Self and Partner/Communication

President C thinks it is important to know one’s self and be able to communicate that to the dyadic partner so that one’s needs can be met, and this is also true on the
partner’s side. When asked what advice he would have for other university and college presidents on how to create good working dyadic partnerships, he says,

To know yourself and know what drives you. What drives you is important and how to convey that to the other party. And to be open to truly trying to understand and value the satisfaction of the other party.

He is similar in this regard to President B, who also talks about the importance of knowing self and being able to convey that to the partner, so in this regard communication is important for President C. Additionally there is interaction with the thematic factor of fairness, in that both partners having their needs met in a fair way involves the necessity of knowing one’s needs and communicating the needs as groundwork for the partnership.

Thematic Factor of *Complementary Strengths
This is not a salient theme for President C. He touches upon it briefly in response to the three wishes question, in that he wishes his key partner had expanded his complementary strengths in more international areas. He says in this regard,

Let’s take Thomas, and maybe, it’s hard to do when I think about that, because one of the things that Thomas adds tremendous value to is an area of expertise that he has that I don’t have, which is understanding language and culture of Country X. So, for me if I could wave a magic wand, it would be having Thomas understand the culture and language of Country Y, so that I could broaden the impact of our partnership...So, maybe I put that forward as two different options, so the option is for this partnership with Thomas. To improve, to grow, I’d like to see his skill set morph into being able to help us in other parts of the world. Or, I’ve got to take out of it an understanding of what works well for Thomas and for me in this partnership and then extrapolate that.
In the follow-up interview when asked directly about the importance of complementary strengths in the success of his dyadic partnerships, he does say they’re important. However, the importance of complementary strengths in this regard for President C seems to concern his emphasis on equality in the partnership:

Researcher: How important are complementary strengths or skills in the success of your partnership?
President C: I think very, I absolutely think very, very important. I’m not sure why I say that; I just think that if we don’t have something that is primarily us that we bring to the table, we’re not necessarily going to be equal partners.
Researcher: And equality matters in the partnership?
President C: I think the answer to that is yes.

Complementary strengths are interactive with trust for President C, but not to a very high degree and in this regard President C differs significantly from President A, for whom complementary strengths is the most salient theme. An example of this difference is when President C is asked directly about the interaction with trust in the second interview:

Researcher: How important are complementary strengths or skills in building trust?
President C: I think that’s less important than the success of the partnership but important nevertheless.

Complementary strengths seem to involve an element of limitation for President C within dyadic partnerships, based upon his assumption that no one relationship will ever have all necessary strengths and skills internally within the relationship. He explains this when asked to rank complementary strengths at the end of the interview for the
ranking of the Gallup factors. He gives complementary strengths an 8 and explains the ranking by saying,

Complementary strengths, I think that would be pretty high. Actually, let’s say 8….I think most people would probably say it’s probably more a 10…Yeah, but 8…Because I think there will always be both overlap of the strengths and weaknesses and that doesn’t make it bad or not it just means you have to find a needed strength externally, so…Alright, so what we don’t have, I’ve never written a curriculum a day in my life and neither has he, so if you think about an ideal partnership in that regards, somebody there should know when you sit down and negotiate a two plus two agreement what the curriculum ought to look like. But what I know is I got a whole bunch of folks back on campus that can do that once I get back there and don’t have to rely on me or Thomas to do that.

Thematic Factor of *Difficulty of Forgiveness

This emerges with President C across both interviews. When asked to rank forgiveness, he says more than once “I’m not good at it,” and he ranks it as a 6. In the second interview he says that he is not easily able to forgive, and once trust has been broken, that is not something that can be forgiven: “Just as I am easily able to enter into a complete trust relationships, once my trust is burned, it’s burned.” This is reinforced with his answer to the question of what he could not forgive: “Performance is not something that I would find, or lack of performance, unforgiveable; breaking a trust would be unforgiveable.” The details of what he considers to be breaking of trust include the following:

Researcher: What does that breaking a trust look like?
President C: Going back to the communication question, not being candid, not being complete.
Researcher: Is it lying, is it not being a truth-teller?
President C: That would do it immediately, yes. Even mission.
Researcher: Could you forgive them if they broke your trust?
President C: No.

Not being easily able to forgive the key dyadic partner is also a similar thematic factor for presidents A and B. While this thematic factor is not emergent with President E, he gives forgiveness a lower ranking (8) relative to his other rankings. President D is the only president for whom forgiveness is seen as necessary—but it has to do somewhat with a collective orientation as discussed further in the section on President D.

**Thematic Factor of *Importance of Partnership with Spouse***

President C emphasizes the importance of his partnership with his spouse several times during the interview process. Also, the first partnership he thought about was with his spouse at the beginning of the interview. He says in this regard,

> There is absolutely outside of religious-based institutions of higher education, I don’t care, that’s probably the most critical partnership. My wife doesn’t get paid; she has a full-time job but she doesn’t get paid but she recognizes her role in being the first lady of X College. It’s much different. And there are so many women who are presidents, guys typically serve differently, but when we gather at institutes, both presidents and spouses, and this dialogue takes place, it’s always two-for-one, university and colleges typically hire one person, they only pay one person but they know they get two.

This partnership with the spouse is salient within President C’s narrative. While President C focuses on the partnerships with Thomas and the superintendent, his partnership with his spouse is detailed in a number of his stories and comments. This inclusion of the spouse will be discussed further in chapter 5 under potential limitations of the study.
Emergent Thematic Material: **SUP—Equality and Distribution of Power (Horizontality Aspect)**

This thematic factor emerges most strongly in the second interview, initially with the question of complementary strengths but also with questions around vertical and horizontal power distribution within his partnerships. Possibly there is an interaction with the factor of “fairness” reflected in President C’s emphasis on equality being necessary within the partnership.

President C is the only president who openly says that he does not have the majority of power in the partnership. While the other presidents, such as President D, speak about horizontality and President E speaks about how both the president and the chair have power, President C specifically says that Thomas often has more power than he does within the partnership. When asked whether there’s a vertical, positional power distribution in the partnership because he’s the president, he says,

President C: I don’t view this relationship that way. To some degree, Thomas is the more, the larger power broker than me. So he’s in Country X and he’s meeting with the university there who are interested in having some of their students go to America. Thomas becomes a power broker for several institutions in the United States. And so he can steer them to…any of the schools he’s representing…

Researcher: Do you ever have the power or not so much? Would you say there are places where the power equals out?

President: Yes, I think that in some cases we might be a preferred institution for certain programs.

Thus, there definitely is a horizontal aspect to this thematic factor, although it manifests differently from the other presidents. There is a situational use of power insofar as President C chooses to go into these partnerships, and potentially when he
holds the balance of power, he might show a situational use of power. However, as with many thematic factors, SUP manifests differently with President C than with the other presidents because the partnerships he chose to discuss are fundamentally different from those of the other presidents across key parameters.

It is important to note that investment of time is important to President C in terms of the partnership but that investment does not necessarily have to happen in the same way, with equal investments of time by each partner. He discusses this in his second-round interview as follows:

Researcher: How important is the investment of time in the partnership to the success of the partnership?
President C: I think it’s significant, and it doesn’t necessarily mean that you are investing the same amount of time. It doesn’t mean that you’re investing time at the same time together but things have to progress….

Emergent Thematic Material: **Intuition—with Trust, with Boundaries**
As described previously, intuition interacts with trust, particularly in instant trust with key partners. Intuition is also important for President C in terms of understanding the boundaries of the relationship: “I think once you have a rough frame of reference as to what the boundaries are, you can pretty much know where the grey areas are too through intuition.”

Emergent Thematic Material: **Deep Personal Friendship Not Possible Within Working Partnership**
This emerged in the second interview. President C says that deep personal friendship is not easily achievable within the key working dyadic partnership. He specifically says in this regard: “I imagine it’s possible, but I’ve never experienced it
where it’s been productive…I can think of one complete failure of a relationship that I had and it just seemed that too much stuff got in the way.” When talking about his dyadic partnerships with Thomas and with the superintendent he states,

I would not refer to either one as a deep personal friendship. Other than travelling with Thomas abroad, I don’t think he and I and our wives have gotten together more than two times over the last fifteen years….I suspect that no matter how busy my day was, I would most definitely take a call from either one of the two and I suspect they would take a call from me. It’s hard to put it at the friendship level though.

There was an instance of contradiction in this interview regarding friendship, but President C’s final statements definitively say that such friendship is not possible. This view of friendship is similar to that of presidents A and B. The topic did not come up with President E, where the format of the interview was slightly different and there was no opportunity for follow-up questions. President D takes a very different view in that she does believe deep friendship is possible with the dyadic partner.

**Findings for President D**

**Table 17. President D’s Partnerships with Sonia and Walter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of President D:</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key dyadic partners:</td>
<td>2 partners: Sonia and Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of key dyadic partners:</td>
<td>Sonia is female; Walter is male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of key dyadic partners:</td>
<td>Sonia was Vice President for Academic Affairs; Walter is Associate Vice President for Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time of partnerships:</td>
<td>Partnership with Sonia was 12 years Partnership with Walter is 17 years and ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thematic Factors of Successful Dyadic Partnerships

The two most salient thematic factors that emerged from analysis of President D’s interview and follow-up questions are sameness and community. Initially sameness appeared more salient but this ordering was changed based upon the responses to the second-round follow-up questions and third-round interview in order to reflect the actual words and meanings of President D. The changed order is that sameness and community are presented as equally salient thematic factors for President D. The following tables provide an overview of the thematic factors that emerged for President D. They are presented in order of salience in Tables 18 and 19.

Table 18. President D’s Thematic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient factors</td>
<td>Sameness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient factor</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient factor</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient factor</td>
<td>The heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most salient factor</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh most salient factor</td>
<td>Challenges/overcoming challenges/learning from challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth most salient factor</td>
<td>The role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth most salient factor</td>
<td>Common vision/mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth most salient factor</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh most salient factor</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19. President D’s Sub-thematic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Sub-thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient sub-thematic factor—twelfth factor overall</td>
<td>*Gender (prevalent sub-theme throughout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient sub-thematic factor—thirteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Longevity (prevalent sub-theme—related to the role, time at institution. While longevity can increase trust over time in a partnership, D believes you can have good partnership from the beginning: “A good partnership can be present from the beginning. I am not sure time is an adequate measure.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient sub-thematic factor—fourteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Religious element (indirect, sub-theme, evident in language and stated beliefs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient sub-thematic factor—fifteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Works hard and determination—implicit throughout and also directly stated; interactive with challenges, the role, learning, community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient sub-thematic factor—sixteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*SUP—horizontality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most salient emergent thematic material—seventeenth factor overall</td>
<td>**Complementary strengths (did not emerge from her initial narrative at all; she states in a follow-up question that she considers it very important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient emergent thematic material—eighteenth factor overall</td>
<td>**Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation (affirmed in a follow-up question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient emergent thematic material—nineteenth factor overall</td>
<td>**Importance of partnerships, work of president can’t be done alone (also interactive with the role)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient emergent thematic material—twentieth factor overall</td>
<td>**Deep personal friendship possible with key dyad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient emergent thematic material—twenty-first factor overall</td>
<td>**No sense of isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most salient emergent thematic material—twenty-second factor overall</td>
<td>**Forgiveness is possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While no identifying or demographic data is provided for the presidents, it is important to note that President D differs from the other presidents in that she comes
from a collective sub-culture. When asked about the impact of this collective sub-culture on her leadership and partnering, she says it has had profound impact. For example, when asked if this collective culture influences how she leads, she said, “Oh I have no doubt, it was…an incredibly formative set of experiences and it was all around community.”

Findings for Word Tone and Usage for President D

President D combines cognition and affect in her word tone and usage with a degree of intensity in both aspects. She is simultaneously both highly cognitive and intellectually oriented as well as being strongly affective and emotional in her tone. On the cognitive side, President D has an intellectual tone to her word usage, incorporating eloquence and exactness. President D is respectful of words and their derivations and appears to make very careful choices in how she uses words. An example of her attention to detail in this regard is the following statement from the follow-up questions:

Researcher: What type of communication do you feel contributes to a successful dyadic partnership?

President D: From the heart, honest, straightforward, truthful, reliable. The word “confide” comes to me….and suggests in its etymological structure its deepest meaning—“con”—together “fide”—faith. To confide, thus, is predicated on trust, and is the action and reflection of “keeping faith with” in the relationship.

President D makes a number of references to literature, theory, and management theory, as well as theological references that include references to St. Paul and Martin Buber’s “I-Thou.” Specific examples of such references include the following:
Reference to Buber

“Such is the nature of dialogue—between the I and the Thou…”

References to literature

“There’s a wonderful line from a Hugo Betty play called, *Corruption in the Palace of Justice.*”

“I just think about the last stanza of Robert Frost’s poem, *Two Tramps in Mudtime*”

References to management literature

“I think there’s some truth, although I don’t buy the whole book of *Good to Great*, you know Collin’s book.”


President D’s cognitive aspect in the use of words is consistent with her background and education and supports the way she talks about partnerships in terms of her understandings, sense-making, and constructs and in this regard she is most similar to President E, who is also highly cognitive in approach. There is also a similarity with President B, who has an intellectual tone to her narrative and cognition. The intellectual, educated aspect of President D’s tone is consistent with her sense of the role of president and her partnerships, in that she feels that part of why she is a good president and partner is that she is well-read and educated about what she has to know and do in the role. She says in this regard, “I invest a lot in learning what I need to know for my job, I’m well-read, I’m well-studied, I’m well-travelled, I’m well-informed, and I think people know that.”
In tone, President D is similar to President B in using both cognition and intellectual tone in combination with affective and emotive tone. President D is most similar to President E in terms of utilizing frameworks and guiding ideas at a similarly high level of abstraction throughout her narrative.

At the same time President D’s tone and word usage includes a high degree of positive affect and emotionality. This manifests not only in the words she uses but also in her tone of voice, which conveys a deep sense of warmth and caring about her partners and her school. This element of warmth and caring is triangulated in the way that she has spoken and interacted with the researcher throughout the research process. For example, during the interview she appeared to go out of her way to make the researcher feel comfortable and at home. She showed respect for the research process in that she extended the time for the initial interview from one hour to three hours to make sure all subjects were covered. She was assiduous in completing the follow-up questions in a timely and comprehensive manner, and she did this despite a full travel schedule and having just undergone surgery. She was open and flexible when a third-round interview was needed and it was scheduled within a few days. Additional triangulation occurred with her staff, who spontaneously said very positive things about this president. For example, one assistant told the story of how a student did not have enough funds to pay for their graduation and President D wrote a personal check to cover it. The president also donated the money from her recent raise to create a charitable fund within the school.
This positivity and caring is reflected in her specific word usage. For example, throughout her narrative she frequently uses positive modifiers such as “generous,” “caring,” “a wonderful, fabulous person,” and “an amazing group of colleagues.” There is also an affective and emotive element to her word usage, which involves the use of words with nuances of feeling such as “love,” “adored,” “bereft.” Some other specific examples of such word usage include the following:

“He adored us and we adored him.”

“The faculty were polarized because some of them loved the president and the academic vice president, the other ones didn’t.”

“And I thought I am bereft, I am bereft, but I was so blessed to have people come in who were either in other positions here and moved up or from the outside. And I have an amazing group of colleagues, amazing.”

“You know I believe in my heart…”

President D’s affective element in her word usage in this regard includes several aspects: a religious aspect to the words; a positive and emotive aspect to her words; and words having to do with family and personal developmental aspects.

Religious Word Usage

Throughout her narrative there is a strong religious aspect to her word usage. While evident throughout, this word usage does not create a dominant religious tone but rather contributes to the religious sub-theme that emerges in a number of ways throughout her narrative. The specifics of her word usage in this regard encompass her references outlined above to theologians and theological perspectives. There is also a
religious element in her word usage that includes use of words such as “blessed,” “privileged,” “gratitude,” “saint,” and “grace.” Some other specific examples include the following:

“It is a legacy and it’s such a blessing to have been privileged to be part of this community for this long a time because, as you know, presidents go and come.”

“I talk to the board all the time about what a privilege it is for me to be here.”

“And she was just such a gift to me, you know, such a gift.”

“And I wake up every day and think, “Oh my God, I’m so blessed.”

“She’s wise beyond her years. She’s just fabulous.”

“And the first person that I had to hire when I became president was the director of human resources and he is, I think, he’s a saint, I really do.”

“And she just exuded grace and care.”

“And this is the Gospel truth.”

“God bless her.”

“They are so blessed with people skills.”

Use of Family Terms

President D uses family terms and personal development terms, which is supportive of and reflective of the emergent thematic factors of relationships and community/family. Some specific examples of this usage include the following:
“I think what it is, what I have with so many of my closest working colleagues, what I have with my assistants…They’re in so many ways like my family.”

“But it’s like, “Mom, you fix it.”

Examples of Use of Personal Development Terms
“…and it was trying to run in an adolescent state the way it had run in childhood.”

“But I think as I’ve matured in my professional career, I’ve just learned more and more the interdependence that’s essential to working and working effectively and working happily…”

She also frequently uses positive modifiers such as “generous,” “caring,” a “wonderful, fabulous” person, “amazing” group of colleagues.

President D is most similar to President B in her use of religious, emotive, and personal development terms. This similarity is particularly striking in that they use some of the same words such as “privilege,” “blessed,” “grateful,” and “love.” The strong similarities in word tone and usage between presidents D and B, who are the two female presidents interviewed, is discussed later within this chapter in the section on gender issues.

Details of Thematic Factors for President D
The following provides details concerning the component aspects and elements of each thematic factor, as well as how each thematic factor is interactive with other thematic factors.
Thematic Factor of Sameness

Aspects and Elements of Sameness

- Sameness in values within her community and partnerships
- Sameness as a sense of initial connection with partners
- Establishes sameness, discusses with interviewer

Interactions of Sameness with Other Factors

- Interrelationship between same values and trust (she trusts people with same values and same demonstrated same values demonstrated over time reinforce trust)
- Interconnection between having same values and having people as partners or within her community
- Interconnection between sameness, intuition, and a sense of connection with partners

Summary and Contextual Comments on Sameness

It is important to surface the positioning of the researcher in this interaction with President D with regard to sameness. The researcher at some point in this process realized the process was becoming iterative in that she herself was also establishing sameness with President D as well. The researcher recognized that the aspects of sameness that were uncovered made the researcher feel more comfortable in the research process. The researcher also surfaced the question as to whether she (the researcher) was working hard to establish sameness because at some level she felt it mattered to President D. This led to the realization that there was some effort to establish sameness on the parts of all the presidents and to some degree this became reciprocated by the researcher, who also worked to establish sameness. However, the extent to which sameness became
dominant within the interview process and narrative was most pronounced with President D.

Sameness is a key thematic factor for President D, across a number of areas, including establishing sameness with the researcher; establishing sameness with her partners; and inclusion into the community based upon a knowing that allows for determination of sameness. An example of the establishment of sameness with the researcher is that a portion of the initial interview time was involved in what seemed to be a process of learning about the researcher and establishing sameness. President D says this initial process of getting to know the researcher (and what to the researcher seems to be establishing of “sameness”) matters for the nature of the interview: “It informs, it informs whatever I will respond to you about, too, so this is where I’m grounded…This is how I work, this is how I live, this is how I lead.” She talks about the sameness with reference to the researcher in the following ways, using terms such as “overlap,” “connection,” “kindred spirits,” and “synchronous link.” Specific examples of such usage on the part of President D include the following statements:

“It’s funny because there’s a lot of overlap in our lives.”

“There’s a further connection… Isn’t that amazing? What a connection.”

“Clearly kindred spirits.”

“Well, you know, it’s interesting, another synchronous link here.”
Sameness is also important to President D with her partners and the people she works with in terms of their having the same core values she has, including caring for and valuing people and being able to relate to people, which she describes as “shared values, a commitment to common purpose, care for and about people.” Specific statements she makes when she describes these values indicate the interaction between the values and her trust in people. For example, when she describes what it was about her hiring interview that helped her in her decision in hiring her second dyadic partner, Walter, she says, “I think it was his values, his manner, his gentleness, his ability to relate.” Later, in the second-round questions, she describes this in greater detail:

It seems to me that trust comes from reliability over time. From the first, I had the sense that Walter was trustworthy; it was part of my gut response to/assessment of him during and after our initial conversations. His values, his care for and about people, his ability to connect resonated with other members of the college community. I think his initial and ongoing sense of connectedness with me mirrored my own with him.

There is thus a two-stage aspect of trusting for President D in her partnerships. The first stage is an intuitive sense of connection, potentially based upon sameness in common values. The second stage of trust occurs after this initial stage where the partner demonstrates their reliability and authenticity over time.

**Thematic Factor of Community**

**Aspects and Elements of Community**
- Building community is key goal
- Community and sense of family
- She has a collective orientation
• Strongly influenced by her early experiences of community

• She feels no isolation in the role

Interactions of Community with Other Factors

• Community and relationships—community is built on relationships

• Connections between community inclusion and sameness

• Interactions between community and common vision/mission—all working towards same goal

• Collectivity and community, and common mission—community is part of her mission and also the idea of a common goal for this community in that all are working towards same goal

• Community and family, where community is the family you choose

• Community and dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation

Summary and Contextual Comments on Community

This is a key thematic element in President D’s successful dyadic partnership.

This element emerged at both the surface level in her narrative as well as through coding and analysis. As described previously, President D comes from a collective sub-culture that is characterized by community and that she herself says has influenced her goals in her job as president and in how she leads and how she partners. An example of how this collective sense of community impacts her presidency is that in her role as president she says she works hardest at creating and promoting community. She says,

No one could do this job alone. It’s that we move the community together. And we affirm the values that inform our mission and our work together and it’s a lot about “community”...and that’s the thing I have worked hardest to promote.
She also has a collective orientation in how she speaks about this community. For example, she says, “It’s that we, we’re all in this together.” The interaction of community and relationships is important for President D in this regard in that there is a sense of interdependence between the elements of the community. She says, “But I think as I’ve matured in my professional career, I’ve just learned more and more the interdependence that’s essential to working and working effectively and working happily.” In terms of her dyadic partnerships and some other relationships, she moves from this sense of community to the idea of this community group as a family group that she and her partners have chosen:

I think what it is, what I have with so many of my closest working colleagues, what I have with my assistants….They’re, they’re in so many ways like my family. We talk, and families can be dysfunctional and I know some of the organizational literature says you should never talk about your working place as a family because there’s too much dysfunctionality….And I default more than to family usually when I’m consciously dealing with this to the notion of community because that’s a group that you’re not born into but you choose in some manner.

Within this context, President D feels that she and her partners are involved in working as part of a community and towards community.

There is interaction between community and the factor of common mission in her partnerships. When asked what the core factor is that gives life and vitality to her partnerships, she says,

I guess it’s that we love what we do and we love each other and we have this common purpose that is transformative. Ultimately, that it’s really; it’s not about me and it’s not about them; it’s about all of us together.
There is interaction between thematic factors of community and the dyadic partnership radiating outwards, as evidenced by her answer to a question in this regard in the second-round follow-up interview:

**Researcher:** Do you feel these dyadic partnerships are foundational for larger relationships such as triads and teams—i.e., does the success of the partnership extrapolate outwards?

**President D:** Yes. I think the living out of the partnerships speaks more than any words about how working together empowers the individuals and the community—even in and through the most complex and difficult challenges.

Unlike the other presidents, President D explicitly states more than once that she feels no isolation in the role: “I do not.” It is possible this has to do with her sense of community. She mentions this connection in the third-round interview. Among all the presidents interviewed, President D most strongly emphasizes community as a thematic factor in her successful dyadic partnerships and in her leadership.

**Thematic Factor of Relationships**

**Aspects and Elements of Relationships**

- Knowing people matters—it’s a key part of who she is and how she deals with people
- Caring
- Valuing people
- Relationships involve interdependence
- Relationships are a key part of how she leads
- SUP—horizontality
- Forgiveness
Friendship

No sense of isolation

Interactions of Relationships with Other Thematic Factors

- Relationships and common mission
- Relationships as foundation for community
- Relationships and trust
- Relationships and caring and knowing
- Relationships including sameness around valuing people
- Relationships and the role
- Relationships and SUP—horizontality
- Relationships and friendship
- Relationships and forgiveness

Summary and Contextual Comments on Relationships

President D is very relational with emotional elements in the relationship, which include caring about and knowing people in a positive way and personal way. She is interpersonally involved to the extent that she also knows their families. She sees herself in a caring, pastoral role, where she is “present” for people at important personal and family times. She believes that relationships are foundational to building community and also allow working together towards a common mission.

… to be present in people’s real time of need. That’s one of the most important things I do… I think that that helps forge the relationship. You really can’t work together on a common mission unless you have built relationships I believe.
She reinforces this emphasis on the interaction between the thematic factor of relationship and mission throughout her narrative as follows:

And the more effective you are at fulfilling the mission, the more strongly grounded the relationships will be and vice versa: the more strongly grounded the relationships are, the better able you are to fulfill your mission.

There is also an interactive element for President D between the thematic factors of relationship and trust. For example, she describes an initial situation where there was no trust: “But they didn’t know who I was. There was no relationship. There was no trust. You know, it was just this huge challenge and the place was in turmoil.”

This interaction with trust also includes the thematic factor of shared values in her key partnerships. When discussing key partners, she says in this regard, “They value relationships, that’s the way they work. I trust them so much.” [said emphatically]

There is reinforcement between sameness and shared values and relationship for President D in that valuing and nurturing relationships is important to her and it is important that her key people are the same. This also has a certain collective element for President D around ego. She states,

I think it’s really important and I think they value people as much as I value people. And I think that they have no ego, I mean no ego in the bad sense, but they have a sense of themselves, they’re grounded, they know that the most important thing we do is we nurture relationships to make people better. That we have an opportunity every day to change the world.

There is a significant difference between President D and the other presidents in the emergent elements of forgiveness and friendship. While other presidents say that
they find forgiveness difficult, particularly when it involves forgiveness of breaking of trust, President D says that there must be forgiveness in this regard. She states in her second-round follow-up questions,

Researcher: Are you easily able to forgive your key partner?
President D: Truly, I can think of nothing in all the years that I have had to forgive.
Researcher: What would be most difficult for you to forgive?
President D: I suppose a breach of trust would hurt the most, but it is necessary to forgive. To live without being able to forgive is to erode your own soul.

This was also addressed in third round questions with President D in a phone interview where she says,

You know I think it’s probably the nature of the relationships that I have with my colleagues with whom I work with most directly. They have never broken trust with me. They have never given me a reason to need to forgive.

In terms of friendship, President D says across all her narrative that she is able to be involved in a deep personal friendship with her key dyadic partner while in the dyadic work relationship. In response to second-round questions on this topic, she states,

Researcher: Would you describe your relationship with your partner as a deep personal friendship or a deep relationship that could be described in ways other than friendship?
President D: … I think deep friendship is something that we share—and also colleagueship—which is what the world observes.

When asked directly by the researcher if it is possible to have a deep personal friendship while you are working together in the dyadic partnership she says,
That is what I have always been blessed to have in some of my closest colleagues. As one of my former colleagues who is now retired said, “You don’t have to like people to work with them effectively.” But if you do have that extra dimension in the relationship, it is so enriching and supporting. Not textbook, but I know it to be true.

This is in direct contradiction to the emergence of this theme with presidents A, B, and C, who all maintain that it is very difficult or not possible to be in both types of relationships simultaneously. President E did not address the topic of friendship at all in his partnership narrative.

While President D is most similar to President B in terms of the emergent thematic factors in her successful dyadic partnerships, there are also some areas where the two female presidents differ. President B talks about the isolation of the role and the loneliness of the role more than any of the other presidents. However, President D says she does not feel any isolation in the role: “No, I know this is counter to what the literature says, that ‘it is lonely at the top.’ I have never felt lonely.” There is also a key difference between President D and President B having to do with the load of the partnership within the relationship. While President B intimates that she carries the load of the partnership at times—“I think partnership in the context of the role is carrying the load”—President D has a very different view. In the second-round follow-up questions she says,

Researcher: Do you feel that in the role of president you work harder in the dyadic partnership than your partner? Do you carry most of the load of the partnership? Is there an even split? Does the partner carry most of the load? Or does this vary during the partnership?
President D: I just think about the last stanza of Robert Frost’s poem, “Two Tramps in Mudtime”—
. . .yield who will to their separation,
My object in living is to unite
My avocation and my vocation
As my two eyes make one in sight.
Only where love and the need are one,
And the work is play for mortal stakes,
Is the deed every really done
For heaven and the future’s sakes.

The words are in my mind and heart. I know it is the foundation of the partnership and relationship.

There is also a difference between President D and the other presidents having to do with boundaries. She emphasizes them less than the others and in fact says,

We’ve never spoken about boundaries. I think respect, affection, trust, understanding, appreciation inform the relationship. It’s not about boundaries and who does what because of job descriptions….It’s Frost’s love and need….and being available.

In comparison with other presidents, President D is similar to President B in the focus on relationships and leading through relationship and there being a deep personal element to the relationship. This personal element to relationships is not present with the male presidents, who present relationships in terms of the concept of “team.” This is a key emergent gender difference that is discussed in further detail in this chapter in the section on gender issues.

Another key difference between President D and the other presidents in terms of relationship and the dyadic partnership has to do with the nature of horizontality. President D believes that while there might be a structural vertical power structure, her
partnerships truly involve a horizontal element, not only in communication but also across the board. She says this is an aspect of how her leadership style influences her partnership. When asked in the third round whether there are still vertical elements because she has positional power, she says,

President D: I think positional power is hard power and you have it by virtue of a title and a place on an org chart. I think that the more important and more powerful power is soft power and it’s the power of influence. Researcher: And how does that work in your partnerships? President D: I think it probably is reflected; it’s hard to talk about with these terms, exponentially because I just work so much more closely.

Finally, as mentioned previously, President D differs from the other presidents in feeling no sense of isolation or loneliness in the role and this could have to do with the close nature of her relationships.

**Thematic Factor of the Heart**

**Aspects and Elements of the Heart**

- She speaks and makes decisions from head and heart
- The heart includes caring about people, valuing people and relationships
- Caring about people is a key part of who she is
- She hires people for the heart which she thinks is more important than skills that can be learned

**Interactions of the Heart with Other Factors**

- Caring about people is core component of sameness and required in her partners and community, particularly in terms of “valuing people”
- Caring about people is part of community
- The heart and communication
Intuition involves listening to the heart

Interaction between heart and relationships where the heart and caring are key elements of relationships

Summary and Contextual Comments on the Heart

The heart is a very important part of how President D interacts in her partnerships and relationships. The heart is a core of her leadership, it’s the core of the community, and is supported in word usage with the use of the word “love” when describing her partners. Also she uses the terms “care” as an element of this theme of the heart. There is a strong interaction between the heart and sameness in that she loves and cares for people and only wants people around her who are the same in this regard. She selects and hires people for positions because of their heart.

Get the right people on the bus and get them in the right seats. I think that’s important. And a lot of it is, I’ll tell you one of the values that X and I share. You have to establish for a position, requirements and credentials but we both say hire the heart, you can teach a skills gap. But if you hire only for the skills and you don’t have the heart, it’s harder to hire really well. And how do you know, I don’t know how you know, I think it’s one of those real combinations of who we are, where we’re mind and heart and sometimes we just work with our minds and we leave the hearts out of it.

She makes decisions and speaks from both the head and the heart: “So that if they ask me for an opinion or I offer it, it’s from my head and from my heart, and it’s probably, we never have the truth, but it’s probably not in error.”

President D is very similar to President B regarding the heart, leadership, and caring aspects of the partnerships. She is dissimilar from the male presidents (A, C, and E), who do not reference heart in their partnerships or their leadership.
Thematic Factor of Learning

Aspects and Elements of Learning

- She is a life-long learner
- She works hard to learn what she needs for the role
- She feels can learn from everyone
- She is not afraid to say she doesn’t know

Interactions of Learning with Other Factors

- The president is chief learner—connection with the role
- Learning about others—knowing as means of generating trust
- Learning and working hard
- Learning and challenges

Summary and Contextual Comments on Learning

President D is a life-long learner, and she talks about how she works hard to learn about something. This matters in her partnerships in the idea that for her learning is reciprocal and she believes she can learn from everyone. An example of President D’s emphasis on learning in partnerships is her statement in which she says that one reason she is a good partner is because she learns from others:

I believe in my heart that I’m a very competent person but I also know that I have a lot to learn….Sometimes when we’re in a room and we have to introduce ourselves, I say sometimes, “I’m D and I’m the chief learner or the chief custodian,” and everybody laughs but it’s the truth.

Learning is a key part of her idea of the role of the president and informs her partnerships in her ideas about complementary strengths and partnerships. There is a
strong interaction between the thematic factors of learning and challenges for President D in that she emphasizes her learning through challenges and overcoming obstacles.

President D is slightly similar to President C, who discusses his ability to learn actively in his narrative.

**Thematic Factor of Challenges/Overcoming Challenges/Learning from Challenges**

Aspects and Elements of Challenges/Overcoming Challenges/Learning from Challenges
- Overcoming through knowing people and generating trust
- Overcoming through demonstrating sameness—implicit
- Overcoming through determination and flexibility—implicit
- Overcoming through resilience—implicit

Interactions of Challenges/Overcoming Challenges/Learning from Challenges with Other Factors
- Challenges and learning
- Challenges and trust and knowing
- Challenges and mentorship—her worst boss was a great learning experience in how not to lead
- Challenges and common mission

**Summary and Contextual Comments on Challenges/Overcoming Challenges/Learning from Challenges**

This is a constant theme throughout President D’s narrative at multiple levels.

She gives many examples of how she had a challenge and how she overcame it. A representative statement by her in this regard is as follows:

There are always barriers and I think the other thing is the hardest things will teach you the most. When things are going well, it’s harder to learn because you think you’re in control. And when things aren’t going well, it challenges you and takes you aback. And I think people have often talked
to me about mentoring, and did you have mentors? And the best mentor I ever had was a negative mentor…. And it was the most instructive relationship I think in terms of learning how to be what I believed I should be, that I’ve ever had.

Challenges are an element in partnerships for President D in terms of working with the partner to overcome challenges. In this sense, challenges are interconnected with common mission. For example, a key story for President D in her partnership with Sonia describes how at the very beginning of the partnership they work together to overcome a difficult challenge. This story also underlines the idea of how President D can value sameness. She describes working with Sonia to overcome the challenge as follows:

So she, she really helped me through that. We were here on Saturday mornings, we were here late at night doing the files and everything but it was a great experience for me and she and I obviously had a lot of similar background….and similar commitment, and she was just my right hand person.

There is a similarity with this theme of challenges and overcoming challenges for President D and the theme of resilience that emerges for President B, who also discusses overcoming challenges with her key dyadic partner. Both these female presidents emphasize needing to have determination and to work hard to overcome obstacles and barriers. This is not a salient theme in the same way for the male presidents. Additionally, it is important to note that the female presidents D and B are the only two presidents to discuss mentorship. While President D mentions mentorship briefly in
terms of learning what not to do, President B discusses mentoring and mentorship having to do with partnership as a key thematic factor.

**Thematic Factor of the Role**

Aspects and Elements of the Role
- Key aspect is creating community
- The job of the president
- Multi-faceted—chief story-teller, chief learner, pastoral
- Knowing people, caring about people
- Longevity
- Works hard
- Never in control
- Valuing people
- Models the values
- The work of the president can’t be done alone (related to the importance of dyadic partnerships for the president)
- Decision maker
- No isolation in the role

**Interactions of the Role with Other Factors**
- Interconnection with intuition: in this role you need to trust your gut/intuition
- The role and community
- Interrelationship and interconnection between the role and caring, heart, knowing, valuing people
- The role and learning
- The role and common mission and communication
Summary and Contextual Comments on the Role

President D sees the role primarily as having to do with creating community and working within this sense of community towards common goals such as helping people to improve their lives through education. She talks about the multiple aspects of the president’s role and the importance of the support and help from her partners and the broader community in fulfilling her role. She cites the multiple aspects of the role: “I believe that the president is the chief storyteller, the chief learner, but also the pastor.”

There are also symbolic elements to the role, where the common mission can be communicated: “So there are these ritual occasions that I really try to take advantage of to say ‘this is what we’re about,’ you know, ‘this is what we do,’ and I always end by saying, ‘I’m so grateful to you.’” [sounds emotional]

A key element of this role is knowing her people and caring about people. This is also interactive with the idea of community. She says,

I’ve had throughout my time here a wonderful group of people with whom I work closely and now I’m probably one of the senior people at the institution and I know everybody…. I want to know about them, I want them to bring their whole selves to work. I care about their families and I want everybody to and they do. You know, we have political squabbles and all that stuff but it is such a generous, caring community…you see such rising to the occasion; it is unbelievable.

Comparison of the Presidents

All the presidents talk about the nature of the role. President D is the same as the other presidents in bringing up the nature of the role throughout the narrative—both independent of the questions and with specific relationship to her dyadic partnerships. Of
all the presidents, President D most emphasizes that the role cannot be done alone and needs the help and support of others. She says, “I said from the beginning and confessed to the college community in my inaugural address that the work of the president is not work one person can do alone.” President D has a collective outlook towards the role and she differs from President B in that she does not feel aloneness or isolation in the role. For example, President D says, “I know this is counter to what the literature says, that ‘it is lonely at the top.’ I have never felt lonely.”

President D differs from President A in that her key emphasis is to hire for the heart, not to hire the right people and tap their expertise. She differs from President C in that she is idealistic about the role but not in the same way. She does not need to explicitly tie the role and her partnerships to the greater good, although she feels the connection is there. In this regard she states, “I do believe everyone yearns to be part of something bigger than oneself.” President D is simultaneously most similar to and most different from President E in her sense of the role and partnerships relative to the role. President D is openly caring and affective about the role on a personal level in her relationships within her partnerships. President E, on the other hand, presents as less affective and more focused on achieving the goal. While he does say his partnerships are personally satisfying, he also sees such partnerships and the emotions associated with them as a vehicle to achieve the goal of advancing and enhancing the university.

However, while all the presidents are extremely driven and very hard working and motivated within their roles, the nature of the intensity of the drive and how it manifests is strongly similar between Presidents D and E. This aspect of comparison came out in
the interview process with the tone of voice used and their underlying sense of drive as expressed in the interactions during the interview.

**Thematic Factor of Common Vision/Mission**

Aspects and Elements of Common Mission and Vision

- Working towards the same goal
- This is one of the most rewarding aspects of partnership for her
- Collective element—everybody must buy into the vision/mission

Interactions of Common Vision/Mission with Other Factors

- Collectivity and community, and common mission—community is part of her mission and also the idea of a common goal for this community
- Common vision and interdependence between people
- Common vision/mission and relationships where relationships are foundational for working towards this

Summary and Contextual Comments on Common Vision/Mission

This is a separate thematic factor for President D, but it is also very present as an interactive element with other thematic factors having to do with her strong emphasis on collectivity and needing to work together. When asked what has been the most valuable to her in her dyadic partnerships, she says,

> I think that working together on a mission and a common purpose that you really believe in and you share the reason why you get up in the morning, and you really do love what you do and you love the people you work with.

When asked in the second-round follow-up questions whether having a common purpose or mission helps the partnership to succeed, she answers,
Yes. We talk frequently about the blessing that we share of being able to get up every day and come to a place where our work is meaningful and we have the ability, in the community to which we contribute, to make the world a little better.

There is a strong element of interaction between the thematic factor of common mission and collectivity for President D in that she truly feels that in leadership and partnership there needs to be a real sense of the common vision, which can’t be mandated or directed. “…you can’t come in and say this is my vision, and I’m going to implement it. If it’s not our vision, it’s going nowhere fast. You may be riding up the hill and nobody’s behind you, and that’s not going to get you anywhere.”

**Thematic Factor of Intuition**

**Aspects and Elements of Intuition**
- Values this highly (“I think I’m really good at listening to my gut.”)
- Trusts her gut
- This intuition involves her gut—and also listening to her heart

**Interactions of Intuition with Other Factors**
- Relationship between intuition and trust
- Relationship between intuition and the role
- Relationship between intuition and initial trusting of partner

**Summary and Contextual Comments on Intuition**

Intuition is an important element in President D’s successful dyadic partnerships in terms of how she relates to her partners; how she communicates with her partners and how they communicate with each other; how she comes to trust her partners; and also in
terms of how she fulfills her role as president and as partner. She feels that intuition can help in the role of the president in understanding goals and working towards goals:

But if you listen, if you’re open to learning and if you understand that your gut will help you a lot, you may not be able to write the equation, but you may have a sense of the ending, where you want to be, at least.

There is a strong element of intuition in how she initially trusts her key partners in terms of a sense of connection and sameness. With reference to Walter in this regard she says,

I guess, I believe you go with your gut because I believe your brains are in your gut as well as your head, you know, and it was just the sense that this was not about him or about his advancement. It was really a feeling of connectedness that I had with him, almost immediately.

The key importance of intuition in President D’s partnerships and its interaction with communication is demonstrated by her answer when asked in the second-round follow-up questions whether having a sense of the partner, an intuition about or knowing of the partner, helps with aspects of the partnership such as boundaries. Her response is, “Three of the eight individuals with whom I work most directly on the executive team share an intuitive connection. We can finish each other’s sentences.” This emphasis on intuition is most salient for President D amongst all the presidents.

**Thematic Factor of Trust**

Aspects and Elements of Trust
- Key element is reliability over time
- She trusts people to do their jobs
• She trusts people who show their commitment
• Trust can develop over time but also is there from the beginning

Interactions of Trust with Other Factors
• Intuition is very important in initial trust
• Connection between knowing, trust, and relationships
• Connections between trust and same values, sameness
• Connections between trust and truth-telling
• Connections between trust and longevity
• Connection between trust and working towards a common mission

Summary and Contextual Comments on Trust
There are multiple aspects to trust for President D in her partnerships. A key idea that she states more than once is that “Trust is reliability over time.” This also includes the idea of authenticity and truth-telling in communication. She says, “I think trust is reliability over time…And authenticity, and I have never not told someone the truth.” However, while she reiterates that trust is reliability over time, she also talks repeatedly about feeling a strong sense of trust and connection with her partners from the very beginning. With this initial trust in particular, there is a strong element of sameness and knowing in how this president trusts. She seems to trust initially based on a sense of intuition or connectedness with the other person, and as the researcher learned from coding, analysis, observation, and follow-up questions, this initial trusting seems to involve some sense of sameness in core values. When asked about this in the second-round follow-up questions, she says,
Researcher: How important is sameness to you in initial trusting—i.e., a sense of the key partner having similar core values, or a similar purpose, or sameness in background?

President D: Shared values, a commitment to common purpose, care for and about people….all important. I don’t think this derives in any necessary way from sameness in background.

These elements all interact in terms of how she initially trusts. Trust is foundational to her relationships and to her communication, with truth-telling as a core element in how she communicates. There is a core element of knowing the person, which informs her trust. For example, she seems to hire and bring into her inner circle people who are known by her or colleagues. There is also an aspect of trust developing over time and developing based upon people demonstrating their reliability over time—and this could potentially be connected to her increased knowing of the person over time.

Trust is highly interactive with other thematic factors for President D. When asked in her second-round follow-up questions, what are some factors that increase the trust in her partnerships, she says,

Reliable and wise counsel, willingness to share news good and bad, a commitment to partnership, a sense of common purpose, a mutual care of and commitment to the community that is the college.

She also feels there is a connection between trust and the separate factors of truth-telling, direct communication, and working towards a common mission. She feels that longevity increases trust: “I think insofar as trust is embedded in a relationship and a relationship grows—rooted more deeply and blossoming more abundantly, yes.” She also feels that there is a connection between trust, relationship, and time in the
partnership: “Yes, I think as our relationship, colleagueship, working together through the
days and weeks and months and years, broadened and deepened, so did our trust grow.”

Additionally she feels there is a relationship between, trust, love, knowing, and
complementary skills: “And I don’t have the expertise they have and I have to rely on
them and I rely on them with great confidence…. Because I trust them, I love them and I
know that they’re good.”

Thematic Factor of Communication

Aspects and Elements of Communication
- Communication is honest, she is truth-teller, and key partners are truth-tellers
- Communication involves someone being able to tell bad news
- Communication involves an open, two-way process
- Communication involves robust discussion and room for disagreement
- Communication is horizontal

Interactions of Communication with Other Factors
- Communication and truth-telling, honesty
- Communication and decision-making
- Communication of values symbolically through actions and rituals, and modeling
  behavior, for example, caring
- Communication and the role—again through actions, rituals, and modeling
  behavior
- SUP—communication is strongly horizontal for President D

Summary and Contextual Comments on Communication
President D emphasizes truth-telling in communication. She values a partner who
can tell the truth, even when it involves bad news. She is a communicator on many
levels, including the symbolic level—as demonstrated previously relative to her symbolic communication through ritual aspects of the role. Communication is foundational in her partnerships and in her building of community, which is part of the common mission of her partnerships. She values robust discussion and people being able to disagree. She listens hard to her partners and makes her decisions with input from partners. As with the other presidents, she feels there is a strong horizontal element in her communication.

When asked about this horizontality, she says,

Researcher: Would you describe your communication with your key partner as taking place horizontally or within a vertical dynamic?

President D: Although the official org chart is vertical, the relationships at the executive level are horizontal. This is reflected in how I describe my relationships with my colleagues—people with whom I work, not people who work for me.

However, when making the decisions she includes the caveats that she is ultimately responsible. This is similar to the other presidents. She says in this regard, “So I mean I’m willing to let the buck stop here, but I never make a decision that I don’t discuss and I want people to say and feel free.” She values robust dialogue and discussion when necessary and describes such communication: “…and I guess for a time there were just the three of them and me and they would duke it out, I mean we would have the loudest meetings.” She values people who can tell the truth, even if it is unpleasant: “He is such a good person. He is so wise, he’s so smart, he is so fair. He can give you bad news.” Ultimately she values communication from the heart, which is honest and reliable. President D states in this regard:
Researcher: What type of communication do you feel contributes to a successful dyadic partnership?
President D: From the heart, honest, straightforward, truthful, reliable.

Comparisons with Other Presidents
The presidents are all very similar in certain respects regarding communication. For example, they all value honesty and truth-telling in communication with their key partner. They all value open, direct communication with their partner and they all have horizontal communication with their key partner. They all rely on their partner to be able to tell them bad news. They also communicate symbolically through modeling behavior and their actions to their partners and to their community. For example, President B models behavior in how she consistently shows up every day, and she demonstrates stability and reliability so that people don’t have to worry about the state of the school and can get their jobs done. She models behavior to her partner in the ways that she mentors her and shows her how to do things. President E sets an example and challenges himself and does everything he expects from others.

Additionally, there is a relationship between communication, decision-making, and the nature of the role across all the presidents. All the presidents say they value people being able to push back, give negative feedback, and have discussions, arguments, and debates. They all say they listen, but at the end of the day, the final decision is theirs.

Thematic Factor of *Gender
Gender is a prevalent sub-theme throughout her narrative and in her answers to specific follow-up questions.
Thematic Factor of *Longevity

This is a prevalent sub-theme and is related to the role and time at the institution. While longevity can increase trust over time in a partnership, President D believes you can have good partnership from the beginning: “A good partnership can be present from the beginning. I am not sure time is an adequate measure.”

Thematic Factor of *Religious Elements

This sub-theme is evident both in President D’s use of language and in her stated beliefs and references.

Thematic Factor of *Works Hard and Determination

This sub-theme is implicit throughout her narrative and is also directly stated. This sub-theme is interactive with challenges, the role, learning, and community.

Thematic Factor of *SUP—Horizontality

President D chooses to use power horizontally in many of her partnership situations. She is strongly horizontal in her relationships, use of “soft power,” and the way in which she leads. She is about collective community as opposed to positional vertical power. She is the most horizontal in her power distribution of all the presidents.

Thematic Factor of **Complementary Strengths

This did not emerge as a thematic factor in her initial narrative; however, in the second-round follow-up questions, she does say that she thinks it’s very important:

Researcher: How important are complementary strengths or skills in the success of your partnership?
President D: Very important. I said from the beginning and confessed to the College community in my inaugural address that the work of the President is not work one person can do alone.
Researcher: How important are complementary strengths or skills in building trust?
President D: See above. I think about the words of Paul that we have different gifts. I firmly believe that as we are committed to a common purpose, we share our gifts with each other and with the community with whom we work. People at the College know that.

**Thematic Factor of **Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation

This factor is affirmed in the follow-up questions.

**Thematic Factors of **Importance of Partnerships

An important idea for President D is that the work of the president can’t be done alone. This factor is also interactive with the role.

The following three thematic factors manifest differently for President D relative to the other presidents:

**Deep personal friendship possible with key dyad

**No sense of isolation

**Forgiveness is possible

\[ \text{Differs from other presidents} \]

It was considered important to do a follow-up third round interview with President D because her narrative and her answers to questions about friendship, isolation in the presidency, and forgiveness of the partner were consistently very different from those of the other presidents. The deeper exploration into these topics with President D revealed consistency throughout all three rounds of interviews and questions, and at all levels of coding and analysis. She does believe deep personal friendship is possible
within the partnership, she believes she can forgive the partner even in a breach of trust, and she does not feel isolation in the role.

Findings for President E

Table 20. President E’s Partnership with Chair of the Board and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of President E:</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key dyadic partners:</td>
<td>2 partners: Chair of the Board and a Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of dyadic partners:</td>
<td>Both are male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time of the partnerships:</td>
<td>Between 1 and 5 years and ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President E initially presented specific limitations around his participation in the research, which included only 30 minutes of interview participation and no options for follow-up or additional questions. In compliance with these parameters, the interview protocol was changed slightly to accommodate the 30 minutes. However, during the interview the president extended the time frame. It was not possible to go back and ask the president additional questions around emergent themes from other presidents, such as friendship and the nature of forgiveness between presidents and partners.

Thematic Factors of Successful Dyadic Partnerships
The key, most salient thematic factors of successful dyadic partnerships that emerged from the analysis of President E’s interview are trust, communication, and the dyad radiating outwards or extrapolating to other relationships. In this regard, he sees the dyad as foundational for building the necessary teams to achieve the common, overarching goal of enhancing the university in terms of its missions in research,
education, and impact. The following table provides an overview of the thematic factors that emerged for President E.

**Table 21. President E’s Thematic Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient factor</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient factor</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient factor</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient factor</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient factor</td>
<td>The role / boundaries/ job of the president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most salient factor</td>
<td>The overarching goal (common mission), ultimate primacy of the goal and idealism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh most salient factor</td>
<td>Challenging self and others—this is an important element of partnership for him, and is also a subset of the thematic factor of the role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 22. President B’s Sub-thematic Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Sub-thematic Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient sub-thematic factor—eighth factor overall</td>
<td>*Relationships—emerges as a thematic factor, also very strong subset of thematic factor of team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient sub-thematic factor—ninth factor overall</td>
<td>*Intuition—emerges as a theme also aspect of the role, aspect of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient sub-thematic factor—tenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Valuing the truth-teller—aspect of communication, aspect of trust, aspect of relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient sub-thematic factor—eleventh factor overall</td>
<td>*SUP—horizontality with caveat—aspect of relationship, aspect of role, aspect of dyad radiating outwards, aspect of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient sub-thematic factor—twelfth factor overall</td>
<td>*Time—need to invest time in the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most salient emergent thematic material—thirteenth factor overall</td>
<td>*Works hard—aspect of role, aspect of communication, aspect of trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tone and Word Usage**

President E is cognitive and concise in his use of words and his narrative is characterized by clarity of tone and meaning. There is consistency between the
preciseness of the words he uses and the cognitive element in his approach to the topic. For example, during the interview he creates a potential model of the dyad as foundational for other partnerships and pays particular attention to the words he uses to describe this process. Within this context he creates a sequence of ideas that progress with the dyad as a foundation for building the team, and the team as the vehicle in working towards the overall goal of the advancement of the university across specific parameters. Such sequencing and building upon ideas are also apparent in his sentence structure as follows: “That only happens if the board is seriously engaged and that in turn only happens if you have a chair of the board…. ” There is a seamless connectivity in the flow of his ideas throughout his narrative. He makes a point that leads to a following point that becomes a foundational part of a larger mental construct. An example of this is when he says,

It’s a huge value for me, for example, to be able to talk to the executive committee of the board—which is not a dyadic relationship but which follows from and only works because of this dyadic relationship.

There is also consistency in his meanings. He discusses his core beliefs about his dyadic partnerships and there are no contradictions in his narrative around these beliefs. He supports his ideas with examples and details, and there are no contradictions between what he states directly and what also emerges through coding and analysis of his entire narrative.

He is cognitive in his approach to word usage and comments on the need for exactness in the wording in response to the interview questions. He says, “And I think
An additional illustration of his exactness is his comment on an aspect of horizontality in a dyadic partnership. He says, “It is horizontal in a funny way in that it is on average horizontal.”

There are also elements of eloquence and elegance in his word usage, as illustrated by the following excerpts from his narrative:

“In order to do those things that are hard, you have to build a team. To do it you have to build a team that has a lot of trust, you have to build a team that communicates, you have to build a team that challenges itself, and that’s what’s going to enable you to accomplish this.”

“And to have a team of people that you feel is now robust enough, communicating enough…”

“Not the goal, just as building a team is not the goal, the goal is enhancement, the team is the vehicle and the underlayment of that is these set of dyadic relationships.”

President E uses strong, action words such as “driving,” “demanding,” “getting to,” “working with,” “leading,” “challenging.” For example, he says, “The president’s a leader and driving the whole agenda.” His words and language reflect a strong and ambitious person who works hard and holds himself and others accountable to the highest standards. Some specific examples of this type of word usage include:

“But in another way the president’s the driver for the agenda of the university.”

“I would say that for a president who wants to be ambitious about getting a lot done…”
“And you have to be doing what nobody can do and what nobody else can do really is drive the level of ambition and challenge of the whole enterprise, create the overall environment…”

“I had to set an environment of challenge and ambition.”

The overall clarity of tone in the way President E communicates reflects his stated values of openness and directness. He says that he values direct communication—

“…direct communication for me is really very important”—and he models this in his tone and word usage. When President E speaks, his sentences are spoken clearly, and there are not many pauses or indistinct sounds such as “um,” or “ah.” When reading the transcript of his interview, the level of clarity is such that it is almost as if he had written and not spoken it. This is true not just for the answers he had been sent in advance but for all the topics he touched upon spontaneously. He also spoke in this clear and efficient way in the pre- and post-interview conversations and interactions.

Unlike some of the other presidents, particularly presidents B and D, there is no overt emotionality or affective element in his tone, apart from a feeling of openness, honesty, and clarity. There is no religiosity or overtly idealistic words used. His tone overall is most similar to that of President A, who is also cognitive and reflective and not overtly emotive. Unlike with the women presidents (B and D), there is no family or personal terms used by President E. He uses the word “relationship,” but it is not used in a way that has strong affect associated with it. The most affective statement he makes in this regard is, “But on a personal level, it’s also immensely personally gratifying to have this set of relationships around people you can trust.” He uses the words “dyadic
relationship” and also uses the word “team” as descriptors for relationships. Examples of his use of the word “team” are mentioned above. Some examples of his use of the word “relationship” are as follows:

“So a key part of this relationship is getting the roles right at various moments.”

“That’s why you actually need to develop a set of relationships where you’re trusting people to do their job.”

“And this is how I’ve dealt with a lot of relationships, which is, I’m reasonably demanding about performance.”

Details of Thematic Factors
The following provides details concerning the component aspects and elements of each thematic factor, as well as how each thematic factor is interactive with other thematic factors.

Thematic Factor of Trust
Aspects and Elements of Trust
- Trust develops over time as someone demonstrates their judgment can be trusted
- Trust involves telling what’s going on
- Trust involves transparency and being able to get feedback

Interactions of Trust with Other Factors
- Trust and time
- Trust and communication—it’s about open, honest, communication such that trust means being able to tell person exactly what’s going on
- Trust and communication—means being able to get feedback
Trust and communication—judgment is an element of trust and being able to communicate it is important

Trust and relationships and complementary strengths—need to develop a set of relationships where you’re trusting people to do their job

Trust and communication, relationships, and the role

Connection between trust and honesty—developing trust requires honesty in communication

Trust and communication are both a two-way street—you have to trust to be trusted. You have to communicate so people feel safe communicating with you

Trust and challenging others

Trust, communication, and team

Trust and time

Summary and Contextual Comments on Trust

For President E, a key element in developing trust involves the partner proving themselves over time. This process of proving oneself includes not only showing specific competencies in the job itself but also the partner demonstrating “judgment” over time, which is interactive with the thematic factor of relationships. He states,

Again, over time I just came to trust his judgment more and more, and so we have this very evolving relationship over an extended period where the nature of my trust in him grew because of how well he did and how good his judgment was. So over time I’ve come to rely on him greatly and also give him much more scope and independence. And that is how I’ve dealt with a lot of relationships…over time, as a degree of trust develops both as people understand what the expectations are and as I see they can do them, then I do try to step back and exhibit a lot more confidence and trust and let them expand and do things more.

When asked to clarify what “judgment” means in the context of trust, President E says,
Judgment means looking at a situation, taking all the available input, seeing what other kinds of questions need to be considered, what kinds of things might impact this that are not completely obvious. It means contextualizing an issue in multiple ways.

There is interactivity between trust and judgment with communication as indicated by his comments later in the interview where he says,

Weighing the different things and being able to participate in a discussion in this kind of balanced way where you’re able to look at these multiple perspectives and participate in conversation that integrates them to come to a conclusion—that’s what judgment is to me.

Trust is interactive with communication across a number of factors, including communication, which is honest, open, and direct, and involves being able to tell the partner what is actually going on. When asked what “trust” means, President E says, “I mean very explicitly to be able to, in both cases, to be able to tell the person exactly what is going on.” Trust within this context is thus a two-way street: “If you don’t trust someone, they’re not going to trust you….If you’re not communicating with them, they’re going to be nervous about communicating with you.”

Trust is also interactive with communication and the role and relationships. For example, trust and communication are foundational for a functional team: “And I would say at a high level having a team that functions well is dependent on…enough trust and communication.” This is also important for President E with trust and communication in getting the roles right in a relationship. When talking about his relationship with the chair of the board, in this regard President E says,
So a key part of this relationship is getting the roles right at various moments, and doing that really demands a great deal of what I would say is developing intuition on both people’s part but, also a great deal of communication, and developing trust which demands that one can be honest and work out any difficulties that arise.

Trust is also interactive with the thematic factors of the role, relationships, team, and complementary strengths:

And that’s why you actually need to develop a set of relationships where you’re trusting people to do their job. And part of your job as people come on is to make sure they’re with the program and going to act well as a member of a coherent team. And insuring people are at that level and that you trust them to be in that place, that’s a developmental step where the kind of relationship has to develop. But at a certain point, as that trust increases, then you have to get focused on the things only you can do.

Trust is interactive with the idea of challenging others in that just because he trusts his partner does not mean that he will stop challenging them. He explains this as follows:

But I would say the other aspect of this is I do try to be challenging of people and not convert a trust to “Well, I’m sure you’re doing a good job.” We’ve got to do more and better and not be complacent in any way.

**Thematic Factor of Communication**

**Aspects and Elements of Communication**

- Must be honest
- He never lies
- Values the truth-tellers
- Must be direct and open
- It’s a two-way street
President needs transparent, open, honest communication

Need to hear productively

Interactions of Communication with Other Factors

Strong connections between communication and trust

Trust and communication a two-way street — you have to trust to be trusted. You have to communicate so people feel safe communicating with you (also presented under trust)

Trust, communication, and team

Summary and Contextual Comments on Communication

A key element in communication for President E is that it is based upon honesty. This involves valuing the truth-tellers and never lying himself. When asked about this in the interview he says,

Researcher: So do you value the truth-tellers then?
President E: Oh absolutely. I have no patience for the non-truth-tellers and I try to model that by always telling the truth myself. Never, ever lie to people, ever.

In this regard he is very similar to President D, who also states that she never lies.

For President E it is also very important that the communication is direct and open. This directness is a key part of his leadership style. An important element in the directness and openness has to do with hearing productively and being open to what he hears. An illustration of hearing productively is provided by this statement:

So, for the board chair [it’s] to be able to tell the president exactly what he or she is hearing from the board or other things that they’re hearing, for the president to be able to hear that in a productive way, for the president to feel comfortable telling the board chair all sorts of things that are going on at the university. Understand then that it’s a positive for the president
to have that kind of transparency and to get, be able to get feedback from a group.

President E not only values hearing productively but also is open to what he hears in terms of considering the opinions of others:

We have five or six people sitting around a table and let’s talk about it. And needless to say, I go in with some priors because it’s impossible not to. I almost never come out of those conversations with exactly the same conclusion or point of view that I went into them with.

President E is similar to presidents A and D in this regard, in that they both emphasize getting input and listening to the opinions of others, particularly in decision-making.

President B also emphasizes this but not as much as presidents A, D, and E.

**Thematic Factor of Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation**

**Aspects and Elements of Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation**

- Same factors that characterize successful dyad can be extrapolated to larger team
- Set of dyads are the foundation, the underlayment of building the team you need to achieve goal of enhancement
- He finds it easier to deal with conflict dyadically
- Dyads only with a few key people, two or three

**Interactions of Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation with Other Factors**

- Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation, and team
- Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation, and relationships
- Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation, and time invested in the partnership
- Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation, and the role—helps him get his job done
- Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation, and common mission
Summary and Contextual Comments on Dyad Radiating Outwards—Extrapolation

During his interview, President E created a model of the dyadic partnership radiating outwards as foundational to being able to build teams that are the vehicles for reaching the common mission of enhancement of the university. Thus the dyadic partnership is of primary importance for President E in his ability to get his job done through the creation and development of relationships. He only has a few key dyadic partnerships, but he has additional dyadic relationships and these are also foundational. There is a strong interaction with the thematic factors of the dyad radiating outwards, and extrapolation and investment of time in the partnership:

I think there’s a lot of value in investing time in people who are working for you. You can’t spend too much time, but it’s also easy to spend too little time and be too divorced. This constant effort to build a set of dyadic relationships that can be leveraged into building an effective team is a crucial issue. And I think phrasing it that way is important because ultimately what you need is a team of people who you trust and who trust each other, and everybody’s communicating with each other. That’s the vehicle through which you’re going to accomplish this enhancement of research, education, and impact. So your goal is to build that functional team; the foundation of that has to be a set of dyadic relationships. Not the goal, just as building a team is not the goal; the goal is enhancement, the team is the vehicle, and the underlayment of that is these set of dyadic relationships….

Thematic Factor of Team

Aspects and Elements of Team
- Need a good working team
- Need to build an effective team with a foundation of a set of dyadic relationships
- Team is the vehicle for accomplishing common mission
• Building team that functions well as integrated team is important to getting a lot done

Interactions of Team with Other Factors
• Team and dyad radiating out
• Team and time—need to invest time to build an effective team
• “And I would say at a high level having a team that functions well is dependent on …enough trust and communication”
• Team is a set of relationships with people you can trust
• Team and trust—having set of relationships around people you can trust very personally gratifying
• Team and common mission
• Team and role—president needs to build integrated team that functions well
• Team and communicating

Summary and Contextual Comments on Team
For President E, the team is a set of relationships of people you can trust. These relationships can be built around a foundational dyad that extrapolates outward. The team can be built on key dyadic partnerships or dyadic relationships that are not the key partnerships. This is an important distinction as he only has a few key dyadic partnerships. The team is the vehicle through which everyone can work together to accomplish the common goal of enhancing the university. He says, “Building a team of people who can work as an integrated team is exceedingly important to actually doing well and getting a lot done.” This sense of the team is the key way he looks at relationships beyond the dyadic partnership relationship:

And to have a team of people that you feel is now robust enough, communicating enough, everybody knows their skills, everybody knows
everybody else and trusts, that I have a great deal of confidence now that we can actually know how to deal with problems that come along. And while I talked about that in a group way, the foundation of that is a set of dyadic relationships…which then is integrated into something larger…So you can’t just have a relationship with a team…[the dyad] gets integrated into, that’s the foundation; it’s not enough, but it’s the foundation for building a team that functions at a very high level.

**Thematic Factor of the Role/Boundaries/Job of the President**

**Aspects and Elements of the Role/Boundaries/Job of the President**

- Not king or queen, not in total control
- Need to get the roles right—who does what—boundaries
- Complicated job
- Works hard
- Models the behavior—challenges self
- Challenges people to achieve
- Only the president can do their job—same as with B, D,
- Job is complicated
- Job means building teams that are vehicles for achieving goal of enhancement of the university

**Interactions of the Role/Boundaries/Job of the President with Other Factors**

- Because of the difficulty of the job and only president can do it, need those trusting relationships
- Need to create those relationships so you can do your job
- Job is complicated

**Summary and Contextual Comments on the Role/Boundaries/Job of the President**

President E sees the role, boundaries, and the job of the president as interconnected. The role of the president within the partnership has to do with the job of
the president. For example, he feels the president needs to set a challenging atmosphere in the university and within his teams and he also needs to challenge his partner. The role also incorporates the idea of having boundaries in what the president does and what his partner does. He describes his interaction with the chair of the board as stated previously as an interaction with intuition when he says, “Getting the roles right at various moments, and doing that really demands a great deal of developing intuition on both people’s part.”

The dyadic partnership is particularly important because of the complexity of the job and needing to have the sets of relationships and teams that can help him to accomplish his goals. President E is similar to President D in acknowledging that he can’t do the job alone and he can’t do it without consensus. President E says in this regard, “…so this job is a very complicated job and anybody who does it with the idea that they’re sort of the king or queen and get to decide everything and do anything is just approaching the job all wrong.”

Thematic Factor of Overarching Goal (Common Mission), Ultimate Primacy of the Goal, and Idealism

Aspects and Elements of the Overarching Goal (Common Mission), Ultimate Primacy of the Goal and Idealism

- The goal (common mission) is advancing the university
- His idealism is about advancing the university and enhancing the mission of the school
- Everything is about working towards this goal—and become vehicles for achieving this goal
- This goal (common mission) supersedes everything else
- He works hard towards this goal
Interactions of Overarching Goal (Common Mission), Ultimate Primacy of the Goal and Idealism with Other Factors

- Interaction with team
- Interaction with relationship
- Interaction with dyad radiating outwards
- Interaction with trust
- Interaction with hard work
- Interaction with idealism
- Interaction with communication
- Interaction with challenging self and others
- Interaction with the role

Summary and Contextual Comments on Overarching Goal (Common Mission), Ultimate Primacy of the Goal and Idealism

For President E, there is a common goal of enhancement of the university and everything he does is about working towards this goal. He feels that dyadic partnerships are helpful in achieving this goal. Aspects of the work and environment are important to President E as they have value in achieving this goal. This is interactive with other thematic factors such as trust, communication, and challenging self and others. President E states,

There’s this drive of challenging ourselves together and with a focus that at the end of the day, the real question is what did we get done. It’s not, did we feel good together. We’re not being paid to feel good, we’re actually being paid to get stuff done. Feeling good, trust, and communication, are actually not the goal, they’re vehicles for the goal… Researcher: What’s the goal?
President E: The goal is advancing the university…And all that means a set of things that different people articulate in different ways. But the university is a place that has a research agenda, has an education agenda
and has an impact agenda. And it should be constantly better at all three of those things, and seeing what that means, you have to argue about and so on. But our job is not to say, “we feel good, we work well as a team,” our job is at the end of the day, when we no longer have these jobs, for people to look back and say the university is a better place for research, it’s a better place for education, and it has more impact. That’s the basis on which we succeed. Whether we were angry at each other or felt lousy, that’s all irrelevant. Why it’s not really irrelevant is, because in order to do those things, which are hard, you have to build a team. To do it you have to build a team that has a lot of trust, you have to build a team that communicates, you have to build a team that challenges itself, and that’s what’s going to enable you to accomplish this.

Thematic Factor of Challenging Self and Others
Aspects and Elements of Challenging Self and Others

- As a president, he must set an environment that challenges people to be their best
- This environment is foundational in building relationships
- He must challenge his partner
- There is a mutual element of challenge with the partner
- He challenges himself—models this challenging behavior
- Multiple levels of challenging to do better—personal, partner, team, and organizational

Interactions of Challenging Self and Others with Other Factors
- Interaction with the role and job of president
- Interaction with goal/common mission in that he is working to make the university better
- Interaction with team as vehicle to work towards this betterment
- Interaction with relationships
Summary and Contextual Comments on Challenging Self and Others

This aspect of challenging the self and others is an important element of partnership for President E. He believes that it is the president who must set a challenging environment for himself and others, including within his key dyadic partnerships. For example he says, “And that has to be my job, because nobody else can.” He also says: “And you have to be doing what nobody can do and what nobody else can do really is drive the level of ambition and challenge of the whole enterprise.” This environment of challenge and ambition is the base within which he builds relationships. He describes this dynamic as follows: “I had to set an environment of challenge and ambition. I recruit these people into it, build a relationship around it.”

The aspect of challenge within the dyadic partnership itself also has a mutual element to it. For example, when asked after ranking the Gallup factors if anything else came to mind as being very important in his successful dyadic partnerships, he says, “I would say that just the word I would use is this word of mutual challenge, challenge in some sense.”

Thematic Factor of *Relationships

Aspects and Elements of *Relationships

- Importance of team
- Key part of relationship is getting the roles right
- Developing the relationships
- Team
- Personally gratifying to have relationships characterized by trust
- Building relationships is important for president
Interactions of Relationships with Other Factors

- Relationships help him get his job done—interactive with the role
- Relationships are important in the dyad radiating outwards
- Relationships are foundational in the team
- Relationships help achieve the common mission

Summary and Contextual Comments on Relationships

Relationships emerge as a thematic factor that is important in a number of ways in President E’s successful dyadic partnerships. Relationships are important in helping the president get his job done through key dyadic partnerships; dyadic partnerships that are relationships but which are not the primary partnerships; and the team relationships that are built upon dyads. Apart from the dyadic partnership, President E usually refers to relationships in terms of the idea of the thematic factor of team. Building these relationships is an important part of the president’s job.

Summary

This section has provided a detailed presentation of the findings for each president. These findings include the nature and salience of the emergent thematic factors with supportive illustrations from the transcriptions of the interviews and follow-up questions. This chapter also provided details of the interactions between thematic factors for each president. In some instances there was a presentation of some comparisons between presidents for word tone and usage, and thematic factors. These findings are used to create the grounded theory and models presented in chapter 5.
Comparison of Factors

The preceding section of this chapter presented the findings of the emergent thematic factors with depth and detail for each individual president. This section builds upon the findings presented in the previous two sections of this chapter and provides a comparison of the thematic findings across all the presidents, with particular reference to the degree of commonality of a thematic factor among them by salience and the level of interaction of a thematic factor with other thematic factors by salience. This section is organized as follows:

- Review of the key findings for each individual president from the first main section in tabular format
- Comparison of the common thematic factors that emerged for more than one president
- Breakdown of the common thematic factors by salience
- Breakdown of common thematic factors by number of presidents and by salience
- Comparison of interactions between thematic factors
- Comparison of the prevalence of interactions between thematic factors
- Findings of alignment between the way presidents lead and the way they partner
- Findings of the importance of the dyadic partnership to the presidents
- Findings of the successful dyadic partnership radiating outwards and extrapolating to larger groups
- Gender findings
- Findings for explicit leadership theory terminology
- Findings for correlation between type of school and nature of the partnerships
Comparative Findings of Thematic Factors

Review of Key Findings from Preceding Sections

The thematic factors for each president were provided in tabular format in section one of this chapter. These tables are provided again below for continuity and ease of reference in the presentation of the comparative findings. It is important to note that themes can manifest differently for the different presidents. For example, four presidents have time/longevity as emergent but the meaning, primacy, and affect related to the term involve differences in nuance. For President A, for example it has to do with investing time in the partnership, whereas for both female presidents, B and D, it has to do both with investment of time and also longevity of the partnership.

There are also aspects of complexity for these factors in that listing them separately does not show the nature of interaction between factors. For example, collegiality is not only a separate factor for President A but is also an element of interaction with other factors such as team. Thus while Table 23 gives a snapshot of the presence of the thematic factors and a rough approximation of their salience, it does not provide a comprehensive sense of their complexity, interaction, and varying meanings. The nature of these interactions is presented later within this section in more detail in Tables 33–36.

The following tables show findings of word tone and usage for the presidents and the emergent thematic factors for the presidents listed by salience. These tables were initially presented in the first section of this chapter. In these tables, a single asterisk (*) indicates sub-thematic factors that emerged but that are not as salient as the key factors; a
double asterisk (**) indicates factors not present in the initial interview but that later emerged in answers to the follow-up questions.
Table 23. Overview—Word Tone and Usage for the Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President A (male)</th>
<th>President B (female)</th>
<th>President C (male)</th>
<th>President D (female)</th>
<th>President E (male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word tone</strong></td>
<td>Cognitive approach to understanding and sense making</td>
<td>Both cognitive and intellectually oriented as well as affective and emotional</td>
<td>Highly reflective and deliberate in his speech</td>
<td>Both highly cognitive and intellectually oriented as well as highly affective and</td>
<td>Highly cognitive, rational, approach to understanding and sense-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall</td>
<td>Both rational, neutral and balanced tone and use of dynamic words</td>
<td>Most similar to President D in this regard</td>
<td>Cognitive and rational tone overall</td>
<td>emotional in tone. Most similar in this regard to President B</td>
<td>Builds mental constructs and models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and words that convey nuance</td>
<td>Warmth in tone—similar to D</td>
<td>Uses storytelling extremely effectively</td>
<td>Warmth in tone—similar to B</td>
<td>Most similar to D in his abstraction and sense-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collegiality and nice ness</td>
<td>Use of psychological frame of reference</td>
<td>Use of humor</td>
<td>Also cognitive approach to understanding and sense-making, most similar to President</td>
<td>Most similar to A in non-emotive tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word tone:</strong></td>
<td><strong>religiosity or spirituality</strong></td>
<td>Present—specifically Catholic</td>
<td>Present as non-denominational Spirituality</td>
<td>Present—Ecumenical Christian and Catholic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>Gratitude expressed has religious tone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gratitude expressed has religious tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word usage</strong></td>
<td>Neutral, collegial, polite, engaged, open, clean—no excessive use of modifiers</td>
<td>Family, emotional and personal development terms</td>
<td>Balanced, neutral, careful and deliberate use of specific words</td>
<td>Positive modifiers, family, emotional and personal development terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to literature</td>
<td>Uses words engagingly in storytelling</td>
<td>Clarity and conciseness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eloquent, dynamic; action words that convey nuance in combination with rational</td>
<td>Most similar in this regard to President D</td>
<td>Some use of financial terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>words and phrases that balance overall tone</td>
<td>Reference to literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of humility in his word usage, somewhat similar to D in this regard</td>
<td>Most similar in this regard to President D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of gratitude in his word usage—with use of the word “fortunate” – differs</td>
<td>Reference to literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from gratitude as expressed by B and D</td>
<td>Most similar in this regard to President B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word usage:</strong></td>
<td><strong>relationship</strong></td>
<td>Most similar in this regard to President D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Relationship, family and community terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most similar in this regard to President E</td>
<td>Most similar in this regard to President D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word usage:</strong></td>
<td><strong>exactness and precision</strong></td>
<td>Careful and exact</td>
<td>Highly precise, reflects as to exact word usage and meanings, deliberateness in</td>
<td>Highly precise, speaks about word choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Careful and exact</td>
<td>Most similar to A in this regard</td>
<td>what he says</td>
<td>Most similar to E in this regard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most similar to B in this regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highly precise, speaks about word choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 24. Overview—Most Salient Thematic Factors for Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
<td>The role</td>
<td>Idealism—serving the greater good</td>
<td>Sameness Community</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community (Both factors equally salient)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common vision/mission</td>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>The heart</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time—investing time in the partnership</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
<td>Challenges/overcoming challenges/learning from challenges</td>
<td>The role/boundaries/job of the president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and boundaries</td>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
<td>The role</td>
<td>The overarching goal</td>
<td>(common mission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of data</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>Common vision/mission</td>
<td>Challenging self and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The same theme can have different meanings and manifestations for the different presidents.
### Table 25. Sub-thematic Factors in Order of Salience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Trust</td>
<td>*Gender</td>
<td>*Knowing self and partner/communication</td>
<td>*Gender</td>
<td>*Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Idealism</td>
<td>*Boundaries</td>
<td>*Complementary strengths</td>
<td>*Longevity</td>
<td>*Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Team</td>
<td>*SUP</td>
<td>*Difficulty of forgiveness</td>
<td>*Religious elements</td>
<td>*Valuing the truth-teller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SUP—horizontality in communication within an overall vertical structure</td>
<td>*Sameness</td>
<td>*Importance of partnership with spouse</td>
<td>*Works hard and determination</td>
<td>*SUP—horizontality with caveat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Religious elements</td>
<td>*SUP—Horizontality</td>
<td>*Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Works hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Works hard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ability to know self and other and convey key aspects of self iteratively

### Table 26. Themes in Direct Response to Follow-up Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Equality and distribution of power (horizontality aspect)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intuition—with trust, with boundaries</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complementary strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Deep personal friendship not easily possible within working dyadic partnership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Importance of partnerships, work of president can’t be done alone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deep personal friendship possible with key dyad</strong></td>
<td><strong>No sense of isolation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of the Common Thematic Factors for Presidents

It is possible to compare the findings of the thematic factors that emerge for the different presidents. This comparison is done by showing the most common to least common thematic factors that emerge for all the presidents. A first step in providing the comparative findings is to show the thematic factors that are common to more than one individual president. In Table 27 all the thematic factors that emerge for more than one president are presented. The thematic factors that are presented in Tables 24–26 (previously, Tables 5–7) above that are unique to only one president have been removed for Table 27 in order to present a comparative overview of common factors. For example, the thematic factor that emerges for President C of *importance of partnership with spouse*, is not present in Table 27, because this factor only emerges for President C. While it is a relevant factor for President C, it is not presented in the comparative findings of common factors for Table 27. This allows for the isolation of the most common thematic factors. The common factors in Table 27 are presented in order of salience for each president.

Table 27 shows that thematic factors can be common to more than one president but have differing orders of salience. For example, trust is common to all five presidents but has the following order of salience from greatest to least salience: trust is most salient for President E; trust is the third most salient common factor for President C; trust is the seventh most salient common factor for presidents B and D. Table 28 below shows trust as a sub-thematic factor for President A. Note: Factors such as trust or communication
that are present in Table 27 can also appear in Table 28, depending on their salience and emergence per president.

**Table 27. Most Salient Common Thematic Factors for More Than One President**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
<td>The role</td>
<td>Idealism—serving the greater good</td>
<td>Sameness</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common vision/mission</td>
<td>Time and longevity</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Challenges/overcoming challenges/learning from challenges</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time—investing time in the partnership</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
<td>The role</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and boundaries</td>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
<td>Common vision/mission</td>
<td>The role/boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>The overarching goal (common mission)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All unique factors that emerged for only one president have been removed.
Table 28. Most Salient Common Sub-Thematic Factors for More Than One President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Trust</td>
<td>*Gender</td>
<td>*Knowing self and partner/communication</td>
<td>*Gender</td>
<td>*Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Idealism</td>
<td>*Boundaries</td>
<td>*Complementary strengths</td>
<td>*Longevity</td>
<td>*Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Team</td>
<td>*SUP</td>
<td>*Religious element</td>
<td>*Valuing the truth-teller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SUP—horizontality in communication within an overall vertical structure; Complementary strengths</td>
<td>*Sameness</td>
<td>*Works hard and determination</td>
<td>*SUP—horizontality with caveat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Religious element</td>
<td>*SUP—horizontality</td>
<td>*Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Works hard</td>
<td>*Works hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ability to know self and other and convey key aspects of self iteratively

Table 29. Most Salient Common Thematic Material for More Than One President (Follow-up Questions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**SUP—equality and distribution of power (horizontality aspect) manifests differently from other presidents</td>
<td>**Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Intuition—with trust, with boundaries</td>
<td>**Complementary strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Deep personal friendship not easily possible within working dyadic partnership</td>
<td>**Deep personal friendship possible with key dyad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relative Salience of Common Thematic Factors by Number of Presidents

Tables 30–32 show the most common thematic factors by number of presidents for which the factor is emergent. The factors are presented in order of greatest to least commonality. This facilitates a comparison of those factors that are common across all five presidents, across four presidents, across three presidents, and across two presidents. The presentation of this comparison also shows the salience of each factor. Thus for example, when trust is compared across the presidents, it is found to be common to all five presidents. The order of salience of trust is that when its salience is compared for each president, it emerges as the most salient of the factors that is present for all five. Common mission is also a thematic factor that is common to all five presidents but its salience is second to the salience of trust.

The thematic factors are presented in order of greatest to least commonality. The presence of each thematic factor per president is represented by the president’s initials: A, B, C, D, or E. In one case the thematic factors have been put together. This occurs with resilience and challenges for presidents B and D because the meaning of these factors within their narratives has some strong similarities although there are nuances that make the thematic factors different. This putting together of these thematic factors indicates a strong similarity of meaning and manifestation of the factors, and this grouping has the symbol (~) in front of the terms to indicate that they have been combined.

The factors of role, and of role and boundaries have been separated in that role as a separate category has a distinct meaning in the narratives from role and boundaries. There are some terms that are used interchangeably in the naming of factors based on the
way the terms manifest within the narratives. Such terms include “complementary strengths” and “expertise” used interchangeably; and “common vision” and “common mission” used interchangeably.

As mentioned previously, in these tables, a single asterisk (*) indicates sub-thematic factors that emerged but which are not as salient as key thematic factors. A double asterisk (**) indicates thematic material that was not in the initial interview narrative but that emerged in the direct responses to the follow-up questions.

**Thematic Factors Common to 5, 4, 3, and 2 Presidents**

The thematic factors common to all five presidents are trust, common mission, and horizontal/vertical elements. The order of salience by president shows how relatively salient a factor is for each president compared to the other presidents. For example, trust is relatively most salient for E, relatively second most salient for C, and third and fourth most salient for B and D. Trust is relatively least salient for A. This is indicated by the listing of presidents in order as E, C, B, D, *A in the third column of the Table 30. The asterisk (*) before A indicates that for President A, trust is a sub-thematic factor.
Table 30. Thematic Factors Common to All Five Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Common Factor</th>
<th>Presidents for Whom Factor Is Present (in order of salience by president)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient across all five presidents—first most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>E, C, B, D, *A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient across all five presidents—second most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>C, A, E, (B, D, equal salience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient across all five presidents—third most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>SUP—with horizontal/vertical elements</td>
<td>*B, (*A, *E, equal salience), *D, **C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The thematic factors common to four presidents are communication, complementary strengths, and time/longevity. These factors are shown in detail in Table 31 below.

Table 31. Thematic Factors Common to Four Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Common Factor</th>
<th>Presidents for Whom Factor Is Present (in order of salience by president)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient across four presidents—fourth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>(A, E, equal salience), B, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient across four presidents—fifth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
<td>A, B, *C, **D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient across four presidents—sixth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Time/longevity</td>
<td>B, A, *D, *E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The thematic factors common to three presidents are relationship(s); dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation; works hard; boundaries, and boundaries in combination with the role; intuition; and friendship. These factors are presented in detail in Table 32 below.

**Table 32. Thematic Factors Common to Three Presidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Salience</th>
<th>Common Factor</th>
<th>Presidents for Whom Factor Is Present (in order of salience by president)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient across three presidents—seventh most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Relationship(s)</td>
<td>(B, D, equal salience), *E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient across three presidents—eighth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
<td>E, C, **D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient across three presidents—ninth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Works hard</td>
<td>D, (*B, *E equal salience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient across three presidents—tenth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Boundaries, and boundaries in combination with the role</td>
<td>B, E, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient across three presidents—eleventh most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>D, *E,**C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most salient across three presidents—twelfth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>**C, **D, (implicit in B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thematic Factors Common to Two Presidents

The role: B, D—thirteenth most salient

Sameness: D, *B—fourteenth most salient

Idealism: C, *A—fifteenth most salient

The role and boundaries: E, A—sixteenth most salient

Team: E, *A—seventeenth most salient

Gender: (*B, *D, equal salience)—eighteenth most salient

Religious element: *D, *B—nineteenth most salient

Knowing self and others and communicating knowledge: *C, *B—20th most salient

~ Resilience, Overcoming challenges: (B, D equal salience)—21st most salient

Thematic Factors Common Only to Female Presidents (B and D)

The role

Sameness

Gender

Religious element

~Resilience, Overcoming challenges

Thematic Factors Common Only to Male Presidents (A, C, E)

Idealism

The role and boundaries

Team
Comparison of Interactions Between Thematic Factors

It is possible to show the interactions of factors with each other. These interactions are presented for each president, in Tables 33–36 below. Specifically, they show not only which factors interact with other factors but also the interactions of factors broken down by individual president. This breakdown by president allows for a comparison of the interactions across presidents.

As shown within these tables, factors can be interactive with one, two, three or more factors; this is indicated by the use of the word *and* between listed factors. However, it is important to note that the exact nature of the interactions between factors is not shown in the tables but is presented in detail in second main section of this chapter. The tables indicate only which factors interact with other factors and how this breaks down across all the presidents. The details of how these factors interact are not presented in the tables but are explained with examples in the second main section of this chapter.

For example, as shown in the tables below for President E, trust is interactive with relationships and complementary strengths and team in combination. The nature of this interaction was explained in the second section of this chapter. That explanation included the idea that this interaction reflects the president’s belief that you have to be able to trust people to do their job, based on their complementary strengths and that this aspect of trust is important in the relationship and the team. An illustrative statement by President E representing this type of interaction is as follows:

> And that’s why you actually need to develop a set of relationships where you’re trusting people to do their job. And part of your job as people come on is to make sure they’re with the program and going to act well as a member of a coherent team. And insuring people are at that level and
that you trust them to be in that place, that’s a developmental step where the kind of relationship has to develop. But at a certain point as that trust increases then you have to get focused on the things only you can do.

Within the presentation in Tables 33–36, a factor is listed in the far left-hand column and then the factors with which it is interactive are presented by president. The factors are broken down by their presence for all five presidents, four presidents, three presidents, and two presidents. The factors are presented in order of commonality with the most common factor listed first. For example, in the factors common to all five presidents, trust is the most common and therefore it is listed before common mission, which is the second most common.
Table 33. Comparison of Interactions Among Thematic Factors Common to Five Presidents (in order of commonality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors across 5 Presidents:</th>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td>Interactive with: time; expertise; integrity; knowing and being known</td>
<td>Interactive with: time; intuition; common mission; time; fairness; complementary strengths;</td>
<td>Interactive with: sameness; time; longevity; relationships; learning; overcoming challenges; truth-telling; direct communication; common mission; knowing the partner</td>
<td>Interactive with: time; honesty in communication; communication; challenging others; relationships and complementary strengths and team; communication and team; common mission</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common mission</strong></td>
<td>communication; the role; trust; idealism</td>
<td>resilience; relationship idealism; trust; dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
<td>relationships; community; collectivity and community; and common mission; overcoming challenges; trust</td>
<td>dyad radiating outwards; team; idealism; relationship; trust; communication; challenging self and others; works hard; relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUP</strong></td>
<td>communication; complementary strengths</td>
<td>communication; mentorship; the role</td>
<td>community; horizontality; relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 34. Comparison of Interactions Among Thematic Factors Common to Four Presidents (in order of commonality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors across 4 Presidents:</th>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trust; honesty; truth-telling; trustworthiness; data; leadership; collegiality; team; common mission; SUP</td>
<td>boundaries; the role; SUP</td>
<td>the heart; intuition; trust; SUP—horizontal; truth-telling; directness; the role</td>
<td>trust; trust and team; team; honesty; truth-tellers; directness and openness; common mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complementary strengths</strong></td>
<td>trust; communication; boundaries; team; SUP</td>
<td>trust; the role</td>
<td>SUP—equality (horizontality); trust</td>
<td>trust; the role and relationships;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time/Longevity</strong></td>
<td>communication; collegiality</td>
<td>trust over time; trust and time; knowing partner over time; resilience over time; investment of time and the honesty of the relationship; knowing and being known and time and trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>dyad radiating outwards; trust; team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35. Comparison of Interactions Among Thematic Factors Common to Three Presidents (in order of commonality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors across 3 Presidents:</th>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trust and knowing of self; communicating and trust; SUP—vertical relationship and horizontal communication</td>
<td>trust; SUP—horizontality; knowing and trust</td>
<td>trust and communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
<td>common mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>common mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works hard</td>
<td>the role</td>
<td>the role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries, and boundaries in combination with The Role</td>
<td>intuition; verticality</td>
<td>verticality</td>
<td>intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 36. Comparison of Interactions Among Thematic Factors Common to Two Presidents (in order of commonality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors across 2 Presidents:</th>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Role</strong></td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
<td>Interactive with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time; longevity; mentorship; SUP; communication; boundaries; resilience; knowing self and other</td>
<td>time; longevity; mentorship; SUP; communication; boundaries; resilience; knowing self and other</td>
<td>relationships; learning; communication; common mission and communication</td>
<td>relationships; learning; communication; common mission and communication</td>
<td>trust and communication; dyad radiating outwards; team; works hard; common mission; challenging self and others; relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sameness</strong></td>
<td>mentorship</td>
<td>trust; community; intuition; relationships; the heart; overcoming challenges</td>
<td>mentorship</td>
<td>trust; community; intuition; relationships; the heart; overcoming challenges</td>
<td>common mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealism</strong></td>
<td>common mission; passion</td>
<td>common mission</td>
<td>common mission</td>
<td>common mission</td>
<td>common mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Role and Boundaries</strong></td>
<td>collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td>trust and communication; communicating; dyad radiating outwards; time; relationships; relationships &amp; trust; common mission; the role; challenging self &amp; others</td>
<td>trust and communication; communicating; dyad radiating outwards; time; relationships; relationships &amp; trust; common mission; the role; challenging self &amp; others</td>
<td>trust and communication; communicating; dyad radiating outwards; time; relationships; relationships &amp; trust; common mission; the role; challenging self &amp; others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>mentorship; leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious element</strong></td>
<td>the role; common mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowing self and others</strong></td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>communication; fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Resilience, Overcoming challenges”</strong></td>
<td>time; mentorship; relationship; common mission</td>
<td>time; mentorship; relationship; common mission</td>
<td>learning; trust; trust and knowing; mentorship; common mission</td>
<td>learning; trust; trust and knowing; mentorship; common mission</td>
<td>learning; trust; trust and knowing; mentorship; common mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Prevalence of Interactions Among Thematic Factors
As indicated in Tables 33–36, there are a variety of levels of interactions. Some factors are very interactive with other factors and some factors are only interactive with a few factors. The degree to which a factor is interactive is described as the prevalence of interaction for that factor. This terminology allows for a comparison of the interactivity of the different factors. A factor that is highly interactive with other factors has a high degree of prevalence, whereas a factor that is not interactive with other factors has a low degree of prevalence. Thus a factor can be described relative to its prevalence with other factors. Table 37 below shows the findings for prevalence of interactions. It includes only the factors that are most interactive with each other and have high prevalence. A factor is listed in the far left column of the table and the other columns to the right show the most prevalent interactions between this factor and other thematic factors listed by the presidents. For example, for trust, the most prevalent interactions across all five presidents include interactions with time and complementary strengths (expertise). Additional prevalent interactions for trust across several presidents include interactions with communication and common mission.
Table 37. Most Prevalent Interactions Among Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors across 5 Presidents:</th>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>time, time, complementary strengths, communication</td>
<td>time, expertise</td>
<td>time, complementary strengths, common mission</td>
<td>time, longevity, truth-telling, direct communication; common mission</td>
<td>time; honesty in communication; communication; relationships and complementary strengths and team; communication and team; common mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Mission</td>
<td>trust, communication, idealism</td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>trust, idealism, dyad radiating outwards</td>
<td>trust, relationships</td>
<td>trust, idealism, relationship, dyad radiating outwards, communication,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>communication; complementary strengths</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors across 4 Presidents:</td>
<td>trustworthiness, honesty, truth-telling,</td>
<td>the role, SUP</td>
<td>trust, truth-telling, SUP—horizontal, directness, the role</td>
<td>trust; truth-telling, honesty, directness and openness;</td>
<td>trust; the role and relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust, the role</td>
<td>trust, SUP equality (horizontal) but manifests differently from other presidents-</td>
<td>trust; the role and relationships</td>
<td>trust; the role and relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Strengths</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/longevity</td>
<td>trust over time; trust and time;</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries, and boundaries in combination with the role</td>
<td>Intuition, SUP—Vertically</td>
<td>SUP—verticality</td>
<td>intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors across 2 Presidents:</td>
<td>President A</td>
<td>President B</td>
<td>President C</td>
<td>President D</td>
<td>President E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>collegiality</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing self and others</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Resilience, overcoming</td>
<td>mentorship, relationship, common mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The role of communication
- Relationships; communication; common mission and communication
- Trust and communication; common mission; relationships
- Common mission
- Relationships; relationships and trust
- Communication
- Mentorship, common mission
Key Findings

The data presented in Tables 33–37 support two key findings:

- The most common prevalent interactive thematic factor is trust.
- Other prevalent interactive factors include communication, common mission, and relationships.

The most interactive thematic factors are also some of the most common thematic factors across the presidents. Trust and common mission as thematic factors are present for all five presidents. Communication as a thematic factor is present for four presidents and relationships is a thematic factor for three presidents. It appears that there is a connection between the commonness of thematic factors and the interactive prevalence of thematic factors.

Additional Comparative Findings

How a President Leads and How That President Partners

For all the presidents there is a strong alignment between their description of their job as a president and as a leader, and the way they partner with their key dyad. This alignment did not emerge as a thematic factor but rather as a hypothesis which resulted from analysis by the researcher and which was then explored further through follow-up questions and interviews. However, it is important to note that this idea originated from the researcher more than from what emerged in the narratives. Thus, the presidents do not talk in terms of this alignment until they are asked directly about it in clarifying questions. This alignment between their approach to leadership as president and their approach to partnership is consistently present with each president although their
perspectives around their roles and the job of the president differ per president. For example, President B is very relationship oriented in her leadership and she is also very relationship oriented in her partnership with Emily. She says, “I started out as a dean of students. My relationship with my constituencies is an important part of how I lead.” When describing her leadership partnership with Emily within this context, she says the partnership is “the leadership spine of the institution.” Additionally resilience is a key factor in terms of how she sees her job as president and the nature of how she and Emily have persevered throughout their partnership over eighteen years. President B also sees part of her job as president to be about creating a stable environment for learning and work. She says,

You show up every day so that people depend on it. You appear and behave and respond consistently depending upon who it is coming in. You’re receptive, you’re stable, people attribute their decision-making to you and then therefore they go about their work without being distracted, you know, that’s my job. You know my job is creating the context within which the core mission of the institution, the teaching, and learning can go on undistracted.

She also tries to live this in her partnership with Emily, where she creates a context within the mentor-mentee relationship for Emily to feel able to learn and develop. The nature of the boundaries around the leadership role for President B also impact the way she partners with Emily. She says,

The thing I think is unique to a partnership in the context of leadership is that you can share almost everything but you can’t share—nor would it be appropriate for you as a leader to do so—ultimate responsibility. So I am never far away from knowing what’s happening at this institution because no matter, whatever happens, I am ultimately responsible. She shares much of that institution perspective with me, but she’s not ultimately
responsible and that’s the way the relationship operates. She’ll never fully understand that until she sits in, because in the darkest moment, the person who has to make the decision is the president.

While President D is similar in some significant ways to President B, she also differs in terms of how she sees the role and job of the president and how she acts as a leader and partner. President D is highly collective in her leadership and for her one of the most important jobs of the president is to build community. This collectivity in working together towards a common mission is a key part of her partnering. When asked, “What is the core factor that gives life and vitality to your dyadic partnership?” President D says,

I guess it’s that we love what we do and we love each other and we have this common purpose that is transformative, ultimately, that it’s really not about me and it’s not about them; it’s about all of us together.

A key aspect of her collectivity as a leader and builder of community has to do with knowing people and being known by them. This is also demonstrated in her getting to know the interviewer. She says in this regard, “This is how I work, this is how I live, this is how I lead.” Such collectivity and knowing are also prevalent in how she has partnered with both Sonia and Walter. She works horizontally and collectively with them such that it is not about her ego or theirs, and there is a heavy emphasis upon relationship. When describing some of her partners, she says,

And I think that they have no ego, I mean no ego in the bad sense, but they have a sense of themselves. They’re grounded, they know that the most important thing we do is we nurture relationships to make people better. That we have an opportunity every day to change the world.
Further examples of this finding of alignment include President E’s view of the job of the president as including working towards the enhancement and advancement of the university across a number of parameters. He feels part of this involves challenging himself and others, including his dyadic partners to work to the highest standard and to keep improving and advancing themselves. Thus there is a parallel between driving and challenging self and others on the personal dyadic level and driving towards betterment, advancement, and enhancement on the presidential leadership level.

**Importance of the Dyadic Partnership to the Presidents**

For all the presidents there are indications in their narratives and follow-up questions that they consider their successful dyadic partnerships to be important across a number of parameters. For example, when asked in the follow-up interviews whether successful dyadic partnerships are important to presidents and if so why are they important, a few of their responses include the following:

President A: I think they are because certainly in the chief executive role you can’t do it all yourself. At times maybe the less you do yourself, the better. The more you can lead or share leadership with others, I think ultimately the more effective you’re going to be and so these sorts of partnerships, and this one in particular we’re talking about, are a means to that end and I think it’s important to look for ‘em. They make you more effective and more fun.

President C: I think in these deep trusting relationships they help you do what you’re charged to do in getting your job done. In both cases that’s been true for me.

President D: The work of the presidency cannot be done alone. It requires a commitment of heart and mind and soul and body. Dyadic partnerships nourish the individuals and thereby enrich the community.
Successful Dyadic Partnership Radiating Outwards and Extrapolation to Larger Groups

A finding that could be related to the importance of the successful dyadic partnership to presidents is the radiation outwards and extrapolation of the successful dyadic partnership to triads, teams, and larger groups in the community. All of the presidents feel that there is such a radiation and that it can be very helpful. There is a caveat in that President B also warns that such partnerships must be managed well to avoid any appearance of favoritism, which could damage larger group dynamics.

Presidents A, C, D and E feel that such radiating outwards is very positive. President D, for example, says in this regard:

I think the living out of the partnerships speaks more than any words about how working together empowers the individuals and the community—even in and through the most complex and difficult challenges.

President E feels that the dyad is an essential building block for larger teams and groups. This is a key salient thematic factor for him and some of his comments in this regard include the following:

“And while I talked about that in a group way, the foundation of that is a set of dyadic relationships…which then is integrated into something larger…So you can’t just have a relationship with a team…[The dyad] then gets integrated… it’s the foundation for building a team that functions at a very high level.”

“I think there’s a lot of value in investing time in people who are working for you. You can’t spend too much time, but it’s also easy to spend too little time and be too divorced. This constant effort to build a set of dyadic relationships that can be leveraged into building an effective team is a crucial issue. And I think this is important, phrasing it that way is important, because ultimately what you need is a team of people who you trust and who trust each other, and everybody’s communicating with each other. That’s the vehicle through which you’re going to accomplish this enhancement of research, education, and impact. So your goal is to build
that functional team, the foundation of that has to be a set of dyadic relationships. Not the goal, just as building a team is not the goal; the goal is enhancement, the team is the vehicle, and the underlayment of that is these set of dyadic relationships.”

**Gender**

There are a number of significant findings concerning gender, including differences in word tone and usage, and differences in the manifestation of thematic factors across gender.

**Word Tone and Usage and Gender**

As demonstrated within the individual findings for the presidents, there are specific differences in the tone and word usage of the female presidents and the male presidents. The females have a combination of both affective and intellectual elements in their tone. Affectively the female presidents use words that are emotive such as “love,” “adore,” and “bereft.” There is also a religious element to their words, with usage such as “blessed,” “saint,” and “grace.” Their word usage involves the use of family terms such as “mother,” “daughter,” and “marriage,” as well as personal development terms such as “adolescent,” “maturity,” and “grown-up.” These words are prevalent throughout but are particularly in use around the idea of relationship. Intellectually the female presidents make references to theoretical ideas, literature, and management and leadership literature.

The male presidents have a very different tone and word usage. Overall they do not have a strong affective element in either their tone or their word usage, with the exception of President C, who has some emotive elements around his idealism for the greater good. He uses the word “passion” in this regard. However, consistently
throughout their narratives the male presidents present cognitive and rational tones. Their speech is more modulated and restrained, and the way they present their thoughts is less emotionally intense than it is with the women. For example, there are much stronger emphatic statements made by the women, where they put intensity and emphasis on certain words, which does not happen with the men. While the female presidents are conceptual, they are intellectual in their application of concepts, for example through reference to theory or literature. The male presidents differ in this regard. They are conceptual in a predominately rational and pragmatic way. For example, as demonstrated within the individual findings, they build conceptual models and constructs throughout their narratives and there is a progression of thought relative to these frameworks. They do not reference theory and literature in the same way as the women do. Their word usage is non-emotive. They do not use emotive, family, or personal development terms. They never refer to the partnership as a marriage or other type of familial relationship. When speaking about relationships in general and relative to the partnership, they tend to use the word “team.”

The differences in findings across gender with word tone and usage reflect deeper differences in the approaches to leadership and partnership manifested across the genders. This is illustrated by two separate statements made by President B about being relationship based in her leadership and leading from the heart:

“I started out as a dean of students. My relationship with my constituencies is an important part of how I lead.”

“I think you don’t want to stereotype things, but everything that we know about women in leadership, without assuming every woman, says that we
lead differently, that we lead more with relationship-centered, with the heart so to speak, and that is a great strength.”

In order to preclude any framing around gender differences in leadership, such gender literature was not studied or referenced prior to the additional research conducted for chapters 5 and 6. However, it is interesting to note that even without any such framing or knowledge of the literature, the actual findings of the study are consistent with President B’s statement. The two women both lead from the heart, where the relationship is a deep and personal relationship, which involves aspects of caring, love, and affection. The women speak about this emotional aspect of their leadership openly. For example, President D talks about wanting to know her people, deeply and on a personal level, wanting to know their families, and wanting them to know she cares about them.

There is no indication that the male presidents lead in this way. While it is potentially likely that they feel affection and personal feelings for their partners, this is not surfaced in their words or in any way throughout their narratives. This may be because they may not feel comfortable speaking in such terms. But it also appears as if they approach the partnerships differently. Ultimately they see the partnerships in terms of a team, where they are working towards a common goal. The partnerships need to have people feeling good and working well together to facilitate reaching the goal. However, the men do not seem to see the need for leading around love and caring or leading from the heart in the way that the women do. This difference goes beyond the surface level of the words to the deeper level where the word usage reflects a surfacing of more profound phenomena. An implication of this finding is whether the emotional
element of the leadership partnership for the women means that it has more importance for them overall. Does this leading from the heart, where the heart is invested to some degree in a partnership, mean that the partnership becomes more important for these female presidents? Also, if women are more relationship centered, then is this dyad more central for female presidents?

**Emergent Thematic Factors and Gender**

There are differences in the emergence of thematic factors as indicated earlier, where certain factors emerge for only female presidents and certain factors emerge for only male presidents, as follows:

**Thematic Factors Common Only to Female Presidents (B and D)**
- The role
- Sameness
- Gender
- Religious element
- ~Resilience, Overcoming challenges

**Thematic Factors Common Only to Male Presidents (A, C, E)**
- Idealism
- The role and boundaries
- Team

Within the salient thematic factors that emerge across both genders, there are differences in the nature and manifestation of these factors for each gender.
Differences in Trust and Sameness and Gender

Differences emerge across gender in the way which trust occurs and develops. For the female presidents there is an initial sense of connection and intuitive trusting that occurs with the dyadic partner. This allows for further trust to develop over time through shared commitment towards the common goal and demonstration of trustworthy behavior. There is an element of homogeneity or sameness that has emerged in the study for this initial, intuitive trusting that occurs for the women. The initial trusting involves an intuition or sense of sameness between the president and the partner. For President B, the sameness involves a number of factors such as the fact that they were both young women and new to the institution. President B also refers to a feeling or special sense she got about Emily from the beginning. President B describes this as follows:

President D: She was here as a young professional when I arrived. She’d been here a year. I removed the VP for finance for reasons and put Emily in that position. Against the recommendation of the chairman of the board initial recommendation because he, if truth be told thought two young women, how could they run this institution, and I said to him, “Well, Sam, you hired me to make these choices and you need to support me and I’ve been proven right.”
Researcher: But you felt something in her from the beginning.
President D: Right, right.

There was also sameness in that President B was repeating a pattern of female mentorship. Her female mentor had been ten years older than she was, and President B is approximately ten years older than her mentee/partner Emily. In this sense, Emily is in the same role that President B had been in earlier.
For President D, the sameness manifested in that her key partner Sonia was also female, came from the same collective sub-culture, was in the same field, had the same core values, and the same commitment. With her second dyadic partner, there is also that instant sense of connection around trust, having to do with similar values.

President C, who is a male, is similar to the females in that he describes an intuitive, instant sense of trust with his two dyadic partners, but he differs from the women in that the element of sameness in his instant trusting involves being passionate about the same thing. When asked about this, he says,

Researcher: Does it have anything to do with a sense of sameness?
President C: In terms of what we’re passionate about, yes.

President C differs significantly from the women in that he says that trust with the dyadic partner can take place either instantly or can take place over time—without it happening with an instant, intuitive connection. He says that trust can happen both ways. The other two male presidents, A and E, do not exhibit a pattern of instant, intuitive trust. Presidents A and E consistently state that trust is not an instant moment of intuitive connection and resonance, followed by demonstrated behavior over time. Rather, they both state that trust is the result of demonstrated behavior over time. This behavior encompasses different elements such as showing judgment and showing expertise in their area of strength.

For presidents A and E there are also factors that reinforce and contribute to this trust, such as direct, honest communication and both partners being involved in a
horizontal communication matrix where the partners are truth-tellers. These additional factors are also present for the female presidents but follow upon the initial sense of resonance and connection.

Differences in Time/Longevity and Gender

There is a strong emphasis on longevity for the female presidents, which does not manifest with the male presidents. Both the female presidents have had longevity with their institutions, which is far longer than that of the male presidents. Both the female presidents have also had longevity with their partners. President D’s partnerships have included the following durations: 12 years with Sonia and 17 years and ongoing with Walter. President B’s partnership with Emily has lasted 18 years and is ongoing. An example of the emphasis on longevity in the female presidents is shown by President B’s brief mention of her provost:

One of the things about being in the role of the presidency, and I am very blessed, I also have a stunning provost. you know I could use Mia as another one of those relationships, she’s only been with me four years though, so anyway….

While it is unclear what this longevity signifies in terms of the nature of the partnership, there are several possibilities which might include but are not limited to longevity involving more of a personal element, greater trust, and more of a family element in that families are enduring so there is a need for that longevity in that once they are trusted, they are invited into more of a permanent family dynamic.

For the male presidents the partnerships are of shorter duration overall. President A talks about a partnership with Laura with duration of a year and a half and which is
ongoing. President E talks about two partnerships of less than five years that are ongoing. President C talks about a partnership of two years and a partnership of fifteen years.

The findings for the male presidents show that they put more emphasis on the investment of time in the partnership—where time has to do with the amount of time put into the schedule around the partnership, not time relative to longevity. Both presidents A and E, for example, stress the importance of the investment of time in the partnership. The female presidents also show some emphasis on investment of time in this manner, but it is far more salient with presidents A and E than with presidents B and D.

Differences on the Topic of Gender

This is spoken about directly by the female presidents. For example, President B talks about female leadership mentoring. She also mentions challenges from male leaders who at times might have been doubtful about two females being able to lead the university. President D discusses the challenges of balancing her multiple roles as leader, wife, and mother throughout her career. However, gender is never discussed at all by the male presidents. There is an awareness of gender and gender issues in leadership and partnership on the part of the female presidents, which is explicitly talked about and which also emerges as a sub-theme through coding, which is not present in the narratives of the male presidents.

Differences in Religious Elements and Gender

Religious elements are present for both the female presidents but not at all for presidents A and E. There is a spiritual undertone in the word usage of President C, but it
is not at all similar to the nature and frequency of the religious word usage of that of the
two female presidents, both of whom reference religious thought and have religious word
usage.

Differences in How a President Partners and Gender

The female presidents partner with elements such as knowing of self and other,
affection, and love. There is a caring and personal aspect to the partnering, which
involves feelings and emotionality associated with family-type relationships. President D
is strongly horizontal in her partnering and overall is the most horizontal of all the
presidents in her partnership relationships. President B has both horizontal and vertical
elements in her partnering. For President B the horizontality manifests not only in
communication but in the nature of her care, affection, and work to help her mentee. She
stresses that they are moving from the verticality of the mentor-mentee relationship into a
fully horizontal partnership, although at the end of the day, within the overall vertical
positional power structure, she is still the president with the ultimate responsibilities.

Overall, the men do not present this way. For the male presidents A and E, the
nature of the partnering is very different from that of the female presidents. For
presidents A and E, partnering is explicitly a vertical team structure with a horizontal
communication matrix. They are more vertical in their presentation in this regard than
are the women. President C differs in that he chooses two key partners who are external
to his institution and where there is an equality of power distribution. However, he also
references his spouse throughout his narrative as a key partner. Thus, it is difficult to
compare President C to the other presidents in this regard.
Differences in Challenges and Resilience and Gender

There is a similarity in the theme of challenges and overcoming challenges for President D and the theme of resilience, which emerges for President B, who also discusses overcoming challenges with her key dyadic partner. Both these female presidents emphasize needing to have determination and to work hard to overcome obstacles and barriers. This is not a salient theme in the same way for the male presidents. Additionally, it is important to note that presidents D and B are the only two presidents to discuss mentorship. While President D mentions mentorship briefly in terms of learning what not to do, President B discusses mentoring and mentorship with partnership as a key thematic factor.

While there are many similarities between the female presidents, there are also some significant differences. President D is from a highly collective sub-culture and she is able to have deep personal friendship with her key dyadic partners while in the working relationship. She also feels she is able to forgive—even a breach of trust. President B on the other hand is not from that collective sub-culture and she also does not feel that she can be friends with her key dyadic partner, although the relationship is a very deep and committed one. President B is less collective and horizontal in her leadership and partnering than is President D, and President B has a more difficult time with forgiveness of the dyadic partner. President B talks about the isolation of the role and the loneliness of the role more than any of the other presidents. However, President D says she does not feel any isolation in the role. A key difference between Presidents D and B is that President D references mentorship as learning from examples of negative
experiences, and President B focuses on mentorship as a key positive in her partnership with Emily.

**Leadership Theory Terminology**

As discussed in the first section of this chapter, there was bias and framing on the part of the researcher with regard to transformational leadership theory during the interview process. Apart from when the researcher introduced transformational leadership terminology into the dialogue, the terminology was not mentioned by the presidents themselves. While this is not indicative as to whether or not there are elements of such leadership within the partnership dynamic, it does mean that the presidents did not present their perceptions using this leadership terminology. The presidents did show familiarity with management and leadership literature, and President B specifically addressed the topic of leadership. However, there was not inclusion of direct reference to either transformational leadership terminology or LMX terminology.

**Type of School and Nature of the Partnerships**

Each of the presidents is affiliated with a different type of school as categorized according to the Carnegie Classifications for institutions of higher education. There are no findings that the type of school with which the presidents are affiliated influences their perceptions of their successful dynamic partnerships. The presidents address the issue of fit with their schools in the first interview question asking what attracted them to the school. They have a variety of responses to this issue but one commonality for three presidents involves the mission of the school and the chance to have impact. Their responses are shown in detail in the table below as follows:
Table 38. Presidents’ Reasons for Coming to Their Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A place where you could make a contribution</td>
<td>Good fit:</td>
<td>A geographical returning home,</td>
<td>I felt like I was coming home.</td>
<td>[Did not do this question due to changed format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but also ultimately where you could make a</td>
<td>women’s college,</td>
<td>connection with liberal arts,</td>
<td></td>
<td>with this interview]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference for people's lives in education</td>
<td>liberal arts,</td>
<td>which is his passion and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic,</td>
<td>with quality of the arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban/suburban,</td>
<td>program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>size and mission fit with how she leads based</td>
<td>Connection with the cultural aspect, sense of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on relationship, also indirectly, opportunity</td>
<td>the history which involves service and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to make a contribution</td>
<td>activism, brings out his spirit—also the idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of impact and being a citizen of the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that’s a part of the college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no indication that the sense of fit they feel with a school would not also occur with a different type of school in the Carnegie Classification spectrum. While a sense of fit might be related to some degree with ability to have impact with the mission of the school, this does not exclude a similar sense of fit in other parts of the Carnegie spectrum. For example, President B mentions a fit between her leadership style and her role in her institution, but she also discusses success in previous institutions as well. Thus, there is no indication in the data findings that there is a relationship between the sense of fit with a school, the nature of each president and their partnership, and the category or type of school where they are president.
Additionally, although indicated previously in this section that there are findings of alignment between how a president leads and how they partner, there is no indication of a correlation between how they lead and partner, and the type of school, apart from President B’s comments on fit.

In summary, while there are differences in the presidents’ personalities and leadership and partnership styles, there is no indication from the data findings of a correlation between how they partner and the type of school where they are president. It is possible that the sense of fit has to do with elements within their personalities, which also impact the ways in which they partner. However, this topic is not the main focus of the study and has not been explored in depth in the research process. It is recommended that this topic be addressed in future research. This topic is discussed in greater detail in chapter 6.

**Summary**

This section has provided summative comparisons for thematic factors across the five presidents. It provided comparative data on thematic factors that are common to the different presidents and also data on the comparative interactive nature of the thematic factors. This section also provided additional findings on alignment between the way a president leads and the way they partner; the importance of the dyad; the dyad radiating outwards and extrapolation; gender; leadership terminology; and partnership and type of school.
Findings of Disparity and Dissonance and Findings for the Gallup Themes Overall

This section provides findings in two different areas. The first area deals with findings of disparity and dissonance. One aspect of the dissonance is in the changes in tone and findings across the progression of the interviews. A second aspect of disparity and dissonance occurs in the rankings of the Gallup themes by the presidents. This section also provides findings in the area of the Gallup themes overall and the nature of their emergence in the study.

Findings of Disparity and Dissonance: Changes in Tone and Findings Across the Interviews

There was a progression in the tone of the interviews and nature of the interaction in the interviews from the first to the final interviews. The tone of the presidents became increasingly more relaxed and open as the interviews progressed. The nature of the interaction between the researcher and the participants became less of a formal interview and more of a conversation. Additionally there were changes in the nature of the responses. As discussed in the beginning of this chapter, both presidents A and C said different things in the initial and subsequent interviews around subjects such as trust and friendship. It is unclear whether there is a connection between the more relaxed nature of the subsequent interviews and the change in responses, or whether the presidents changed their minds upon deeper reflection, or changed their minds for some other reason. However, it is important to note that both the tone and content of the interviews changed.
Findings of Disparity and Dissonance: The Ranking of the Gallup themes

At the end of each interview the participants were asked to rank the eight Gallup themes from the *Power of 2*. The presidents were not told that these themes were from *The Power of 2*, and they were not given any explanatory information relative to the themes. The question asked was,

*How important are the following elements in your successful dyadic partnerships?*

- Complementary strengths
- A common mission
- Fairness
- Trust
- Acceptance
- Forgiveness
- Communicating
- Unselfishness

The ranking scale was from 1 to 10, with 1 being the least important and 10 being the most important. The ranking was carefully explained to each president such that each individual theme should be ranked separately. There was no “forced ranking” or need for a distribution in the rankings. Rather, each theme should be seen as a discrete unit with its own ranking.

For each president there was a disparity or dissonance between what they said in their initial and follow-up interviews and questions, and the way in which they ranked the Gallup themes. For each president there was some area in the ranking in which their ranking was in contradiction to what they said everywhere else. This dissonance also occurred in the pilot study done as part of this research. The details of the dissonance and disparities are provided below in Table 39 and in the explanatory comments. In the table,
the areas of disparity are represented by a “D” for significant degree of disparity and a “d” for a lesser degree of disparity. The themes are listed in the order in which they were asked, which was based upon the order of presentation of the themes in Power of 2. The value for the average ranking for each theme was calculated by adding the values for the rankings for that theme given by each president and dividing by 5.

Table 39. Presidents’ Rankings of Gallup Themes in Their Successful Dyadic Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
<th>Average Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Strengths</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 D</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Mission</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>7 D</td>
<td>9 D</td>
<td>10 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfishness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning (added for President D’s interview only) | 9 D

The presidents appeared to take the ranking process seriously and to try hard to provide honest responses. An example of their honesty is apparent in their ranking of forgiveness and the comments that A, B, and C made in this regard. For example, President C says in this regard: “I’m not good at it” more than once. The difficulty with forgiveness emerges consistently for presidents A, B, and C and was reinforced with the data from the follow-up questions and interviews. Additionally, the comments made by
all three presidents (said spontaneously by both B and D when ranking the theme) would mitigate the idea that presidents are ranking in a way that might make them look good or appear a certain way to the researcher. Additionally, it does not seem to be indicative of trying to rank in the way they would like to see themselves, i.e., ranking to reinforce psychological consistency.

As shown in Table 40, there are incidents of dissonance and disparity for each president in terms of what they say in their narratives and the thematic factors that emerge from the narratives and the way in which they rank the Gallup themes. Some specific examples of this disparity and dissonance are discussed below.

President A
For President A, communication is the second most salient thematic factor in his successful dyadic partnerships, after complementary strengths. He stresses the importance of communication across a number of parameters relative to the success of his key dyadic partnership. For example, in answer to the question as to what is the core factor that gives life and vitality to his partnership, he says: “We’re able to relate to each other directly… So I think that is what gives the most life and vitality to the partnership—the ability to speak pretty directly about issues and things we need to do.” Communication is also one of the most interactive of President A’s thematic factors, and is interactive with such key factors as trust, common mission, horizontal/vertical elements, complementary strengths, and time/longevity. Thus, for President A to give communication a ranking of 7, which is the second lowest ranking he gives overall, is
dissonant with his stated beliefs and emergent themes throughout his initial narrative and follow-up interview.

As a caveat, however, President A tried to force rank initially, so that could be thought to mitigate the dissonance. “President A: I’m trying to force rank a little bit just so they’re not all 10s.” However, after it was explained again that it was important to rate each theme separately, and thus they could all be 10s or 1s or whatever he thought appropriate, he still ranked communication as a 7, which is low relative to his overall scores.

President B

President B emphasizes communication throughout her narrative and it is an emergent thematic factor for her in her partnership with Emily. She talks often about how Emily is the truth-teller and that she trusts her to communicate openly. She also worries about the times when Emily does not keep her informed or “in the loop.” However, while she emphasizes communication, she gives it only a 9, whereas she gives complementary strengths and common mission a ranking of 10. This is dissonant in that communication, complementary strengths, and common mission are of similar emergent salience for her. For example, in the interview, immediately after the ranking, she summarizes her advice to other presidents by putting communication before awareness of strengths and weaknesses as follows:

Researcher: And what advice would you have for other presidents in terms of how to form and maintain a really good partnership?
President B: Honest communication, I would say, as I said before, resilience, a self-consciousness. In other words you have to be conscious of your own strengths and weaknesses and what you need. Some degree
of humility, whether it’s public or not, you have to have to be able to understand the benefits and the needs of the relationship.

A further example of dissonance is that President B ranks unselfishness as a 7; however she presents herself as very unselfish in the partnership. Examples of this unselfishness include her mentorship of Emily, including her working to provide Emily with development and growth areas as well as additional educational opportunities; her description of her role as being the grown-up, and being there for Emily to help her no matter what; and also her unselfishness in her saying she is the partner who bears the burden of the load.

**President C**

Communication is not a salient emergent thematic factor for President C; rather it is an aspect of a sub-theme that emerges and has to do with knowing the self and partner and being able to convey that knowledge. Among all the presidents, President C puts the least emphasis on communication and it is least salient for him when compared with the other presidents. However, in the Gallup rankings President C gives communication a ranking of 10. There is further dissonance in that complementary strengths is an emergent sub-theme for President C, yet he gives it a ranking of 8. This occurs despite his response to the three wishes question, in which one of his key wishes is to broaden his partner Thomas’s complementary strengths.

**President D**

The incident of dissonance with President D and the rankings has to do with the added theme of learning. The researcher added this onto the Gallup themes at the end
because of the president’s repeated emphasis on learning throughout the interview. The researcher added this theme because President D had ranked every theme a 10 and the interviewer wished to see if adding a theme that she knew was important to the President would also result in a 10. This had to do with convenient sampling because at this point in the process the researcher was aware of the trend of dissonance in the ranking of the Gallup themes for the presidents and in the pilot study. The theme of learning was simply listed with the other themes; there was no distinction made. After ranking all other themes a 10, President D ranked learning a 9. The only theme she ranked below 10 was one which she had said repeatedly was very important to her.

President E
While complementary strengths is not an emergent thematic factor for President E, he does talk about the need for complementary strengths in his narrative, relative to trusting people to be able to do their job well. He also deals with complementary strengths in terms of the partnership as the formation of a functioning team and also in terms of acknowledging that there are things he can’t do well that others can. However, when he ranks complementary strengths, he gives it a 3, which is the lowest ranking given by any president to any of the themes. Apart from the ranking of a 3 for complementary strengths, President E gives relatively high rankings to the other themes as follows: 3, 10, 10, 10, 6, 8, 10, 10. What is particularly dissonant about this is that he never talks about fairness or unselfishness but gives them both 10s. Yet he does reference complementary strengths as relevant and then gives it a ranking of 3.
The consistent appearance of this dissonance and disparity with the Gallup themes in both the pilot interviews and the research for this study could have implications both for this study and for future research.

**Overall Emergence of the Gallup Themes Within This Study**

The purpose of this study was not to prove or disprove the Gallup data. However, the Gallup research from *The Power of 2* did inform potential avenues for the research. The Gallup themes were included in the ranking questions at the end of the interviews to see if the presidents felt they were important in their dyadic partnerships. The themes were included at the end to preclude framing. Apart from this inclusion, it is interesting to note that four of the eight Gallup themes emerge independently as part of the interview and overall research process. The four Gallup themes that emerged in order of salience are common mission, trust, communicating, and complementary strengths. The nature of their emergence is depicted in Table 40 below. The table shows the relative rankings of the Gallup themes by average and their salience as emergent themes in the study.
A key finding shown in this table is that the top four ranked Gallup themes based upon the average ranking by the presidents are among the top five most salient emergent themes overall. These findings are reinforced by the data in Table 41 below, which shows the emergence of the Gallup themes by salience and by president. The order of salience has been taken from the data findings already presented, with the indication of Gallup themes shown as follows:

### Table 40. Gallup Themes and Thematic Factors from the Presidents’ Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>President A</th>
<th>President B</th>
<th>President C</th>
<th>President D</th>
<th>President E</th>
<th>Average Ranking</th>
<th>Order of salience from presidents’ narratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; most salient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; salient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>7 D</td>
<td>9 D</td>
<td>10 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; most salient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Strengths</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; salient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfishness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(added for President D’s interview only)
Table 41. Thematic Factors Common to All Five Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of salience</th>
<th>Common factor</th>
<th>Whether factor is also Gallup theme</th>
<th>Presidents for whom factor is present—in order of salience by president</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient across all five presidents—first most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Also a Gallup theme</td>
<td>E, C, B, D, *A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient across all five presidents—second most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>Also a Gallup theme</td>
<td>C, A, E, (B, D, equal salience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient across all five presidents—third most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>Not a Gallup theme</td>
<td>*B, (*A, *E, equal salience), *D, **C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The thematic factors common to four presidents are communication, complementary strengths, and time/longevity. These factors are shown in detail in Table 42, with indications as to whether the factor is also a Gallup theme.

Table 42. Thematic Factors Common to Four Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of salience</th>
<th>Common factor</th>
<th>Whether factor is also Gallup theme</th>
<th>Presidents for whom factor is present—in order of salience by president</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient across four presidents—fourth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Also a Gallup theme</td>
<td>(A, E, equal salience), B, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient across four presidents—fifth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Complementary strengths</td>
<td>Also a Gallup theme</td>
<td>A, B, *C, **D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient across four presidents—sixth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Time/longevity</td>
<td>Not a Gallup theme</td>
<td>B, A, *D, *E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of the thematic factors common to three or to two presidents are also Gallup themes. The Gallup themes only emerge in the top five most salient themes across five and four presidents. This is shown in Table 43 below where none of the thematic factors common to three presidents are also Gallup themes.

**Table 43. Thematic Factors Common to Three Presidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of salience</th>
<th>Common factor</th>
<th>Whether factor is also Gallup theme</th>
<th>Presidents for whom factor is present—in order of salience by president</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most salient across three presidents—seventh most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Relationship(s)</td>
<td>Not a Gallup theme</td>
<td>(B, D, equal salience), *E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most salient across three presidents—eighth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation</td>
<td>Not a Gallup theme</td>
<td>E, C, **D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most salient across three presidents—ninth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Works hard</td>
<td>Not a Gallup theme</td>
<td>D, (*B, *E equal salience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most salient across three presidents—tenth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Boundaries, and boundaries in combination with the role</td>
<td>Not a Gallup theme</td>
<td>B, E, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most salient across three presidents—eleventh most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>Not a Gallup theme</td>
<td>D, *E, **C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most salient across three presidents—twelfth most salient common factor overall</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>Not a Gallup theme</td>
<td>**C, **D, (implicit in B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thematic Factors and the Gallup Themes**

The top two ranked Gallup themes are also the top two most salient thematic factors that emerge from the narratives, although the orders are reversed. For example,
the most salient emergent thematic factor is trust, which is ranked second by the presidents. The second most salient emergent factor is common mission, which is ranked first by the presidents.

Of the top five most salient thematic factors that emerge from the narratives, four of the top five are Gallup themes as follows: trust (Gallup); common mission (Gallup); horizontal/vertical elements (not Gallup), communication (Gallup); and complementary strengths (Gallup). Overall, the order of the ranking of the thematic factors that are most salient and are also Gallup factors is reinforced by the ranking. Thus, there is some overall consistency between the most emergent salient thematic factors and the ranking by the presidents of the same factors as Gallup themes.

Of the eight Gallup themes, forgiveness has the lowest average ranking and this is consistent with the issue of forgiveness, which emerged throughout the narratives of forgiveness being difficult for presidents.

Of the eight Gallup themes, only four are present as salient thematic factors. In addition, apart from President C’s emphasis upon fairness in his partnerships, none of the other three Gallup themes emerged. Specifically, the Gallup themes of acceptance and unselfishness did not emerge at all. Forgiveness emerged only in the ranking of the Gallup factors around problems having to do with forgiving on the part of the presidents. This subject was later addressed in detail in the second and third round interviews, but it was not an emergent thematic factor on its own.
Summary

This section has provided data on the disparity and dissonance that occurs across the interview process and also between the ranking of the Gallup themes by the presidents and the emergence of data from the research. This section also provided data on the overall emergence of the Gallup themes within the research.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter provided the findings for the emergent thematic factors in the university and college presidents’ perceptions of the phenomenon of their successful dyadic partnerships. The data findings were presented within the context of grounded theory protocols and included the surfacing of biases and the positioning of the researcher in the data process, consistent with the constructivist grounded theory approach.

The findings on the thematic factors were presented individually for each president and also were presented in a summative, comparative format across the presidents. The findings included the nature of the thematic factors; the commonality of the factors across presidents; and the interaction of the thematic factors. This chapter also presented findings for additional thematic material, including,

1. Findings of alignment between the way a president leads and the way they partner
2. Findings of the importance of the dyadic partnership to the presidents
3. Findings of the successful dyadic partnership radiating outwards and extrapolation to larger groups
4. Gender findings
5. Findings for explicit leadership theory terminology
6. Findings for correlation between type of school and nature of the partnerships
Additionally this chapter presented information on disparity and dissonance in the research progression and with the Gallup themes. The findings on the Gallup themes were also presented. Chapter 4 provided the data findings that are the foundation for the generation of the theory and models that were presented in this chapter.
Chapter 5: Toward New Theories and Models

Overview

This chapter contains the following sections:

Introduction
Theoretical Context and Perspectives from the Literature
Discussion
New Theories and Models Based upon the Findings
Additional Models
Limitations of This Study

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomenon of university and college presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships. A qualitative approach was used which incorporated constructivist grounded theory. The research process included initial and follow-up interviews utilizing open-ended appreciative inquiry questions along with additional follow-up questions that were more directed and closed ended. The research participants were five university and college presidents who each represent a separate category of school according to the Carnegie classifications of institutions of higher education. The schools represented are all located within the United States, but apart from this information no identifying information is provided about the schools. Little identifying information is provided about the presidents apart from their gender and the nature of their partnerships. Convenient sampling was used to select presidents for participation.
The data were analyzed according to constructivist grounded theory protocol, which involves open, axial, and selective coding and an iterative, abductive process, with both inductive and deductive elements. The data findings were presented in chapter four and included the following:

Emergent thematic factors in the successful dyadic partnerships presented both for each individual president and comparatively for all the presidents

Common emergent thematic factors for the presidents

- Comparison of the common thematic factors that emerged for more than one president
- Breakdown of the common thematic factors by salience
- Breakdown of common thematic factors by number of presidents for which the factor was common and by salience
- Comparison of interactions between thematic factors
- Comparison of the prevalence of interactions between thematic factors

Findings of alignment between the way a president leads and the way they partner

Findings of the importance of the dyadic partnership to the presidents

Findings of the successful dyadic partnership radiating outwards and extrapolation to larger groups

Gender findings

Findings for explicit leadership theory terminology

Findings for correlation between type of school and nature of the partnerships

A hope for this research, consistent with the use of grounded theory, was the potential generation of theories and models that would shed light on the phenomenon of successful presidential dyadic partnerships in institutions of United States higher
education (USHE) through exploration of the presidents’ perceptions of these partnerships.

Several theories and models have been generated based upon a foundation of the grounding of the theory in the data findings. These theories focus on the following aspects of the presidential partnerships:

The complex interactions of thematic factors
The situational use of power (SUP)
Gender differences, including differences in trust and relational elements of the partnerships

The models that have been created based upon these theories focus on the following:

Diagrams representing the complexity of the interaction of thematic factors
A model showing the process of partnering in successful dyadic partnerships
Application of the process model to an organization design model dealing with effectiveness outcomes
Models for effective presidential dyadic partnerships for three different types of partnership

The theory and models are grounded in the data but have also been informed by additional research in the literature based upon the data findings. This chapter presents the theory and models within the context of a presentation of this additional literature.
Theoretical Context and Perspectives from the Literature

This section presents the theoretical perspectives from the literature that inform and provide context for the theory and models that have been generated by this research study. The topics relevant to the theory generated by this study that are informed by the literature and that are touched upon in this chapter include the following:

- Partnership theory
- Gender theory
- Trust theory
- Leadership theory
- Complexity theory

Partnership Theory

There has been recent literature on partnership theory, which is consistent in providing prescriptive approaches to leadership partnering involving lists of component factors necessary in such partnering as well as actions and behaviors that can reinforce leadership partnering. For example, in the book *Partnering, the New Face of Leadership*, edited by Segil, Goldsmith, and Belasco (2003), a number of leadership and management scholars provide recommendations on how best to partner in leadership. Kaplan and Norton, for example, recommend using a balanced scorecard approach to strategic partnering. Kouzes and Posner emphasize the need to build cultures of collaboration.

The learning leader as partner is presented by Rosenblum and Oates, who delineate a list of competencies and detail the social and analytic dimensions for such a learning leader. However, there does not seem to be an attempt by many of these scholars to deal with the type of complexity of leadership partnership that is presented in
this study. For example, the presentation of lists of successful leadership partnership attributes or behaviors does not seem to deal with the complexity of the interactive nature of the different factors within the presidential partnerships. A key exception is Phil Harkins, who looks at the different aspects of partnership as building blocks where relationships are built on trust as follows:

- If the basic building block of partnerships is trust, then we must think about how trust works. Consider the following logic points:
  - All partnerships are based on relationships and relationships are built on trust
  - Trust is a function of communication
  - So often when partnerships break (and leaders become ineffective), it’s because trust disintegrate, people disengage, and the relationship drifts apart.
  - Knowing this, leaders must then become masters of building trust through communications. (Harkins, 2003, cited in Segil, Goldsmith, & Velasco, pp. 268-269)

While Harkins does not dig more deeply into such interrelations and goes on to provide lists of leadership do’s and don’ts that do not deal in complexity, he at least initially presents the factors in terms of being a function of one another.

There is a similar approach in Power of 2 (2009), the key work on dyadic partnerships that helped to inform the initial design of this study. Within Power of 2, there are eight themes that emerge as necessary for successful dyadic partnerships, but these themes are presented individually and not in terms of their complexity or interactions with one another within the partnership process.

A key exception is Ayers’ (2002) dissertation work on transformational partnerships and the dynamics in dyadic business partnerships. Ayers’ work is most
similar to this study and involves the following as summarized from her abstract and as initially presented in chapter 2:

There is very little literature in the field of business that addresses the relational dynamics of dyadic business partnerships. This study explored the cross-section of three bodies of literature: (a) marriage and family systems, (b) leadership, and (c) relational development… For this study 7 partners (dyads) in business together were interviewed, all of which self-reported having experienced personal and professional growth as a result of their partnership. The study applied the principles of qualitative research and utilized unstructured in-depth interviews to elicit relational stories from the business partners. The interviews were transcribed, organized thematically, and then tapered down to 5 dominant characteristics…Those characteristics are: (a) having a shared vision, (b) a defined purpose for the partnership, (c) trust that is experienced at a deep level, (d) appreciating the talents that are brought by each partner to the partnership, and (e) the development of mutual empathy. This study provides detailed accounts of how these characteristics are built and how they interrelate to build transformational relationships. (p. 1)

Initial consideration of Ayers’ work by the researcher prior to conducting the research for this study focused on the fact that Ayers’ was able to isolate five dominant characteristics that seemed to offer hope for similar possibility of isolating such factors in dyadic presidential partnerships. More detailed consideration of her work was put aside until after the writing of chapter 4 in order to preclude framing or bias by the researcher based upon Ayers’ results. However, after the writing of chapter 4, Ayers’ work was re-visited and the outstandingly relevant aspect of her work for this study became the fact that she did find aspects of interrelation of the factors towards building transformational relationships.

There are profound differences in Ayers’ study in terms of focus, approach, key questions, and overall results, including a therapeutic and transformational growth
perspective, and use of a marriage metaphor with dyadic business relationships.

However, she is a key voice found in the literature that deals with dyads, isolates factors, and finds a fundamental inter-related aspect of some of the separate factors. Specifically, while not taking a complexity perspective, Ayers’ summarizes the nature of the interrelation between the five characteristics in terms of the way in which each contributes to and builds on the other. She states in this regard,

In summary, this research identified five characteristics found in seven business partnerships where the partners felt they had been transformed personally and professionally, as a result of their partnership. What the data suggest is that each characteristic contributes to, and builds on, the other characteristics in a way that promotes personal and professional growth. They offer the reader an inside look at what is taking place within the relationship when each of these characteristics are present. The data suggest that while all five of the characteristics are interrelated, appreciating differences and mutuality may play a significant role in the formation of a growth promoting environment. (pp. 132–133)

This study reinforces Ayers’ work in that it shows that from a very different research perspective there are still findings that support the nature of the interrelationship of characteristics or factors within a dyadic relationship. Although there are differences between the interrelationships found by Ayers and the interrelationships of this study, the fact that such interrelationship appears in other research is supportive of the findings of this study.

Finally, as introduced in chapter 2 of this study, Roussin’s (2008) work on trust and safety in dyadic partnerships is relevant to this study in providing a foundation for leadership work within dyads as ways to improve trust, safety, and team performance. This has implications for the emergent theme of the dyad radiating outwards.
Gender Theory

Gender was never intended to be a focus of this study. As mentioned in chapter 3, the study was initially scoped by the researcher to focus only on male college presidents in order to limit the factors impacting the phenomenon. The scope was changed because the researcher’s dissertation committee felt strongly that the study should include mixed gender for both the president and partners, if that was what naturally emerged through the convenient sampling process. The researcher was surprised during the data collection and analysis stages at the degree to which gender and differences in partnering in terms of gender were becoming emergent. After chapter 4 was written, the researcher reviewed gender theory with particular reference to the findings of the study. The study reveals stereotypical differences in gender in the way the female and male presidents partner.

The female presidents are more relationship-centered in that their relationships have to do with family-type dynamics and encompass greater degrees of emotive affect, caring, love, and mentoring than do the male presidents’ relationships. The male presidents deal with relationships in their partnering more as hierarchical teams. They are not emotive in affect and do not focus on caring, love, and other stereotypical gender qualities. There is little literature on gender and dyadic leadership partnering. However, there is a great deal of literature on gender and leadership, which is relevant to this study.

Gender and Leadership

There is debate in the literature on gender and leadership styles. As described by Northouse (2010), mainstream literature ascribes differences between the genders and their styles, and some writers support the idea that female leadership is more effective.
However, within academic scholarship, “many argue that gender has little or no relationship to leadership style and effectiveness (Dobbins & Platz, 1986; van Engen, Leeden & Willemsen, 2001; Powell, 1990)” (cited in Northouse, 2010, p. 302). There are also findings in scholarly research that are supportive of differences in leadership styles and gender. Aldoory and Toth (2004), for example present both sides of the argument. They delineate studies with findings that support sex differences, particularly having to do with perceptions and with transformational and transactional leadership as well as studies that do not support gender differences:

Studies that have found support for sex differences have focused on perceptions of leadership (Butler & Geis, 1990; Casimir, 2001; Cooper, 1997; Doherty, 1997; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Ragins, 1991; Yammarino et al., 1997). Female and male subordinates and superiors have rated women leaders with key aspects of transformational leadership—that is charisma and individualized consideration more frequently than men (Bass, Avolio & Atwater, 1996; Bycio, Hackett & Allen, 1995; Carless, 1998; Maher, 1997). Druskat (1994) found that female subordinates rated female leaders as displaying significantly more transformational behaviors and significantly fewer transactional behaviors than male leaders who were rated by male subordinates…Other scholars have found no sex differences leadership (Carless, 1998; Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Thompson, 2000…). (pp. 160–161)

With specific reference to gender and leadership dyads, there is some literature that looks at the gender composition of leader-subordinate dyads. The work of Ayman, Korabik, and Morris (2009) explores the gender composition of a leadership subordinate dyad and the evaluation of the leader by gender with reference to transformational leadership.

The relationship between a leader’s self-report on transformational leadership and their subordinates’ evaluation of their performance was
significantly less positive for female leaders with male subordinates than for female leaders with female subordinates. (p. 852)

Douglas (2012) looks at the moderating role that the gender of both the leader and the follower have in leader-subordinate dyads. This study found that “subordinate sex moderated the relationship between transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness such that the relationship was stronger when subordinates were male than when they were female…contrary to what gender stereotypes would predict (Eagly et al., 2000; Kite et al., 2008)” (p. 173).

Of particular relevance for this study in the overall literature on leadership and gender are the findings of Eagly across two co-authored studies. In an analysis of the leadership styles of men and women, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) describe agentic and communal aspects as being important aspects of gender roles:

Aspects of gender roles that are especially relevant to understanding leadership pertain to agentic and communal attributes (see Eagly et al., 2000). Agentic characteristics, which are ascribed more strongly to men than women, describe primarily an assertive, controlling, and confident tendency—for example, aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent, daring, self-confident, and competitive…Communal characteristics which are more strongly ascribed to women than men, describe primarily a concern with the welfare of other people—for example, affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nuturant, and gentle. (p. 5)

These aspects of gender roles are supported by the findings from this research as presented in chapter 4, across a number of parameters. For example, in word tone and usage, the words of the female presidents are highly emotive and contain terms such as
care, love, and family. For the males there is little emotive affect in the word usage and the words such as those used by President E tend to be more highly agentic than for the female presidents.

Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) also found small gender differences in the use of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. Specifically they found that female leaders: “exceeded men on three transformational scales....In contrast, men exceeded women on the transactional scales…and on laissez-faire leaders.” (p. 18)

In a meta-analysis of gender and leadership style Eagly and Johnson (1990) found small differences between males and females. There were differences in results in gender styles in organizational and in laboratory settings and assessments. In organizational studies they did not find stereotypical differences: men did not lead in a more task-oriented style and women did not lead in a more interpersonally oriented style. There were small differences in experimental settings where each gender behaved more stereotypically. Eagly and Johnson attribute this stereotypical behavior to gender roles having more influence (p. 249). In all three settings they found that “…women tended to adopt a more democratic or participative style and a less autocratic or directive style than did men.” (p. 233)

The findings of this study are somewhat supportive of Eagly and Johnson’s findings and Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt’s findings. The female and male presidents exhibit gender-stereotypical behavior in the way they partner; however, they are doing this in organizational and not experimental settings. Additionally the female presidents
exhibit more transformational behaviors than the males in their partnerships, although transformational leadership was not a strongly emergent thematic factor in the study. Overall, the findings of this study show significant gender differences in the way that leaders partner in dyadic partnerships. In the one-on-one dyadic partnership relationship stereotypical gender behavior appears more prevalent. The reasons for this prevalence could be explored in future research and could potentially shed light on other areas of difference or similarity in gender, leadership, and partnering.

**Trust Theory**

There is significant scholarship on trust within a number of disciplines, as delineated by Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998):

Understanding why people trust, as well as how that trust shapes social relations, has been a central focus for psychologists (Deutsch, 1962; Worchel, 1979), sociologists (Gambetta, 1988), political scientists (Barber, 1983), economists (Axelrod, 1984), anthropologists (Ekeh, 1974), and students of organizational behavior… (p. 438)

According to Burke, Sims, Lazzara, and Salas (2007), trust is one of the most researched topics in organizational literature, and the specific approaches towards understanding trust have involved three different perspectives: trust as a trait; trust as a process; or trust as an emergent state (p. 607). Yet, despite the large body of scholarship on trust there is still not one comprehensive description of its nature or how it functions. As described by Hitt, Keats, and Yucel (2003), trust is difficult to define and there is little consensus in the literature as to one definition of trust (Bhattacharya, Devinney, &
Pillutla, 1998). However, a commonly cited definition is that proposed by Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995), where trust involves

…the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party. (p. 712)

Relative to the general nature and functioning of trust, McAllister (1995) has proposed that interpersonal trust involves two principal forms: cognition-based trust based on beliefs about reliability and dependability, and affect-based trust based on feelings of care and concern which is reciprocated between parties (p. 25). Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, and Camerer (1998) differentiate between forms of trust from another perspective. They present the various forms of trust: deterrence-based trust, which involves the idea of trusting because there are high sanctions in place for breach of trust on the part of the other party; calculus-based trust, which involves the idea of rational choice in trusting due to perceptions that the trusted party will perform beneficial actions; relational trust involving repeated actions over time between the trustor and trustee such that both sides have information about the trustworthiness of the other derived from the interactions; and institution-based trust where institutional factors such as organizational culture and societal laws can facilitate trust (pp. 398-400).

There is some agreement in the literature on the overall importance of trust and trust functions. As delineated by Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, and Camerer (1998), trust can enable cooperative behavior; promote network relations; decrease transaction costs; and facilitate group formation (p. 394). Additionally, Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and
Werner (1998) have found that there is a relationship between interpersonal trust and organizational variables such as quality of communication; performance, citizenship behavior; problem solving; and cooperation and cooperative relationships (p. 513).

It is important to note that there is no standard definition of trust in this presidential partnership study; rather, each president defines for themselves what they believe constitutes trust, and there are significant differences in the meaning and nature of trust across presidents. However, trust is the key salient emergent thematic factor across all five presidents and the nature of the literature on trust informs the role of trust in the generation of partnership theory and models as put forth in this chapter. This is particularly true for theory, which has to do with trust development and the creation of initial trust formation.

**Development of Trust and Trust Formation**

There has been significant research on trust development (Lewicki, Tomlinson, & Gillespie, 2006), which looks at how and why trust forms. There have been studies, for example, into the development of trust over time, as well as the factors that influence initial trusting (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998). Within the body of scholarship in this area there is evidence for values-based behavior on the part of leadership as instrumental in the development of trust. Jones and George (1998) find that, “…values contribute to the generalized experience of trust and can even create a propensity to trust…trust serves to maintain and express the shared values that trust originates from and, also that shared values help create relationships characterized by trust” (p. 532).
They argue that for the existence of synergy within organizations which can lead to competitive advantage there needs to be a level of unconditional trust between members which involves a culture characterized by trust and which encourages knowledge sharing and the “expression of values underlying trust” (p. 543). Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) look at dimensions of trustworthy behavior on the part of managers as well as the role of managers as initiators of trust in organizations. They find that the values of managers have influence on whether they are motivated to inspire trustworthy behavior. Specifically, they conclude that, “Managers whose values are self-transcendent will be more likely to engage in trustworthy behavior, such as demonstration of concern and behavioral integrity, than will those whose values are self-enhancing” (p. 523).

The research of McNight, Cummings, and Chervany (1998) creates an initial trust model that pulls together aspects of trust which include disposition to trust, institution-based trust, trusting beliefs, trusting intention, and cognitive processes. While their model does not explain the nature of the instant, resonant, and connective trust felt by presidents such as B, C, and D in this study, aspects of their model such as trusting beliefs and elements of personality could provide a context for this phenomenon. Additionally, their model does not deal with gender differences and initial trust, and the theoretical perspectives on this topic are highly relevant for this study because there seem to be different patterns in such trusting for the male (A, E) and female (B, D) presidents, with C showing both patterns.
Trust and Leadership

The strong relationship between leadership and trust is supported by the extensive literature in this area. Within this field there is a consistency between trust in leadership and the appearance of certain factors such as value-based behaviors. For example, Burke, Sims, Lazzara, and Salas (2007) provide a review of the trust and leadership literature and provide an integration of the two whereby they create a new framework for understanding trust in leadership. Based on data from the literature, they present three broad categories of antecedents for trust in leadership at a number of levels including individual, group, and organizational. The antecedents for trust in leadership are ability, benevolence, and integrity. While there is no evidence in this study that the particular values or character of the specific presidents correlate with greater or less trusting behavior with their partners, the relationship between trust and values in presidential partnerships could be an important area for future study.

Trust and Gender

There are findings in the literature that there are differences in trust such that men tend to be more trusting than women. For example, the work of Buchan, Croson, and Solnick (2008) shows that males were more trusting in the research exchange experiment; that females behaved in a more trustworthy fashion; and there were no differences in trusting behavior based upon the gender of the person trusting or being trusted. The work of Bevelander and Page (2011) has similar findings in that men are more trusting, particularly with same gender trust than are women. A key aspect of their findings is that
for men, same-gender trust increased over a three-month time span, but for women it decreased over the same time period.

The results of this study are not consistent with the work in the field to date. There seems to be more trust taking place on the part of the female presidents B and D, which involves an instant trust that could involve either the same or opposite gender. The trust that takes place with the male presidents, A and E, shows a different pattern of trust developing over time, without instant intuitive trust but involving equal trust across both genders. The trust pattern for President C differs from the other presidents in that it incorporates instant trust or trust over time depending on the situation. There is little theoretical work on trust and gender that references leadership dyads and it is hoped that this study will add to the literature in this field.

**Leadership Theory**

Leadership as a separate topic in and of itself did not emerge strongly in this study, with the exception of President B, who speaks about her interest in leadership and leadership as a puzzle. Concerning relationship-based leadership style and gender and leadership, she says,

> I mean, I think you don’t want to stereotype things but everything that we know about women in leadership, without assuming every woman, says that we lead differently, that we lead more with relationship-centered, with the heart so to speak.

However, all the presidents do speak about their ideas of the role of the president as leader and there is reference to the ways in which they lead. Within this context as reported in chapter 4, there is alignment between the ways in which presidents lead and
the ways in which they partner. President D, for example, is highly collective in her idea of the role of the president, the way in which she leads, and the emergent theme of community and collectivism in her partnerships.

In the initial literature review presented in chapter 2, there were two leadership theories that were expected to be particularly emergent and relevant to this study: transformational leadership theory and leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. Surprisingly, while there are elements of both theories present in the findings, there are also other theories such as complexity theory that are more directly explanatory of the phenomenon of the university and college presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships.

Elements of transformational leadership manifested most strongly by gender within this study, supporting the gender theory work of Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001). As described by Northouse (2010) transformational leadership “is a process that changes and transforms people. It is concerned with emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals” (p. 171).

In the gender literature the argument is put forward that the elements of transformational leadership are in fact more aligned with the female role:

Some have argued that transformational leadership may be characterized as more feminine because the socialized character of nurturing and supporting subordinates are integral to this leadership approach. (Aldoory & Toth, 2004, p. 162)

Within this study, there are stronger manifestations of transformational leadership with both the female presidents than with the males across a number of parameters. The
female presidents present word tone and usage that is more caring, nurturing, and loving than do the males. The females openly discuss the need to help others to develop and uplift themselves and they model this in their partnership behavior. Examples are the collective approach of President D, which is about love and transformation in the service of the mission and working towards something greater than the individual; and the mentoring approach of President B, in which she works to provide every opportunity for Emily to develop and grow. The male presidents do not evidence this element of personal transformation within their partnerships. President C, for example, says specifically that such partnerships are not about transformational leadership.

Elements of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory were present within the findings of the study but did not manifest by gender. Specifically, LMX theory focuses on the dyadic relationship between the leader and the follower, particularly in a vertical leader-subordinate relationship. The overall focus of this theory is relevant to this study in that the presidential partnerships exist within an overall vertical leader-subordinate relationship and involve an individual relationship between the president and the partner. While President D tries to mitigate this verticality and partner in as horizontal and collective a way as possible, presidents A, B, and E are in highly vertical leader-subordinate partnerships. President C is an exception in this regard in that his key dyadic partnerships are external to his organization and involve horizontal relationships characterized by more equality of power distribution. Additionally the focus on the process of the interaction between the leader and the follower is consistent with the LMX
theoretical approach. However, there are some aspects of LMX theory that do not seem to clearly apply to the partnership relationships explored in this study.

A key aspect of LMX theory is that of in-groups and out-groups, whereby there are two types of relationships between the leader and follower: “those that were based on expanded and negotiated role responsibilities (extra-roles), which were called the *in-group*, and those that were based on the formal employment contract (defined roles), which were called the *out-group*” (Northouse, 2010, p. 149).

The partnerships explored in this study do not neatly conform to these in-group and out-group relationships. For example, one of President E’s key dyadic partners is the chair of the board. While they work closely together within their defined roles, there is no indication that there is an expansion of the role as part of the partnership on either side. This is also true of President E’s relationship with his other key dyadic partner, who is a vice president. The same is true for President A. He describes a sense of collegiality and working closely with Laura, his provost. However, he is in a partnership with her in which a key component of the success of the partnership is her expertise within the parameters of her established positional role, which involves complementary strength’s relative to those of the president. There is no indication of in-group or out-group aspects in President C’s dyadic partnerships, particularly in that his occurs outside of his institution. With President D, there is a sense of connection and partnership with all those around her, although she does feel a stronger sense of connection with some than with others. In the collective approach, which is a fundamental part of D’s orientation, there is effort to be inclusive and loving towards all; thus it is difficult across a number of
findings with D, including triangulating comments from subordinates, to find elements of strong out-group status. President B is the only president where it is possible to infer an in-group relationship with Emily, her key dyadic partner. President B alone of all the presidents makes indirect reference to possible out-group dynamics in her comments on being careful to manage the dyadic partnership so as to mitigate any perceived favoritism. The strong mentorship relationship that B has with Emily does conform to LMX definitions of expansion of the positional role. Additionally there seems to be a longevity factor with in-group status with President B in that she refers to her provost as excellent, but not a key dyad in that she has only been at the institution for four years.

The question of in-groups and out-groups with presidents is interesting as an area for future research going forward, particularly with reference to the way an out-group could potentially become triadic. For example, if a president chooses someone outside of traditional positional partnership roles (such as provost or chair of the board) as their key dyadic partner, there could be a triad formed where the positional role is almost an out-group. For example, in the situation with President B where the key dyadic partnership is with Emily, a senior vice president, and not with the provost, does the provost perceive himself or herself to be in an out-group position and if so how would this dynamic impact the functioning of the overall presidential leadership team?

An additional area where there is not a neat fit between LMX and the partnership findings of this study is with the three phases of leadership making: the stranger phase, the acquaintance phase, and the mature partnership phase. There are elements of the mature phase that seem to happen almost instantly for the female leaders:
Phase 3, mature partnership, is marked by high-quality leader-member exchanges. People who have progressed to this stage in their relationships experience a high degree of mutual trust, respect and obligation toward each other. They have tested their relationship and found that they can depend on each other. (Northouse, 2010, p. 153)

There is also an instant sense of trust experienced by President C with both his dyadic partners, and President A describes phase 3 elements early on in his relationship with Laura based upon her expertise. In some aspects the presidents seem to have bypassed or condensed the first two phases, particularly where there is no evident expansion of the roles offered, as is characteristic of phase 2.

The lack of clear consistency between all aspects of LMX theory and the findings from this study does not mitigate the elements of LMX that do manifest in the study or the possibility that there are deeper LMX elements present which did not emerge or which the researcher did not recognize. However, it is possible to say that not all the findings from this study appear to conform uniformly to all aspects of LMX theory.

An interesting aspect of leadership that emerged from this study is the situational use of power by presidents. One of the top three most salient emergent thematic factors in this study is that of the situational use of power (SUP). The presidents have the power to decide how power will be distributed within their partnerships, specifically whether the power dynamic will be vertical or horizontal. This power distribution varies during the partnership because the presidents appear to decide how to distribute the power based upon different situations. These situations are informed by their differing needs having to do with the multiple aspects of their role, which include but are not limited to vision and
mission creation; strategic and tactical planning; decision-making; implementation of objectives; consensus creation; team building; and dealing with the personal aspects of the role.

The theory that could be potentially relevant to this thematic factor is the situational approach to leadership, which involves the leader being flexible in their style depending upon a given situation. This is described by Northouse (2010) as follows:

The premise of the theory is that different situations demand different kinds of leadership. From this perspective, to be an effective leader requires that a person adapt his or her style to the demands of different situations. Situational leadership stresses that leadership is composed of both a directive and a supportive dimension.…To determine what is needed in a particular situation, a leader must evaluate her or his employees and assess how competent and committed they are to perform a given task. Based on the assumption that employees’ skills and motivation vary over time, situational leadership suggests that leaders should change the degree to which they are directive or supportive to meet the changing needs of subordinates. (p. 89)

While there are certainly situational elements in SUP, it is unclear the degree to which presidents are making their decisions about power distribution based upon their partner’s skills and motivations. There seem to be other elements at play in these partnerships and the decisions about how to use power vary across the different presidents. A key driver for presidential decisions seems to be the need to fulfill the aspects of their role listed above. In certain situations they take their partners’ complementary skills and expertise into account. That is certainly the case with President A for example who relies on Laura’s governance experience. However, in other situations they override this expertise. President B emphasizes this in saying she will
listen to her partner Emily but at the end of the day the final decision is hers. President D, on the other hand, appears to take a more collective approach to decision-making. Thus, the nature of how presidents decide to distribute power in the partnership is an area for further study.

Additional areas of theory that could be enlightening in such research could be theory that deals with leadership power and use of power, as well as the application of contingency theory, which deals with leadership styles and situations. Leadership styles were not a primary focus of this study per se, but further exploration in this area could help to shed light on how presidents choose to distribute their power in differing situations within the key dyadic partnerships.

**Complexity Theory**

Complexity theory presents a theoretical perspective that seems particularly descriptive of the phenomenon that is occurring in the presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships. Complexity theory is emergent across a range of diverse disciplines such as biology and psychology (Haggis, 2008), and contains an inherent ontological causal perspective that is not necessarily reducible to independent factors, in that causality is complex and can involve interaction between a number of factors.

Within this context, complexity theory looks at not only a single cause but also the emergence of multiple causes and the emergence of end results that are not predictable by looking at unique causal factors on their own. As described by Mason (2008),

> The whole becomes, in a very real sense, more than the sum of its parts in that the emergent properties and behaviours are not contained in or able to be predicted from the essence of the constituent elements or agents.
central concern of complexity theory is thus with the relationships among the elements of agents that constitute a particular and sufficiently complex environment or system. (p. 37)

This focus on the interactions of factors is a crucial aspect of how complexity theory approaches understanding of a phenomenon such that: “…it is the manifold interactions among constitutive elements of agents, whether essential or not, that are responsible for the phenomena, the patterns, properties, and behaviors that characterise a particular field” (p. 39). This theoretical approach is relevant to the findings of this study as well as the construction of new dyadic partnership theory and models from the findings of this study in that it provides a framework for approaching such partnerships, which is truly representative of what has been found to be occurring within the partnerships in this study. The partnerships are characterized by complexity in that there is not only emergence of common thematic factors such as trust, common mission, and communication across the presidents, but there are also ambiguous and hard to define interactions that are occurring between these factors. It is the interaction between the factors not only their presence in the partnerships that seem to contribute to the success of the dyadic partnership.

**Discussion**

This research study highlights university and college presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships. Each of the partnerships presented in this study are unique. The presidents have different personalities, visions, and perceptions of their leadership and their partnering. Their choices of partner and the characteristics of their
partners also are unique to each individual partnership dyad. The presidents represent different types of presidencies that vary in duration and focus, and the presidents are also representative of different categories of schools within the Carnegie classification system. Yet despite these differences, there are common thematic factors that emerge with salience across all five presidents. The factors may have different nuanced meanings or may manifest differently but there are common factors which are emergent within the protocols and research process of this constructivist grounded theory study. As presented in chapter 4, these are as follows:

- The emergent factors common across all five presidents in order of salience are trust, common mission, and situational use of power (SUP).
- The emergent common factors for four presidents in order of salience are communication, complementary strengths, and time/longevity.
- The emergent common factors for three presidents in order of salience are relationship, dyad radiating outwards—extrapolation, works hard, boundaries, and boundaries in combination with the role, intuition, and friendship.

An unanticipated finding of this study is that the emergent factors are also interactive with other thematic factors. There is a strong element of complexity revealed by this study because it appears that the nature of these interactions, in conjunction with the presence of these factors, could have some causal relationship to the success of the partnerships. The most common prevalent interactive factors by salience are trust, communication, common mission, and relationships. There is a key finding that the most interactive common factors are also some of the most salient common thematic factors
across the presidents. It is interesting to consider the nature of causality in this instance. Do the most common and most interactive factors manifest in this fashion because of the nature of the research process itself or the way in which the findings are presented? For example, because the common factors appear emergent most often, does it seem as if they are the most interactive when in fact they are not? It is important to note that the nature of the analytic process with these findings was such that the interactivity of the factors was analyzed based on how the factors emerged relative to one another through multiple levels of coding and iterative analysis. The interactions of the factors emerged through the data separately and the specifics of these interactions are detailed in chapter 4 for each president.

However, the analysis of the interactions revealed a high level of complexity. As described in chapter 4, it was difficult to categorize or absolutely define the nature, intensity, or frequency of the interactions from the nature of the data. Additionally limitations of the study impacted the degree to which the complexity could be understood. These limitations included small sample size and logistical difficulties in going back for fourth- and fifth-round interviews in combination with bias on the part of the researcher involving a level of interaction and liking of the presidents, all of which could impact the research.

At this time, with these research findings it is possible to say that a fundamental aspect of the phenomenon of the university and college presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships is that the partnerships are characterized by uniqueness as well as commonality. The elements of commonality include common emergent thematic
factors that are also interactive with other factors. The nature of this interactivity, while present, is complex and difficult to categorize based upon the data findings and limitations of the study.

There are additional aspects of the research that are important to note. One such aspect is the importance and value of these dyadic partnerships for the presidents. The presidents all believe that the job of the president is not done by one person alone and that these partnerships are instrumental in the functioning of the presidency. There is also a consensus on the part of the presidents that the successful nature of the dyad could radiate outwards to triads and other teams as well as to the university and community. This idea is put forth with elegance by President E who describes the dyadic partnership as the foundation for the team, which is the vehicle for achieving the goals and mission of enhancement of the university.

The partnerships also appear to be valuable for the presidents on a personal level. The manifestations of this personal element vary according to the presidents. President E describes such working together as being personally very satisfying. President B describes her relationship with Emily, which has lasted for eighteen years, as a deep relationship, deeper than a friendship. President A finds the collegial elements and the ability to work together towards the goal to be very personally satisfying, and President D characterizes her dyadic relationships as loving and involving deep friendship. President C also describes the relationship with Thomas as meaningful and derives satisfaction from the way in which they are able to work towards the greater societal good. There are many potential reasons as to why these partnerships are so emotionally rewarding for the
presidents. However, during the research process a theme emerged as the researcher listened to the presidents’ narratives. With the exception of President D, who has a uniquely collective and community orientation when compared to the other presidents, there was a strong sense of the loneliness and isolation of the role of president, which became apparent as the presidents spoke about their jobs, their institutions, and their partnering. For president B, for example, the role and the isolation associated with the role, particularly as the ultimate decision-maker is so important that she sees her relationship with the role as an example of a dyadic partnership. Within the context of the narratives and observations, it is possible to postulate that an element of the personal importance of these partnerships derives from the function they serve in mitigating the sense of personal loneliness and isolation.

As with other aspects of this study however, the personal nature of these dyadic relationships is complex. This is particularly apparent with issues such as deep friendship and forgiveness. President E did not address these topics and due to the nature of the limitations of the agreement for his participation in the study, he was not available for follow-up questions regarding the topics of friendship and forgiveness. With the four remaining presidents, President D is the only president who says that a deep friendship is possible with the dyadic partner during the partnership relationship. She is also the only president who says she could forgive a breach of trust. Presidents A, B, and C do not describe their dyadic partnerships as involving deep friendship. Despite the deep and personal aspect of the relationship, President B specifically states that she and Emily are not friends.
Presidents A and C both say that friendship within such a dyadic partnership work relationship is difficult and potentially not possible. The reason as to why friendship is not possible is unclear. President A says that it is difficult to balance the personal and work aspects of the relationship if friendship is involved. The other presidents don’t offer explanations as to why a deep friendship aspect of the relationship is not present. However, this is a recurrent emergent theme with these presidents. Perhaps not becoming deep personal friends despite deep personal involvement and proximity over time is unique to these presidents or perhaps it is a manifestation of other factors. Perhaps, for example, it is a way of setting boundaries in a relationship so that the work goals are always paramount. Perhaps it is a way to provide boundaries around the vertical nature of the president’s ultimate power. However, the issue of friendship within dyadic leadership partnerships both within and outside of the academy would be an interesting topic for further research.

The issue of forgiveness is also a complex issue in these partnerships. Presidents A, B, and C all say that they find forgiveness difficult in this dyad, particularly regarding a breach of trust. For President C for example, if the dyadic partner betrays his trust, then the relationship is over. The reasons as to why the presidents find forgiveness so difficult in this relationship are open to conjecture. One possibility is that given the nature of the isolation of the role and the personal and professional importance of this partnership for the president, it is essential that the president feel that he can trust the partner. In fact, trust is the most common salient emergent thematic factor in this study. Therefore, if the partner breaks trust, it becomes a breaking of a foundational element in the partnership.
that is not necessarily reparable. As with friendship, the topic of forgiveness would be an interesting area for further research.

Important related topics for discussion are situational use of power (SUP) and time/longevity, both of which manifest in this study in ways which are particularly reflective of the distinctive role of the president within the unique culture of the academy. The thematic factor of SUP is representative of the way in which the president chooses the way that power will be distributed in the partnership at different times based on differing situations. These manifestations of both vertical and horizontal power are always occurring within the overall vertical power dynamic within the academy. The power structure in institutions of higher education tends to be characterized by a diffuseness in that multiple groups such as the board, the administration, and the faculty all have elements of power. However there is also a strong element of hierarchy and verticality in the positional power structure of institutions. As described by President E, even with the chair of the board, the president still can be in a position of great power at times because he is tasked with the running of the institution. With the exception of President C, whose partners are outside his school, the presidential partnerships all exist and function within this vertical and hierarchical power structure. However, the presidents choose in different situations to have a mitigation of this verticality within the partnership itself particularly with communication.

The presidents all describe the importance of honest, direct, transparent, communication with the dyadic partner. They emphasize the need for truth-telling between themselves and their partner and they describe this communication process as
taking place horizontally in a peer-to-peer fashion. It appears that the presidents can choose to create a horizontal space or matrix, present within their overall vertical relationships where direct and honest communication occurs between the partners. This communication is very interactive with trust, in that honesty and truth-telling is a required component of the communication on both sides and such honesty results from conditions being present that are horizontal to the degree that the truth can be spoken. It also creates more trust within the partnership itself because both partners know they can rely on the other to tell the truth. It is interesting to note, however, that at the end of the day, with the exception of President D, all the presidents when speaking about horizontality with reference to communication always provide a caveat in the discussion about the verticality of the positions. For example, in two different instances when referencing the horizontal communication, President A also immediately reinforces the vertical element by referencing Laura’s place working for him on his team. Similarly President B says a number of times that even with this communication, at the end of the day she is in the vertical position of ultimate decision maker. The presidents’ perceptions of their boundaries and the importance of boundaries relative to the role clearly manifest in the way in which they talk about the horizontality of communication with a vertical caveat. This underscores the power the president has to make the choice about how power within the partnership is distributed, and that ultimately vertical and positional power rest with the president.

The importance of the thematic factor of time/longevity is a manifestation of the culture of the academy where the presidents’ jobs are extremely difficult. They are
tasked with meeting the demands of multiple internal and external stakeholders and their schedules are notoriously busy and require long days of frequent constant work and pressure. One of the most valuable commodities for these presidents thus becomes that of time. Their recognition that time must be invested into these partnerships is one of the most emergent thematic factors in this study. President A says that if he could have three wishes for these partnerships, the first would be that of more time. The other presidents echo the importance of investment of time in the relationship. The female presidents also emphasize the longevity of time investment, both in their schools and in the partnerships. The presidents’ recognition of the need to invest valuable time into these partnerships perhaps underscores the value of the partnerships to the presidents.

Gender is an important topic in this study. As presented in chapter 4, there is gender differentiation across a number of parameters, including word tone and usage; perceptions of relationship; thematic factors; and ways of partnering overall. The female presidents differ from the male presidents in their word tone and usage in that they are both highly intellectual and cognitive while also being highly emotive and affective, whereas the male presidents are cognitive and rational and not emotive or affective. The female presidents use words that show love, caring, and positive emotional elements. They speak about partnership relationships using personal development and family terms such as “mother” and “daughter” and “marriage.” The men do not use emotive words; rather they use action words such as “driving” and “demanding” and their overall tone is neutral, balanced, and non-affective. They speak about partnership relationships in terms of team.
Such word tone and usage reflects deeper differences in the way that the males and females lead and partner. The females lead and partner from the heart and within the context of a caring, family-like relationship, whereas the males lead and partner in hierarchical teams where they are working towards a goal. An interesting question for further study is whether this emotional and caring aspect of the partnership for women means that it is more meaningful for them personally than it is for the men. This is an aspect of the overall gender issues raised by this study about partnership, which would merit further research. An important difference between the female presidents B and D and two of the male presidents A and E has to do with the nature of trust and trust formation by gender. The trust patterns of C do not conform to either gender pattern but exhibit elements of both.

There are emergent thematic factors that emerged by gender and that support the overall gender differences between the presidents. The emergent factors common to female presidents include the role, sameness, gender, religious element, and resilience—overcoming challenges. The emergent factors common only to males include idealism, the role and boundaries, and team. The following are some observations on these themes from the perspective of the researcher and her interactions with the presidents and her familiarity with the data.

The female presidents are the only ones who see gender as an issue. This is potentially a reflection of this phenomenon in the greater population where females are more aware of issues such as greater challenges based on obstacles such as sexism and
glass ceilings because they have had to deal with such obstacles. For males, these issues, while presumably important, are not as salient in their experiences and perceptions.

The issue of sameness is very salient for the female presidents. It seems to inform the fundamentals of the way in which they trust and their ongoing partnership relationships. For females there is an instant sense of connection or trust with the dyadic partner, which is based upon sameness and can involve a sense of intuition about the other. It is unclear whether this sameness is based on similar values alone or whether there are other factors involved in sameness. According to the literature, there are indications that females are more risk averse than are males in initial trusting and that such sameness could be a mitigating factor that facilitates trust formation for these female presidents. After the initial trust, there is the opportunity for trust to develop over time through demonstrated reliability. For the males A and E, there is no initial, intuitive trusting based upon sameness; rather trust develops over time based upon demonstrated expertise and judgment.

The presence of the religious element for these female presidents seems to be characteristic of their unique backgrounds and personal values and not in any way associated with gender. Findings based on further study in this area could clarify whether there are religious elements associated with gender in presidential partnerships.

The emergent factor of resilience and overcoming challenges seems to reflect the difficult path these females have had to take in becoming leaders within the academy. It is interesting that the narratives of the males do not contain such references to challenges and having to overcome challenges. President B also talks about this a great deal in
terms of her partnership and the need for resilience within the partnership dynamic over time. Thus, in a sense for President B, the partnership and its challenges are reflective of the potentially greater challenges faced by female leaders in USHE. While not conclusive in any way, it is important to note that this thematic factor is key for the women and not for the men, and there could be many possible implications for what this means for female presidents overall.

The emergence of the thematic factors of idealism, the role and boundaries, and team for the males reinforce the patterns of the male partnerships. They seem to be motivated by an external factor such as the goal of improving society through education or improving global citizenship through education. They are idealistic about this goal and they move towards it linearly. Presidents A and E in particular are hierarchical and team oriented. In their teams they are the leaders of the team and driving the vision and mission of the team. The thematic factor of role and boundaries seems to reinforce their vertical role and the boundaries that maintain this role within the overall hierarchical structure. While President C also shares the thematic factor of idealism with A and E, and in fact idealism is his primary thematic factor, the factors of team and of role and boundaries are not equally salient for C. His patterns are consistently different from the other presidents across many key parameters.

The strong degree of gender differentiation that has emerged in this study is the foundation for the creation of three models for effective partnering that reflect specific gender elements and that are presented next in this chapter.
New Theories and Models Based upon the Findings

The creation of theories and models are grounded in the data findings. These theories and representative models provide new thought about university and college presidents and their partnerships. There are four new theories put forth in this study:

- Complexity theory of successful dyadic presidential partnerships in USHE
- Theory of situational use of power (SUP) by the presidents in their partnerships
- Theory of gender differences in presidential dyadic partnering in USHE
- Theory of differing trust patterns in successful dyadic presidential partnership

Complexity Theory of Successful Dyadic Presidential Partnerships

Based upon the findings of this study it is possible to postulate that these successful dyadic partnerships of university and college presidents within USHE are characterized by complexity regarding thematic factors present in the partnerships. The successful dyadic partnerships have primary common thematic factors that are present across all or the majority of presidents. These common thematic factors are interactive with other thematic factors within the successful partnership process. The most salient emergent thematic factors are also the most interactive factors. The overall partnership process is characterized by a complexity in the way in which these factors are both present and interactive. However, based upon the findings it is possible to say that for these five presidents their successful dyadic partnerships involve the presence of the following factors: trust, common mission, and situational use of power (SUP). The interactions of factors for all five presidents involve trust, communication, common mission, and relationships.
Successful presidential dyadic partnerships in USHE are characterized by complexity and involve both the presence and interaction of common thematic factors.

It appears that the common thematic factors need to be present in the partnerships and also that there needs to be the personal and relational space in the partnership for the interactivity of the factors. These common factors include trust, common mission, and situational use of power. The interactions of factors involve trust, communication, common mission, and relationships.

Diagrams Illustrating This Theory

There are four diagramed representations of this complexity provided below in Figures 3–6. The first, Figure 3, shows the nature of the interactivity of the factors, using the example of trust for President A. The second, Figure 4, shows the nature of the interactivity of the factors, using the example of trust for President B. The third, Figure 5, shows how the interactivity of factors displays linearly. The fourth, Figure 6, shows a holistic representation of this interactivity within the partnership.
Note: Within the diagrams, the interactivity is represented by the iterative arrows.

**Figure 3. Interactivity of Trust with Other Factors for President A**
Note: Within the diagrams, the interactivity is represented by the iterative arrows.

**Figure 4. Interactivity of Trust with Other Factors for President B**
The diagramed representation of trust for two different presidents, shown in Figures 3 and 4, provides a way to show the complexity of thematic interactivity. As noted, the diverse and complex nature of interactivity is not yet understood. However, it is possible to detail the types of thematic factors with which another factor interacts. Based upon the findings presented in chapter 4, these two diagrams represent the interaction of trust with thematic factors for presidents A and B. Within the diagrams the interactivity is represented by the iterative arrow between factors. Trust can either interact directly with another factor or indirectly with a factor via an additional factor. For example, for President A, trust interacts directly with communication and indirectly with SUP.

Figures 3 and 4 also provide an example of the nature of the variance in interactivity between thematic factors. For example, similar factors might be present but there might be differences in nuance, as for example with complementary strengths for President A and complementary strengths/expertise for President B. Additionally the same factors may be present but may interact with differing factors; for example communication interacts with the role, relationships, and SUP and indirectly with trust for President B, and communication interacts directly with trust and SUP for President A. This variance potentially exists for all factors across all five presidents.

These figures show how trust can be present and interactive for each president, but the presence and interactivity of the factor varies across the presidents. There is such variation present for all the thematic factors and their interactivity across all five
presidents. Thus these diagrams show how there are multiple formations of interactivity possible for each factor and for each president.

The nature of this interactivity relative to the overall partnership is presented in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Aggregated Interactivity of Thematic Factors in Presidential Partnerships

Within this diagram, the interactivity between factors has been aggregated into the arrows themselves. While this diagram shows only the most salient and interactive factors, an actual representation of the nature of the factors characterizing these
successful dyadic partnerships would need to encompass all the thematic factors that emerged and that were interactive across all the presidents. The model has thus been simplified for ease of presentation.

In the Figure 5 diagram, common thematic factors are represented both as separate factors and as interactive with the other factors. This interactivity is represented by the iterative arrows. The complexity of the partnership itself is represented by the fact that the partnership exists overall in an aggregated state. The thematic factors are presented outside the state but actually they exist both independently as aspects of partnership as well as within the partnership in a complex and non-reducible state characterized by a complexity of interactions between factors that are not yet understood. This could also be represented holistically as a series of embedded circles where the separate factors exist independently and also interactively in the partnership, as shown in Figure 6:

![Figure 6. Holistic Presentation of Interactivity of Thematic Factors in Presidential Partnerships](image-url)
The separate factors in the above diagram are represented by the abbreviations T for trust, C for common mission, and SUP for situational use of power.

Theory of Situational Use of Power (SUP)

Within this study, the participants demonstrate the situational use of power (SUP) such that they decide whether the power distribution within the partnerships will have more verticality or horizontality. They make these decisions based upon different situations and according to different criteria. The criteria can include but is not limited to what they perceive to be the best choice in a given situation to help them fulfill their role; what they perceive to be most beneficial to achieving the goals of the institution; and what they perceive to be best for the partnership at a given time.

Statement of Theory

Successful dyadic presidential partnerships in USHE appear to be characterized by the president choosing the way in which power will be distributed within the partnership based upon a given situation.

Model Representing This Theory

Based upon the data findings, it is possible to create a model that represents the process of presidential partnering in USHE. This model shows both the complexity of the interactivity of thematic factors as well as the SUP that are presented in the previous theory, and also shows how these new theoretical elements manifest in the overall partnering process as shown in Figure 7.
Figure 7. Process of Presidential Partnering in Successful Dyadic Partnerships
Specifically, this model shows an iterative process where the different aspects of the process can occur either sequentially or simultaneously. In this model, the interactive phenomenon of complex interactivity between trust and common mission, iteratively inform the president’s SUP. This SUP informs the horizontal or vertical power distribution within the partnership at a given time, which impacts the nature of how they are partnering in that instant. They partner together to work towards the achievement and implementation of aspects of the presidential role, which include but are not limited to:

- Vision and mission creation and adjustment
- Strategic and tactical planning
- Decision-making
- Implementation of objectives
- Consensus creation
- Team building
- Personal aspect—(mitigating isolation and loneliness of role)

The recognition of these aspects of the president’s role informs the way the president makes the decisions regarding the SUP. These aspects of the president’s role are also impacted by the internal and external stakeholders in United States higher education. An example of this process would be as follows:

President B trusts her partner for many reasons, but one such reason that she discusses is that they are held together by their working towards a common mission which is to serve their university. The more they demonstrate to each other that they are both working towards this
common mission, the more trusting they will be of each other that they truly have the same overarching goal. This overarching goal of common mission provides a way for trust to be generated and reinforced. Thus there is interactivity between trust and common mission.

An aspect of the president’s role, which President B talks about a great deal, is that of decision-making. In a situation where the president needs to make a decision, she will be impacted by her knowledge that she can trust that Emily is working towards the same common mission. She will trust that Emily will do what she can to help President B make the right decision to achieve this common mission, because President B knows that working towards this common mission is very important to Emily. Thus, based upon the interactivity of trust and common mission, President B might make a decision to move from a more vertical power distribution in a given situation to a more horizontal power distribution in order to be able to communicate more openly, honestly and equally with Emily. President B would move towards this SUP because such equal communication could help President B to get the information she needs to make the best decision.

**Application of This Process Model to Other Models**

This process model has been organically derived through a grounded theory process based upon the data that emerged from the study of five presidents in USHE. However, the process model itself is not limited in scope and applicability to either presidents or USHE. The model can be used to expand the nature of theory and practice within other sectors such as the corporate and organizational development arena. A specific example of such potential application is with the following model put forth by Daft (2007) showing the role of management in organizational direction and effectiveness. Daft’s model illustrates external and
internal influences on leadership with overall iterative impact on organization direction, design, and outputs.

This model, shown in Figure 8, is based on earlier work by Lewin and Stephens (1990, 1994) that looks at the attitudes and individual properties of the CEO relative to their impact on organizational design. Daft’s adaptation incorporates the idea of assessment of effectiveness. Daft describes the model as illustrating,

…how managers evaluate the effectiveness of organizational efforts—that is, the extent to which the organization realizes its goals. This chart reflects the most popular ways of measuring performance…It is important to note here that feed back into the internal environment, so that past performance of the organization is assessed by top management in setting new goals and strategic direction for the future. (p. 57)
Figure 8. Top Management's Role in Organization Direction, Design, and Effectiveness

Daft’s model can be extended through an application of the presidential partnership process model from this study. Specifically, an application of the process model could involve the addition of the phenomenon of interactive thematic factors from the process model. These factors are represented in the presidential partnership process model as follows in Figure 9.

Figure 9. Presidential Partnership Model
The factors could be inserted into Daft’s model with a graphical representation in which the entire phenomenon of interactive thematic factors depicted above is represented by Figure 10:

![Figure 10. Phenomenon of Interactive Thematic Factors (PITF)](image)

This triangular symbol for the phenomenon would be inserted into Daft’s model to the left of the CEO and top management grouping, and there could also be further additions relative to partnership within other sections of the model as shown in Figure 11.
Figure 11. Application of the Presidential Partnership Process Model to the Daft Model
This application in Figure 11 involves the extension of Daft’s model to specifically incorporate the addition of dyadic leadership partnership elements as factors that directly impact the CEO top management team function. Additionally these elements both impact and are impacted by the external environment and internal situation as outlined by Daft. This application provides a new way to surface, utilize, and assess partnership and collaborative effectiveness as it plays out in organizational design and direction. Thus, potential additions to the Daft model could also include incorporation of partnership elements throughout. For example, there could be the addition of cross-functional partnership and collaboration, including information sharing, communication, and learning structures in the organization design section, as an extension of both Daft’s “organizational culture” and “organizational linkages.” There could also be an expansion of the effectiveness outcomes section to include partnership and collaboration activities as specific performance indicators that could be assessed in terms of measurable outcomes. This is just one example of how the presidential partnership process model can have direct application beyond theory to implementation and practice. An additional area of further exploration in the extension of this model might include extending the work of Lewin and Carroll (1994) and moving beyond an attribute impact model to a values impact model. This exploration could encompass research on the impact of leadership values on partnership as well as overall organization design and effectiveness.
Theory of Gender Differences in Presidential Dyadic Partnering

Based upon the findings from this study, it is possible to theorize that there are significant differences in the ways in which male and female presidents are partnering. Consistent with findings in the literature about stereotypical behavior, the male presidents A and E exhibit generally more agentic behavior and the female presidents exhibit more communal behavior. Also consistent with the literature is the demonstration by the females of more transformational leadership behavior. What is inconsistent with the literature is that the findings from this study indicate the potential for significant gender differences in leadership styles.

Statement of Theory

Successful presidential dyadic partnerships in USHE appear to be characterized by gender differences in leadership styles where male and female presidents exhibit stereotypical gender behavior.

Theory of Differing Trust Patterns in Successful Dyadic Presidential Partnership

The findings from the research support the generation of a theory describing the different trust patterns in the ways that the presidents are partnering. These patterns seem to have some alignment with gender. Presidents A and E, who are male, do not experience an instant and intuitive sense of trust with their partners. Rather, trust develops over time based upon demonstration of expertise, complementary strengths, and judgment. The female presidents B and D, on the other hand, do experience a sense of instant, intuitive trust and connection with their partners, which seems to be at least partly based on a sense of sameness. There is then the development of trust over time with their
partners and this trust can involve reliability over time and demonstration of complementary strengths. There is a third pattern demonstrated by President C, who is male. He can either trust instantly, like the female presidents, and for him this is based upon intuition, or he can develop trust with the partner over time, like the male presidents. When trust develops over time for President C, there is a specific point in time where there is a realization of the trust, as illustrated by his statement, “Once you know, you know.” For President C, this trust that develops over time appears to be connected with demonstrations of loyalty on the part of the partner, such as being willing to sacrifice or “fall on their sword” for the president.

**Statement of Theory**

Successful presidential dyadic partnerships in USHE appear to be characterized by differing trust patterns that indicate some alignment with gender differences.

**Additional Models**

Based upon the partnership findings for each of the presidents as well as the theories generated, which are grounded in the data, it is possible to generate three models of successful dyadic partnership that represent the presidents as follows:

- Figures 12–13—a model representing the aggregated successful dyadic partnership patterns for the male presidents A and E
- Figures 14–15—a model representing the aggregated successful dyadic partnership patterns for the female presidents B and D
- Figures 16–17—a model representing the successful dyadic partnership pattern for the male President C whose partnerships findings are significantly different from the other four presidents
Each model incorporates the phases of partnership formation and creation, and partnership development. Each model also initially shows Venn diagrams, which represent the different progressions of the trust process.

**Model of Aggregated Successful Dyadic Partnership Patterns for Male Presidents A and E**

The trust aspect of this partnership involves trust over time, where degree of trust is shown by the overlap:

- **Phase One:** No initial or intuitive trusting
- **Phase Two:** Trust through demonstrated expertise and judgment

**Figure 12. Partnership Pattern for Male Presidents**

The partnership formation and creation phase for this model involves partnership selection based on non-emotive factors such as complementary strengths and expertise. There is no initial and intuitive sense of instant trust. The depiction of partnership development in this model is shown in Figure 13:
Phase One

Partnership creation: expertise and complementary strengths

Phase Two

Partnership development: trust developing; vehicle for moving towards common goal

Common goal: vision or mission of school; idealistic goal of having impact

Trust develops over time

Figure 13. Partnership Development for Male Presidents

The partnership development phase for this model involves trust that develops over time as expertise and judgment are demonstrated repeatedly. There is a linear and forward directivity in that the partners are working together towards a common mission or goal. One of the functions of the partnership in this phase is that it can provide a vehicle for this forward movement towards the goal.

Model of Aggregated Successful Dyadic Partnership Patterns for Female Presidents B and D

In the second model describing the partnership patterns for the female presidents, the trust aspect of this partnership involves both initial and intuitive trust, and trust that develops over time, which can almost become symbiotic. (See Figure 14.)
Phase One— instant trust

Phase Two— trust developing over time based on reliability and expertise

Figure 14. Development of Trust for Female Presidents

Partnership formation and creation for this second model involves hiring for the heart, sense of sameness, instant trust, intuitive connection, and potential for mentoring. Complementary strengths and expertise can be important in partner selection and formation, but other elements are also important. Figure 15 depicts the partnership development in this model.
The partnership development for the female presidents involves relationship, which is an organic process where there is further knowing and trust development over time. It is not linear but is holistic. It is reinforced and held together by the common mission. It is characterized by a sense of community in service to the mission. In its graphic representation above, the two phases are not easily differentiated within the holistic nature of the partnership pattern.

Figure 15. Partnership Development for Female Presidents
Model of Partnership Pattern for Male President C

The third model describes the partnership pattern for male President C, whose partnership findings are significantly different from the other four presidents. The trust aspect of this partnership varies. Trust can form instantly and intuitively or it can develop over time. Thus the trust patterns can involve separate or overlapped circles as with the first and second models just described. A key difference is that these partners never move towards symbiosis through trust, as can happen with the second model. There is either an initial instant trust or trust over time.

Initial trust looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Trust

Over time there is slightly more overlap

Trust that develops over time looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trust over time

Figure 16. Development of Trust for Male President C

President C’s partnership is driven by the overarching idealistic mission of contributing to the greater societal good. Both phases of this partnership are defined
relative to that mission. The partnership formation is based on meeting a potential partner who has expertise or some other factor that will allow working together towards the common good in such a way that the impact is greater than if either partner worked alone. Both partners recognize from the start that they will benefit individually and collectively from this process. Figure 17 depicts partnership development in this model.

**Figure 17. Partnership Development for Male President C**
This model is characterized by upward movement towards something perceived as the greater societal good. The partnership development phase can involve the development of trust if trust did not develop instantly through intuition. This phase is characterized by fairness in having one’s needs and the partner’s needs met. A key element of this phase is knowing one’s own needs and communicating those needs to the partner.

**Summary Comments on the Three Models**

These three models are not prescriptive. They describe the aggregated patterns for the successful dyadic partnerships that are presented within this study. While these models accurately present patterns of successful partnerships, these models in a sense are also over-simplified in that, as indicated previously, the presidential partnerships are characterized by overall complexity. These models can be expanded upon with additional data from further studies in this area.

**Limitations of This Study**

There are a number of limitations to this study, which include size of the study; the nature of saturation; researcher bias; logistical limitations; inclusion of Presidents E and C and cultural differences for President D; and inconsistencies and variability in the data.

A key limitation is the size of the study. The sample size of five university and college presidents limits the degree to which any findings for an individual president or for groups of presidents can be aggregated or generalized to a more macro level. The creation of theory and models for this study are thus potentially limited in their
applicability for the general population. This being said, the qualitative nature of this study incorporating interpretation and critical analysis involves an openness relative to overall sample size in terms of depth of meaning and richness for the results of the study. Another limitation of this study is the nature of saturation within the constructivist grounded theory protocol as it manifested within this particular study. The nature of the interview process and interactions between the researcher and the participants involved the discussion of personal topics and presumably elements of truth-telling on the part of the researcher and the participants. A result of this process was a sincere sense of liking on the part of the researcher for the presidents. By the second- and third-round interviews with the presidents, the researcher found herself biased by this liking to the extent that it was beginning to impact her research. For example, she began to feel reluctant to include quotations or comments made by presidents that might put them in an unfavorable light.

This limitation ultimately raised the question for the researcher about limitations of such grounded theory research for this type of study. If there is an element of proximity and trusting established between the researcher and participants enabling deep truth-telling over a period of time, which in turn establishes more proximity, is it possible to conduct such research without the emergence of strong bias from the process itself? While constructivist grounded theory incorporates surfacing and acknowledging of such bias, as well as the positioning of the researcher in the study itself, it seemed important to revisit the nature of the research methodology overall relative to this study. There is not
a clear answer to this question based upon this one instance of research, but the process as it manifested clearly had inherent limitations around the bias of liking.

Additional bias also created limitations in this study and included researcher bias involving leadership theory, particularly transformational leadership theory; the creation of initial categories for the data interactions; and the presence or absence of the Gallup themes.

There were also logistical limitations inherent in this study. These involved the restricted nature of the presidents’ schedules, which made it difficult for there to be opportunities to go back for repeated interviews within the time frame of the doctoral process.

Further limitations in this study involve the inclusion of two presidents: E and C. The question of limitation for the inclusion of E was whether his inclusion would impact the integrity of the study because his representative presented an initial limited time frame of one-half hour for the interview with no options for follow-up questions. This differed from all the other presidents, who had much longer time frames and were available for additional follow-up questions and interviews. Although President E was clear and on point throughout his interview and the time frame was expanded, it was difficult not to have the opportunity to go back for follow-up and clarifying questions if it turned out to be necessary. However, given the nature of President E’s responses, particularly in his clarity and consistency, it was not necessary and while it is important to mention potential limitation regarding the inclusion of E, such inclusion did not appear to adversely impact the integrity of the study.
The inclusion of President C presents a more difficult issue of potential limitation, in that the nature of the study focus on work partnerships was not consistent with the possibility that emerged: that President C’s key dyadic partner within his work setting is his spouse. He states this directly as follows in the first interview:

President C: I’m still struggling to think about the question you’re going to ask me soon about partnerships…You know, when I saw partnerships I leaped to, I initially leapt to not one-on-one but, president-faculty. And then I leaped to president-spouse because…There is absolutely outside of religious-based institutions of higher education, I don’t care, that’s probably the most critical partnership. My wife doesn’t get paid, she has a full-time job but she doesn’t get paid but she recognizes her role in being the first lady of X College. It’s much different. And there are so many women who are presidents, guys typically serve differently but when we gather at institutes, both presidents and spouses, and this dialogue takes place, it’s always two-for-one: university and colleges typically hire one person, they only pay one person but they know they get two.

While President C tried to address the topic and speak to his dyadic partnerships, he introduced this idea about his spouse in the beginning and it appeared consistently in his content throughout the initial and follow-up interviews. A number of his examples and illustrative stories had to do with his spouse. Additionally, unlike the other presidents, President C chose two key dyadic partners who were external to his institution. These partnerships reflected differences in power distribution in that the partnerships did not involve President C in a positionally superior-subordinate relationship. Also, President C showed more variability in the nature of his answers with more contradictions across and within interviews than did the other presidents. His word tone and usage differed most markedly from the other presidents and his emphasis on idealism and the partnership needing to be for the greater good also differed from the other presidents. While no two
presidents were alike, President C was the most different from the other presidents in terms of the content of his responses. The inclusion of President C was still deemed to be important because with such a small sample size, it is difficult to assess the outlier status of any of the presidents relative to the others. Thus, if the participant pool were to be extended, President C might be far more typical of a large number of presidents than the other presidents in this study.

A minor limitation in this study is in the very different background of President D. President D differs from the other four presidents in that she is strongly impacted as a leader and as a partner by her formative collective cultural experiences. Thus, she is very different in her attitudes towards forgiveness and the possibility of deep friendship with the partner. While these differences make it difficult to generalize about forgiveness and friendship across all the presidents, the differences are realistic and representative of President D’s narrative. Again, with such a small number of presidents, it is difficult to generalize the findings conclusively and it is important to note that the presidents as a whole are characterized more by difference in some ways than by any similarity.

An important potential limitation is the nature of the inconsistencies that occurred in the data when the presidents contradicted themselves. This was particularly impactful on the analysis process with the case of President C in reference to the nature of the trust process and the nature of friendship with his partner. The researcher made a sincere effort to represent the contradictions and incorporate them into the analysis but feels that the presence of such inconsistencies can mean that the data findings for President C are weaker than for those of the other presidents.
Another area of limitation in this regard is the disparity and dissonance that occurred with the ranking of the Gallup factors as opposed to the emergent data about the factors from the coding and analytic process. There can be a number of explanations for the disparity and dissonance as previously presented in chapter 4 that might include but are not limited to the possibility that the presidents are not aware at the cognitive level of how they feel affectively; the possibility that the presidents answered the cognitive questions in a way that was felt to be psychologically consistent—i.e., they feel they are the type of person who should value forgiveness so they rank it higher; the possibility that they compartmentalize their thoughts; the possibility that it is a combination of the preceding factors or perhaps a further factor that is not yet determined.

One potential explanation, which also presents a key limitation, is that there can be difficulties with self-reported finding, particularly with questionnaire-based methods. As detailed in the work of Yarborough (2011), these methods can incur validity problems as well as bias. The implications of such limitations for future research are presented in chapter 6.
Chapter 6: Implications for Future Research

Overview
This chapter contains the following sections:

Introduction
Areas for Future Research
Reflections on the Research Process
Concluding Advice from the Presidents
Final Lessons Learned from the Presidents
Summary Comments

Introduction
In some ways it seems as if this study raises more questions than it answers. It was initially anticipated that the study would reveal that a number of thematic factors are present within and characteristic of university and college presidents’ perceptions of their successful dyadic partnerships. While some common thematic factors such as trust, common mission, and SUP emerge across all five presidents, they emerge relative to complexity. There is an interactivity between the factors and other emergent factors that appears to be important to the success of the partnership. For example, trust is an element of communication as evidenced in the role of the partner as a truth-teller who can be trusted to tell the president both good and bad news. Additionally trust interacts with communication because the more partners communicate the more they trust one another. Similarly trust interacts with common mission for a president such as President B, because at the end of the day she trusts her partner to be resilient in the partnership,
because the purpose of the partnership is the common mission of the school. The common mission reinforces the sense of the trust between the partners.

A key theory which has been created within this study and which is grounded in the data findings is that such successful dyadic partnerships are characterized by complexity. It appears that the common thematic factors need to be present in the partnerships and also that there needs to be the personal and relational space in the partnership for the interactivity of the factors. Additional theories generated within this study address gender and trust differences in this leadership partnering.

Models have also been generated showing three models of successful presidential dyadic partnering. The first two models consist of an aggregation of patterns for the two male presidents A and E, as well as an aggregation for the two female presidents, B and D. A third model shows the partnership pattern of President C, who is different in significant ways from the other four presidents.

**Areas for Future Research**

Some important areas for future research have emerged from this study. These include the following.

1. **A further exploration of the interaction between the thematic factors**

   This exploration could address research questions such as the following:

   What more can we learn about how factors interact with each other?

   Are there varying degrees of interaction within different stages of the partnership process? For example, is there more interactivity with trust and other factors at the
beginning of a partnership for women when instant trust is occurring or not occurring?

An extension of this would involve plotting the nature and degree of interaction of factors across stages of a partnership.

What are some variables that impact the nature of the interactivity overall?

2. An extension of this study to include a greater number of participants

There is a danger in generalization, particularly from such a small number of participants. However, given the strong similarities in certain areas with presidents A and E and with B and D, it is possible to generalize with the caveat that these are generalization based upon a small sample size and further research is necessary to determine if such aggregations are in fact representative across larger numbers of research participants. Such studies could be helpful for presidents and their partners as they create and develop successful dyadic partnerships.

3. An extension of this study to include the dyadic partners

An extension of this study could include interviewing not only the presidents but their key partners as well in order to gain insight into both sides of the partnership dynamic. While this type of study could present limitations and difficulties in a number of areas such as the less powerful partner not feeling comfortable saying something
potentially negative about his or her boss, still the findings from such a study could have
great positive potential impact on the understanding of leadership partnership dynamics.

4. A further exploration of the gender issues that emerged from this study

The area of gender and leadership is an important area for development,
particularly in that the researcher believes it is important to provide as much knowledge
and information as possible to empower female leaders and improve their opportunities
for success. There are a number of gender questions raised in this study that could help
current and future female leaders as well as those with whom they interact. Some
possible research questions might include the following:

Does the element of sameness or homogeneity in values evidenced by female
presidents in this study in their initial trusting apply to the initial trust process for
females in general?

Does sameness mitigate risk-aversion for females?

What elements comprise sameness?

How important is intuition in perceiving sameness?

Does gender impact the sense of sameness?

Is there more initial trusting for females with other females as their key dyadic partner
as opposed to males as the key partner?
5. *More research into aspects of leadership theory*

There are elements of both LMX and transformational leadership theory present in these dyadic partnerships. It might be helpful to do further research on the nature of how these theories manifest in dyadic partnerships, particularly around gender. Some questions might include the following:

Can the findings about dyadic partner selection and partnership creation shed light on the nature of dyadic partnerships relative to general LMX theory? For example, does the issue of sameness for female presidents in initial trust and partnering have relevance for female leaders in other sectors as they choose to create in-groups with specific dyadic partners?

Are there certain types of dyadic partnerships that tend to involve more transformational leadership? If so, are there gender elements of these partnerships, such as the more female-patterned partnerships being more transformational in keeping with the current research in the field showing tendencies for transformational leadership among females?

There are also aspects of situational leadership emergent in this study in the situational use of power (SUP) of the presidents. Further research in this area could include the following questions:

What are the variables or factors that influence how the president chooses to distribute power in the partnership?

Are there gender differences in the way these choices are made and implemented?
To what degree can theory about situational leadership approaches and contingency theory further inform study of the power distribution in such partnerships?

To what degree can understanding power and the use of power help inform insights into these dyadic partnerships where the use of power is so important?

A further exploration of the potential application of the presidential partnership process model to other models such as the Daft model could help to move the results of this study from theory to implementation from a practitioner perspective. At the same time it would be potentially helpful to scholarship in the field to look at the implications of the theories generated by this study for other current theories, as well as additional theory generation. One possible area for related new research might be the values aspect of leadership partnerships and the way in which the values of the leader, partner, and organizational culture influence and are influenced by the partnership process.

6. The nature of partnering and potential correlations with the type of school and the culture of the school

This study did not reveal a correlation between a particular type of partnering behavior and the type of school represented by an individual president. Further research could explore whether the type of school within the Carnegie classification spectrum and the specific culture of a school impact the nature of the leadership partnerships.
7. The dyad radiating outwards and extrapolation

An important area for further research is the way in which the successful aspects of the presidential dyadic partnership can radiate outwards and positively impact triads, teams, and the larger university and college communities.

8. The question of friendship

The issue of why presidents feel it is difficult to be in a deep personal friendship with the dyadic partner in a working relationship may merit future research. Such research could explore the nature of interpersonal relationships within the work environment and whether friendship with subordinates is possible or advisable for senior leaders.

9. The dark side—looking at issues of forgiveness and betrayal in partnerships

The issue of forgiveness is emergent in this study and would be an interesting area for further research. Some possible research questions in this area might include the following:

Is difficulty in forgiving the dyadic partner a characteristic across a larger sample size of university and college presidential partnerships?

Is forgiveness more difficult in dyadic partnerships than in other types of relationships? Is this particularly the case for leaders?

Is difficulty in forgiveness characteristic of leaders outside of the education sector?

Is betrayal of trust the most difficult thing for presidents to forgive? What else is difficult to forgive for these leaders?
What is involved in forgiveness? Are there ways to develop models or interventions that can help to bring about forgiveness for leaders and their partners and leaders in general?

10. The nature of the grounded theory process

As noted previously by the researcher, there were issues of bias and saturation involving developing a liking for the presidents, and almost the beginnings of dyadic interactions with some of the presidents who participated in this study. Further exploration of this topic might be of interest to those scholars who specialize in qualitative research methodology, such that they could explore ways to mitigate bias that can arise out of the repeated interactions that occur in working towards saturation. This would be particularly helpful for researchers who are working in areas where the nature of the interviews and interactions involve personal revelations on the part of the participants based on a trusting of the researcher. This trusting can require an establishing of factors such as sameness, which by definition could begin to involve the researcher in a personal liking dynamic with the participants, which could be biasing. A key question would be,

Is a grounded theory process the best methodological approach for research that involves deep personal revelations on the part of the participants and repeated interactions with the researcher?
11. The use of quantitative protocols

An additional area of methodology exploration has to do with the use of quantitative protocols. Based upon the disparities and dissonance that occurred with the Gallup rankings, along with the findings about validity in questionnaire approaches from the work of Yarborough (2011), it is recommended that future research in this area that incorporates a quantitative element also incorporate a qualitative element as well to provide verification of the quantitative results and discovery of potential disparity and dissonance. The researcher believes that scholars who are interested in quantitative methodology could explore ways to mitigate the problems in self-report leadership rankings and questionnaires, which could have a positive impact in making it possible for studies such as this one to incorporate quantitative elements to reach a larger number of potential participants.

12. The situational use of power (SUP)

The situational use of power as it manifests in the presidential partnerships could also manifest in similar or different aspects in other sectors such as the corporate sector. It could be helpful for current and future leadership partnerships to explore this dynamic beyond its manifestation within the academy to other leadership partnerships across many sectors. It could also be helpful to look at the global and cross-cultural aspect of the situational use of power in both leadership partnerships and leadership study overall.
13. Expansion of the horizontal communication matrix

Within the overall vertical power structure, the horizontality of communication appears to provide a space for increased trust within the partnership dyad. An area of further exploration could be about this horizontal communication. Some research questions might include the following:

What constitutes optimal communication in this arena?
What would be ways to expand or improve this horizontal space in order to facilitate stronger dyadic partnerships?

**Reflections on the Research Process**

This doctoral thesis was completed while the researcher was also working on a second doctoral degree, as well as on several work projects. While there were challenges inherent in this process, there were also several key lessons learned.

The first lesson is one that the researcher learned from her students in China. She spent a number of years where she was honored to be a professor at Zhejiang University in Hangzhou, China. She asked her students what lessons they would have for others. Often the answer was the same: Never give up. She feels this is the most valuable advice she might offer to other doctoral students. Never give up.

The second lesson is to be open to what emerges from the data. At the Academy of Management conference in San Antonio in 2011, a professor who spoke at the beginning of the content analysis round table presentation gave the following advice: When you are trying to shine a flashlight on the data to see what is there, be careful not to overlook those elements that are trying to crawl into the light. The researcher went
through this when she initially was biased regarding the emergence of the Gallup themes. It took multiple additional rounds of coding and analysis to move past this bias and begin to see the data, which was trying to crawl into the light. This data was ultimately the most salient and most emergent.

The third lesson is to have good friends along for the process. Two cohort members, Matthew Allen Woolsey and Sharon Milsap, were instrumental in providing support and encouragement along the way. A dissertation can be an exciting but sometimes stressful process. It is important to have people around you who are also on an academic journey and who can understand what you are going through and be there for the discussions that make all the difference. The researcher remembers a moment that epitomizes such mutual encouragement. It was when she was standing in a parking lot in Evanston, Illinois, on a hot summer day speaking on the phone with Sharon. This was one of many such conversations with Sharon who was a supportive friend throughout.

The researcher can also remember countless conversations with Matthew about every aspect of their respective doctoral journeys. She can remember rehearsing interview protocols with him and the mutual support they provided each other at each juncture including: the presentations for the defense proposal; the difficulties of the IRB process; scheduling with participants; trying to decipher the data; and ultimately speaking one’s truth with one’s own voice and putting forth a unique vision of the research and the findings.

The fourth lesson is to choose a committee who is wise, devoted to the research process, and willing to question you and push you to be your best. The researcher was
blessed and lucky to have an exceptional committee in every respect and advises others to choose carefully in the committee process.

The fifth lesson is to choose a topic you are truly passionate about. Almost every doctoral student the researcher knows at this time went through changes and revisions to their topic. At the end of the day it is important to listen to your heart and research an area about which you are intrinsically curious and to which you are irresistibly drawn. The researcher strongly believes that the right topic and questions will find you if you are willing to be open to who you are and what you truly long to know.

*Advice from the Presidents*

As part of the research process, the presidents were asked what advice they would have for other presidents on the creation of successful partnerships. Their advice is presented below. (President E could not be included in this part of the survey because of the time limitations imposed by his schedule.)

President A

President A: You want to identify people with complementary skills, assess your strengths and their strengths, your weaknesses and their weaknesses, that’s number one. Number two you should both provide and expect directness and openness. Number three you should enjoy the process of thinking and discussion that helps guide decision-making. So those three things are those which I rely on most heavily and certainly have in the case of this particular partnership.

Researcher: Any other core factor important for successful partnerships?

President A: Well, you’re not always going to come upon, pick people who fit this model. There will be folks who don’t fit well in the structure and so probably the net result of that is that if you’re going to have a strong institution, folks are going to have to go. They’re not going to be happy and neither are you. So I think to that extent it’s not always something that you the leader or the principal do. It’s also very dependent
upon the people you’re with and I think it’s assumed, but I think it’s important to recognize that you won’t bat 1,000 and they won’t bat 1,000 with you.

President B

President B: Honest communication I would say, as I said before. Resilience, a self-consciousness, in other words you have to be conscious of your own strengths and weaknesses and what you need. Some degree of humility, that you have to whether it’s public or not, you have to be able to understand the benefits and the needs of the relationship and at times some of the best partnerships are places where you have weaknesses and she has strengths and together you are a stronger entity and that takes maturity if not humility.

President C

President C: To know yourself and know what drives you. What drives you is important and how to convey that to the other party…And to be open to truly trying to understand and value the satisfaction of the other party.

President D

President D: Well I can tell you advice about partnerships is that there’s nothing you do alone…That everything is a partnership and the more, the stronger the relationship upon which the relationship is built the better it will be and it starts at home, you know in your own institution but then it branches out to the way you work with your donors, your students, the people, business and industry….

But if you listen, if you’re open to learning and if you understand that, your gut will help you a lot, you may not be able to write the equation but you may have a sense of the ending, where you want to be, at least…That’s really what it is, where do you want to be and then you figure out going along how you get there because the road is never straight. There are always barriers and I think the other thing is the hardest things will teach you the most. When things are going well it’s harder to learn because you think you’re in control. And when things aren’t going well, it challenges you and takes you aback.
Final Lessons Learned from the Presidents

Each of the presidents was unique and presented a special and informative perspective on their successful dyadic partnering. In the research process which involved multiple rounds of interviews, coding, and iterative analysis, the researcher felt that key lessons emerged from each president in addition to their advice statements, which could be helpful for dyadic partnerships. These lessons are lessons that the researcher believes she learned from the presidents in the research process.

President A

The importance of collegiality and niceness

The importance of listening deeply and attentively at both verbal and non-verbal levels

President B

The importance of mentorship

The importance of resilience through difficult times

President C

The importance of idealism and working towards something which is about more than either partner and which can have positive societal impact

President D

The importance of love, collectivism, and community

The importance of poetry and lyricism in leadership
President E

The importance of being a leader who can challenge themselves and others

The importance of building dyads which can lead to building teams which can lead to achieving the goal

Summary Comments

Dyadic partnering involves risk and vulnerability. It involves being willing to reach out to someone beyond one’s self and form an alliance that can have potential mutual benefit or harm. The key lesson the researcher has learned about partnering overall from this study and life lessons has to do with being willing to reach out to the stranger and work towards infinite possibility in the interstices between partners. Such reaching out involves a willingness to be supportive and resilient through difficult times and a willingness to be open to true collaboration, which might not look like what one expected but which involves a mutuality that is almost unconditional. This lesson can be summarized by the Gospel of Matthew 25: 35–36 as follows:

For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in, I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me.
Appendix A: Email to Presidents

The following is the letter sent via email to presidents requesting their participation in follow-up questions and introducing the follow-up questions.

The study: University and College Presidents’ Perceptions of Their Successful Dyadic Partnerships
Carolyn Maraist
Benedictine University

To all the presidents:

Thank you again for helping me by participating in the initial interviews for my doctoral thesis. I greatly appreciate the time and effort you spent as well as the wisdom of your words and insights. Over the past few months I have been analyzing the data from the interviews with multiple levels of coding and then re-coding. As I have worked through this process, a number of themes have emerged. I am now asking if you would answer some follow-up questions based upon these themes. I don’t wish to take more of your time—I know that is a precious commodity, especially for presidents! However, in order to be true to the research and to your initial comments, I feel it is important to seek additional clarification around the themes and the inter-relationships between themes. If you have time, I was wondering if it would be possible for you to complete the following questions. Thank you in advance for your help with this research—it looks as if it might contribute to knowledge in the fields of partnership, leadership, and higher education leadership.

A few notes about the questions: please do not feel you need to go into detail on the questions—brief, or yes/no answers would be fine. In case the questions feel repetitive to you or address something you think you covered in detail in the initial interview, please just skip those questions. I am asking the same questions of all the presidents to insure consistency, but that means there might be some repetition. I apologize if there seem to be too many questions (there are 35 total). I am putting forth the questions to be true to what has emerged from the data, and so I am making an effort to do this rigorously.

In the spirit of rigor, I would like to note a problem with posing these questions having to do with framing. I need to explore certain themes so I am asking broad questions first and then follow-up questions. The follow-up questions could have some bias in them, based upon the emergent themes and sub-categories of these themes. If possible, could you answer the questions as they come up without reading ahead to the further questions? I realize this is an unusual request but I am asking this to prevent your initial answers being framed or biased in any way by the follow-up questions.
Thank you again for your time and your support. I am doing my best job to try to be true to the data and the emergent themes from this research. Thank you for your help with this!!!

With appreciation and best wishes,

Carolyn

P.S.: As with all the research data in this study, your answers, your identity, and the identities of your partners will be kept strictly confidential. All identifying information will be removed to protect anonymity, including your name, the name of the school, the specific type of school, and the size and location of the school. All that is specifically said about the presidents is that they were chosen through convenient sampling, they represent a number of diverse categories of schools across the Carnegie classifications sectors, and the schools they represent are within the continental United States. The only demographic information provided is gender.
Appendix B: Initial AI Interview Questions

1. What attracted you?
   Think back to when you first decided to join this college/organization, what attracted you? What were your initial excitement and impressions?
2. Could you tell me the stories of some of your experiences of successful dyadic partnerships during your time at this institution?
3. What do you value most about your dyadic partnership experiences?
4. What is the core factor that gives life and vitality to your dyadic partnerships?
5. If you were to describe your ideal dyadic partnership, what would it look like?
6. Three Wishes
   If you could develop or transform your dyadic partnerships in any way, what three wishes, in order of priority, would you make to heighten their overall health and vitality?

Added Questions:
What do you feel makes you a good partner?
What advice would you have for other presidents about creating successful dyadic partnerships?

Note: At the end of the initial interview, all participants were asked to rank the following elements from 1 to 10, with 10 being very important and 1 being not important at all. The rankings were discrete for each element such that each element was ranked separately from 1-10 with no forced distribution of numeric values across the elements.

How important are the following elements in your successful dyadic partnerships?
- Complementary strengths
- A common mission
- Fairness
- Trust
- Acceptance
- Forgiveness
- Communicating
- Unselfishness
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