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Abstract. Social work leadership is valuable to the existence and future of the profession. Equally important is leadership within academia. Leadership in academia is impelled and obligated to the historical leaders, agency organizations, communities, and individuals influenced by the profession to lead, provide vision, and educate tomorrow’s leaders. Mary Richmond and Edward Devine assembled social work education in the 1900’s and were pioneers significant in shaping the vision of social work. However, there is a scarcity of empirical research regarding social work leadership within academic settings. More specifically, limited literature is available that discusses the philosophical prisms, perceived realities, and behavior principles in which leaders in social work academia conduct themselves. The aim of this paper is to add to the literature of social work leadership in academia and provide an emotionally intelligent theoretical framework for leadership practice from a rural BSW program director’s perspective.
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In recent years, social work scholars and academics have become increasingly interested in social work leadership. The knowledge of social work leadership has great importance for the vision and future of the profession. A long standing issue with social work leadership has been the ever changing and multifaceted (Williams, 2003) yet constantly evolving (Ciulla, 1998) phenomena of classifying, defining, and clarifying social work leadership.

Most of the current social work leadership literature focuses on grassroots (Boehm & Staples, 2005), social service agencies (Bliss, Pucukonis, & Snyder-Vogel, 2014; Elpers & Westuis, 2008; Knee, 2014), and maternal child health (Dodds et al., 2010). With the growth of Bachelor’s and Master’s programs nationally of 20% from 2009-2013 (CSWE, 2011), leadership will influence and shape social work today similar to prior pioneers of yester years.

As programs grow, new opportunities for leadership will provide eager faculty the chance to implement leadership styles and models. Many of these leaders will assume roles with limited mentoring (Stoez, 1997). However, the questions that remain unanswered consist of: (a) What models and styles have been useful in social work leadership within academic settings? (b) How have other leaders in social work academia been successful as a new junior and experienced leaders such as deans, department chairs, and directors? These questions remain unanswered due to the limited literature about social work leadership as derived from social work leaders: deans, department chairs, and directors within academia in the 21’s century (Desrosiers, 2015; Mizrahi & Berger, 2001). The aim of this paper is to add to the literature of social work leadership within academia from a leader's perspective and to provide an emotionally intelligent theoretical and practice approach to leadership from a director's perspective in a rural BSW program.
Historical Leadership

Social Work leadership has a rich history that dates back to the 1817’s. Individuals such as Elizabeth Fry known as the Angel of Prisons; Thomas Chalmers who tried to help the poor to help themselves; Jane Addams known for her work in Settlement houses; and Mary Richmond who founded of social casework, were influential in establishing different fields within social work. Mary Richmond and Edward Devine assembled social work education in the 1900’s and were deliberate in shaping a vision for the profession. Richmond advocated for and initiated training programs for future charity workers (Richmond, 1897) thus developing education and exemplifying leadership. Devine assisted in creating a yearlong training program for social work education taught by Mary Richmond (Austin, 1983). These leaders not only shaped undergraduate social work education currently but also constructed the foundation of social work as a profession with structure by 1912 (Austin, 1983).

The leadership efforts of Richmond and Devine are still prevalent today as demonstrated by social work associations such as the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), National Association of Social Workers (NASW), and the American Association of Schools of Social Work (AASSW). These organizations purpose to provide leadership to advance the social work profession and to provide platforms for social workers to advocate for or against legislation identical to those efforts of Richmond and Devine.

Social Work Academic Leadership

According to Brilliant (1986), leadership research is the missing ingredient in the profession. Furthermore, Graham (2002) stated:

Although some literature exists offering unfalsifiable theories about leadership behavior and personality, there is a dearth of primary empirical information about leaders, the philosophical prisms through which they perceive reality and the principles by which they conduct themselves (p. 87).

Social work leadership has many definitions (Williams, 2003) and is ever changing and evolving (Ciulla, 1998). “Leadership is guided by the NASW Code of Ethics to create proactive processes that empower individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities” (Rank & Hutchinson, 2000, p. 499). Rank and Hutchinson’s definition encompasses leadership in the profession at many levels. Therefore, social work leadership should by definition provide guidance, direction, supervision, governance, administration, control, management, and vision in multiple aspects of leadership within the profession including academia. And these definitions could encompass social work leadership in academia.

Academic leadership is at the forefront of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and their vision for the profession as demonstrated in the development of the strategic plan in 1998-2000. Leadership should maintain consistency in social work education with the values and ethics of the profession (Council on Social Work Education, 1998; 2011). CSWE emphasizes the significance in preparing “competent social work professionals” through national leadership (Council on Social Work Education, 2011, p. 595). What defines competent professionals regarding social work leadership?
CSWE’s Leadership Institute provides various opportunities for formal training for all levels of leadership as outlined by the Council on Leadership Development Initiatives. These include Program Directors’ Academy (those in the position three years or less) and Leadership Scholars (in collaboration with Harvard University for those in administrative roles five years or more who are preparing for the role of Dean) which reinforces leadership within the academic environment (CSWE, 2011). Additionally, the Network for Social Work Managers and the National Public Health Leadership Development Network provide educational programs that have identified core competencies embedded into leadership curriculum (Hassan, Waldman, & Wimpfheimer, 2013).

Effective Leadership

Effective leadership has many definitions; however, understanding what effective leadership is and identifying evidence to support outcomes that are associated with leadership is rare (Tafvelin, Hyvonen, & Westerberg, 2014). Tourish, Pinnington and Braithwaite-Anderson (2007) stated that successful leadership motivates people to achieve a balanced outcome that meets the needs of the leader, teams, and the organization. Holosko (2009) identified five core attributes common to social work leaders that included vision, influencing others/motivation, teamwork/collaboration, problem-solving capacity, and creating positive change. Leaders enhance engagement in tasks, develop and embrace the vision, set goals for the program, and provide faculty support (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). House, Fowler, Thornton, and Francis (2007) reported that strong emotional intelligence is also a critical factor in effective leadership.

Emotional Intelligence

Before any leadership style or design implementation, there should be an assessment of fit with the program or department to ensure effectiveness. The author's style of leadership is consistent with Emotional Intelligence (EI): A Model of Team Effectiveness (Druskat & Wolff, 2001) in that it is imperative for team leaders to recognize, understand, and allow each member of the team to choose how they manage emotions to best interact and become successful. The director’s goal was to increase the EI abilities of faculty in regards to emotion management and regulation; or better stated, to increases self-awareness and relationship skills to impact team performance to accomplish the program’s goals (McCleskey, Berrios, & Gruda, 2016). Mayer and Salovey (1997, p. 36) stated that “[p]eople high in emotional intelligence are expected to progress more quickly through the abilities designated and to master more of them.” Goleman (2000) adds to be an effective team as evident in Chart 1, three essentials must be present. They include: (a) trust, identity, and efficacy; (b) participation, cooperation, and collaboration; and (c) better decisions and more creative solutions to achieve a higher productivity which is the ultimate goal. EI is possessing the management of self and our relationships effectively based on four fundamental capabilities of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills (Goleman, 2000). Salovey and Mayer (1990) add that EI “is the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and use the information to guide one's thinking and actions.” These authors provide slight variation to the definition and meaning of EI; however, the underpinning agreement is that increasing emotional intelligence creates an atmosphere for success.
Chart 1

A Model of Team Effectiveness

Adapted from Druskat & Wolff (2001).

Program Background

The program is located in a large southern state. This rural area is regarded as an agricultural community and one of the largest producers of milk. This community is comprised of 87% White, 2.2% Black/African American, 15% Hispanic, 1% Asian, 1% American Indian, and 1% classified as two or more races or bi-racial (U. S. Census, 2015).

The author utilized EI to accomplish the goals of this rural program and to increase faculty emotional intelligence. The program had approximately four full-time faculty. When the author assumed the leadership role, the program was attempting to obtain reaffirmation, implementing two off-site campus programs, and had been without leadership for a year. Additionally, the climate or working environment was one that was toxic and faculty members did not work cohesively. Therefore, one of the initial goals was to establish trust among the program faculty. Others goals were to achieve reaffirmation and to implement the two off-sites campus programs.

Goleman (2000) compared applying leadership styles to that of clubs in a golfer's bag. During the process of playing the game, clubs are chosen based on the demands of the next shot. The golfer has to prepare the next course of action and face the next challenge by putting the right tool to work. Over time, players become more proficient and develop the ability to foresee challenges, road blocks, and obstacles ahead. This is how “high-impact leaders operate” (Goleman, 2000, p. 80). The next paragraphs will discuss the steps of incorporating EI in this rural BSW program.

The initial step of the “EI Model of Team Effectiveness” is trust (Druskat & Wolff, 2001). To achieve the most critical task, reaffirmation, the program had to begin working as a team. Teamwork is only established by trusting each other. The program had not begun to implement the new 2008 EPAS standards before the author's arrival. To gain faculty trust, the author met and
discussed the teamwork philosophy which included faculty ownership of aspects of the program. This created an initial vision and a *come with me*, authoritative or visionary leadership style. Goleman (2000) suggested that this style of leadership creates self-confidence and is a catalyst for change within the environment (Chart 2). The author established this as a foundation to develop teamwork and increase emotional intelligence within the program.

To build on this foundation, the second step in the model of EI teamwork is participation, cooperation, and collaboration (Druskat & Wolff, 2001). To accomplish the goals of the program and to encourage collaboration, the author had to discover the source of the toxic climate. The author had to establish effective ways to encourage each team member to self-manage and build relationships effectively based on self-awareness, social awareness, and social skills. An open-door policy supported growth in these characteristics as faculty became more aware of how to address emotions to heal rifts and manage conflicts.

The final step in establishing the EI model of teamwork (Druskat & Wolff, 2001) is where high impact productivity occurs. Additionally, this process is where better decisions and emotional self-awareness occur. During this phase, the program achieved its goals. To maintain focus and increase self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills, the author developed two questions to keep the faculty aligned to achieve to objectives of the program. Are these concerns based on what is best for the student? Are these concerns best for the program? If individuals possess EI abilities, including emotion management and regulation, justice perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Modus Operandi</th>
<th>Style in a Phrase</th>
<th>Underlying EI Competency</th>
<th>When Appropriate</th>
<th>Impact on Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive/ Commanding</td>
<td>Demands immediate compliance, obedience</td>
<td>&quot;Do what I tell you.&quot;</td>
<td>Achievement, drive, initiative, emotional self-control.</td>
<td>In a crisis to kick-start a turnaround, or with problem employees.</td>
<td>Strongly negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative/ Visionary</td>
<td>Mobilizes people toward a vision</td>
<td>&quot;Come with me.&quot;</td>
<td>Self-confidence, empathy, change catalyst, visionary leadership</td>
<td>When change requires a new vision or when a clear direction is needed</td>
<td>Most strongly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>Creates harmony and builds emotional bonds</td>
<td>&quot;People come first.&quot;</td>
<td>Empathy, building bonds, conflict management</td>
<td>To heal rifts in a team or to motivate during stressful times</td>
<td>Highly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Forges consensus through participation</td>
<td>&quot;What do you think?&quot;</td>
<td>Teamwork, collaboration, communication</td>
<td>To build buy-in or consensus or to get valuable input from employees</td>
<td>Highly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Develops people and strengths for the future</td>
<td>&quot;Try this.&quot;</td>
<td>Developing others, empathy, emotional self-awareness</td>
<td>To help an employee improve performance or develop long-term strengths</td>
<td>Highly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacesetting</td>
<td>Sets high standards for performance</td>
<td>&quot;Do as I do, now!&quot;</td>
<td>Conscientiousness, achievement, drive, initiative.</td>
<td>To get quick results from a highly motivated and competent team.</td>
<td>Highly negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Goleman (2000).
and, ultimately, team performance are likely to be impacted. Team members are more likely to approve of a leader who understands how they are feeling when given contextual emotional cues.

**Program Outcomes**

Emotional intelligence increases and programs improve outcomes the more leaders manage and control emotional elements (Goleman, 2000). Three issues needed to be addressed to achieve success. These include achievement of reaffirmation, implementation of two additional campuses, and the establishment of leadership. In February 2014, the BSW program accomplished reaffirmation. During this reaffirmation period, faculty collaborated to develop a new curriculum model entitled the "University Curriculum Inquiry Educational Model" that integrates research throughout a sequenced scaffolding. Community-based participatory research is the foundation of the curriculum. This foundation focuses on integrating research with community partner initiatives to provide students with applied learning experiences and documented portfolios. It is important to note that the program was able through the implementation of the core attributes and stages of EI to achieve reaffirmation over a 6-9 month timeframe.

The program also implemented the addition of two offsite program offerings that increased overall student enrollment. This enrollment increased from 61 students in 2010 to over 190 during the 2014 academic year. The graduation numbers improved from 7 students in 2010 to 57 graduated in 2014.

**Conclusion**

Hecht (2004) states that effective leadership is a process that occurs through self-learning because only 3% of colleges and universities support formal training for those assuming academic leadership roles (Gmelch, 2004). Understanding the role of leadership as it pertains to balancing work with faculty and upper administration in social work academia is limited (Call, Owens, & Vincent, 2013), perhaps more so in rural programs. Integrating a teamwork philosophy has become the established framework on this campus. Characteristics such as clear goals, well-designed tasks, skilled faculty, resources, coaching accompanied with support, and assistance in effective team performance (Hackman, 2012) have aided the author and program to accomplish significant outcomes.

There is no one leadership style, philosophy, or model that is a good fit for all leaders. Leadership is absorbing (Filan & Seagram, 2003), demanding, and continuously calls for self-assessment and evaluation. Leadership requires one to possess the abilities to deal with negativity and emotional challenges. In essence, leaders must discover what framework is successful within the environment in which they are providing leadership and be willing to adjust or incorporate an eclectic approach in rural and urban campuses. Leaders seek to become efficient and do so in a positive manner that achieves positive change. Confident leaders, as opposed to cynical leaders (Chart 2), are conscious of possibilities even in the worst type of situations (Buller, 2013). The author provided a theoretical framework approach to leadership within a rural BSW program from the author's personal perspective. Munson (1994) reported that many in social work leadership entered to influence change, are actually interested in the role, seek a challenge or new stimulation, respond to colleagues' nomination, desire to increase income, skills and abilities, hope to implement program goals, and gain status, image, and prestige. Research measuring current
reasons for entering program administration is lacking. This account of one leadership challenge emphasizes the point made by Hopkins, Meyer, Shera, and Peters (2014) that educational institutions should be at the forefront of human services professionals and student training opportunities for leadership across organizational types. Personal accounts of successful leadership experiences is one avenue by which to begin this process in academia.
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