

2011

Leading and Managing Those Working and Living in Captive Environments

John T. Eggers

National Institute of Corrections Academy

Rebecca I. Porter

Col, US. Army, Office of the Surgeon General

James W. Gray

Col (Ret), U.S. Army

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usarmyresearch>

Eggers, John T.; Porter, Rebecca I.; and Gray, James W., "Leading and Managing Those Working and Living in Captive Environments" (2011). *US Army Research*. 343.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usarmyresearch/343>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the U.S. Department of Defense at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in US Army Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

John T. Eggers, National Institute of Corrections Academy
Rebecca I. Porter, Col, US. Army, Office of the Surgeon General
James W. Gray, Col (Ret), U.S. Army

CHAPTER 15

Leading and Managing Those Working and Living in Captive Environments

John T. Eggers, Rebecca I. Porter, and James W. Gray

Imagine you are the warden of a prison or the administrator of a jail, you enter the facility, and the heavy metal door clangs shut behind you. A riot breaks out and several members of your staff are taken hostage. Fires are set in various locations. The rioting inmates, members of a gang, attack other inmates who want no part in the rebellion and are only concerned for their safety. The decisions you as a leader make are literally matters of life or death, not only for yourself, but also for your staff and those incarcerated. The dynamics of power and guarding against potential corruption are also a constant concern. The leader of an incarceration facility must account for and respond to public opinion and political demands, as well as the individual needs and group dynamics of corrections officers and inmates.

Some of the desired outcomes for leaders in a confinement setting are a reduction in recidivism, security of the facility, prevention of escape, and efforts at rehabilitation. While some would argue that depending upon the reason for incarceration, the inmates do not deserve much more consideration than would an animal in a zoo, others—leaders—in this situation strive for much more. Accomplished leaders in a confinement setting seek to develop a culture that creates and sustains the psychological health and well-being of the corrections officers and provides inmates opportunities to develop skills and their potential. After all, they are in the “people business.” Such an approach would conceivably result in an institution that functions based on the strengths of the corrections officers and inmates, thereby allowing them the greatest opportunity for self-development, physical and psychological security, and indirectly decreased chances of recidivism.

This chapter discusses the contexts of confinement, the psychology of corrections officers and inmates, and the forces at work on a leader and the population being led.

CONTEXT AND ENVIRONMENTAL DIFFERENCES

Leading and managing in captive environments, such as jails, prisons, detention centers, briggs, and disciplinary barracks, differ from leading and managing in private sector or other public sector arenas. Captive environments are for housing individuals—detainees, prisoners, offenders, inmates, and so on—with whom staff interact as part of their jobs. The potential danger leaders working in captive environments confront is rarely experienced by leaders in more traditional workplaces. One's thinking, emotions, and behaviors are put to the test in a variety of ways in the former; one must constantly be "on your toes," so to speak, because the environment can move swiftly from calm to all-out violence. Accordingly, leading and managing in this context adds an element of complexity not experienced by leaders and managers outside such an environment.

Correctional facility staff at executive, senior, manager, supervisor, and line staff levels need to function as role models for each other and for the inmates. Leaders outline the parameters of what is appropriate when it comes to the performance of their followers. Managers operate within these parameters, following the rules and regulations, and pursuing goals and objectives.¹ In essence, leaders create the boundaries within which staff and inmates work and reside. Thus, leaders create opportunities for positive change in the correctional environment, while managers maintain the established status quo.

Secure environments often operate in a routinized manner. Eating meals, exercising in the yard, visiting the canteen, and talking with visitors are a few examples of routines limited by specified periods of time, all in part focusing on the enhancement of physical safety. Both staff and inmates are involved in the routines. Sustaining these functions in accordance with policies and procedures requires sound management skills and behaviors, which also play a role when contemplating and implementing policy and procedural changes.

Correctional leaders must have a vision of the future as it could be. This is different from the managers' perspective, which may only be to operate in the present. Having the ability and willingness to adapt when necessary, rather than being merely consistent, is another trait that differentiates leaders from managers.² We suggest that a leader's vision be rolled out throughout the organization, so everyone can imagine it, and that a strategy be created to

enhance employee ownership of it. For example, at the beginning of his tenure, the commandant of the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks (USDB) issues his correctional philosophy (in writing), so all staff members know it and work within it. In general, this philosophy is developed within the larger framework of two long-standing principles of the USDB. First, the treatment of inmates by all staff is governed by the notion that they are “in prison as punishment, not for punishment.” In other words, staff members are never to exact punishment upon the inmates; the mere fact the inmates are incarcerated is all the punishment the court intended upon sentencing. Second, the USDB’s motto—“Our Mission, Your Future”—sums up the institution’s goals of rehabilitation and preparation of inmates for eventual release. A large portion of the USDBs staff is dedicated to treating, training, and educating inmates so that upon release they have a chance to be successful citizens, who have paid their debt to society by serving a sentence.

CORRECTIONAL MANAGEMENT MODELS

Three correctional management models—authoritarian, bureaucratic, and participative—influence the choices one has in leading or managing. The authoritarian model suggests that a leader maintain firm control and that any deviation from prescribed, centralized authority be met with a high level of disdain and punishment. All decisions are essentially made by the power holder. The bureaucratic model proposes a chain of command approach, with an emphasis on rules and regulations. In short, it advocates “going by the book,” which makes it difficult to be flexible and adaptive when it comes to innovation. This protocol does, however, allow staff to move in, out of, and around the organization, using rules and regulations as guideposts. This model advocates a managerial, rather than a leadership approach. The participative model promotes staff involvement in how the organization should do business. As a result, employees may feel a sense of ownership, moving from a business as usual approach to a business beyond usual approach. This model requires a greater investment in time compared to the authoritarian and bureaucratic models. The latter two are the more common today. According to P. Carlson and J. Garrett, “Many successful agencies have adapted the bureaucratic model to include elements of the participatory style.”³

An example of a management model is based loosely on the USDB’s Inmate Advisory Council. The leadership of the Bagram Theater Internment Facility (BTIF) in Afghanistan—the U.S. military’s largest detention facility supporting the Afghan campaign and holding several hundred unlawful

enemy combatants—created a representative system whereby the detainees selected leaders from each of their respective communal cells to meet with the BTIF leadership and discuss current issues over a traditional Afghan meal on a monthly basis. The goal was to give the detainees a voice and a forum in which they and the leadership could mutually affect positive change. This forum proved hugely successful, and along with the implementation of a behavior-based “carrot and stick” privileges system, dramatically reduced detainee assaults and disturbances.

It is particularly important that one knows when to manage and when to lead. The full-range leadership model may be helpful in this respect.⁴ It professes that transactional leadership is comprised of two components: contingency reward and management-by-exception (active). Contingency reward can be looked at as a quid pro quo situation, whereby the leader and follower together decide on goals the follower will work on, and if the follower is successful, he or she receives a reward for goal achievement. Management-by-exception (active) leader behaviors focus on coaching and counseling the follower not to continue to make mistakes. Here, the leader does not engage the follower unless a problem presents itself.

Management behaviors exhibited in a leader-follower relationship inside the correctional facility may focus on planning, directing, and organizing, for example, overseeing inmate movement, cell shakedown, inmate classification, staffing patterns, and so on. Management behavior, for the most part, does not promote the development of followers, nor does it typically create positive change inside the organization. Rather, as noted above, it maintains the status quo. In no way, however, does this suggest that management is not a good thing. It is critical.

Transformational leadership, in line with the full-range leadership model, promotes positive change within the workplace. Transformational leaders focus on assisting their followers in elevating their own self-interest for the interest of the organization. They also help their followers become more self-aware, so they can self-regulate their thinking, feelings, and behavior, and as a result, become more self-developed. These leaders focus on four components (or “4 I’s”):

- Idealized influence—works to create trust and respect with the follower; demonstrates a strong sense of purpose, ethics, and values whereby followers can emulate the leader
- Inspirational motivation—talks optimistically about the future, articulates a vision for the future, and displays enthusiasm about what needs to be accomplished

- Intellectual stimulation—prompts followers to look at challenges from a variety of angles and welcomes different perspectives from followers on how to solve problems
- Individual consideration—focuses on the needs, expectations, and wants of the followers; spends time coaching and teaching followers, which promotes follower self-development

Transformational leadership essentially augments or builds upon transactional leadership (management). This type of leadership moves individuals, teams, and the organization in a positive direction. It should be used to create and sustain succession-planning efforts inside the organization. This leadership influences follower awareness of what is important, going beyond what needs to be done to explain the how, the why, and the what is being done. It creates a buy-in from followers whereby they feel a part of, rather than apart from, the organization. As a result, followers are better positioned to carry out the mission, vision, goals, and values of the organization. Transformational leadership comes to life when leaders practice the 4 I's.

A number of characteristics and behaviors, some of them noted above as well as below, differentiate management from leadership.⁵

Table 15.1 Management and Leadership Characteristics and Behaviors

Management	Leadership
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Does planning, directing, controlling ▶ Provides predictability and order ▶ Organizes and structures plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Promotes change ▶ Examines and motivates others to new directions ▶ Focuses on improving group members and the organization; develops a culture that promotes growth and learning

If individuals in supervisory positions do not take the time to establish positive relations with their followers, chances are the status quo will prevail. Promoting change implies possible risk. Asking followers to elevate the interest of their organization above their own and to take risks requires a sound, positive working relationship between leader and follower. Ideally, leaders and followers together make sense out of what's important as they compare their personal values and personal visions with the values and visions of their organization. Values such as competence, care, character, integrity, respect,

responsiveness, innovation, and accountability, along with professional development, are key to a sound organization.

When asked what one needs to do to manage and lead effectively in the correctional sector, several leaders stressed the need to establish and maintain trust, be constantly aware of the situation at all times (situational awareness), and to empower their employees to get work done in a manner that increases individual and organizational capacity:

The Importance of trust

"Our business involves direct personal dangers which increase the importance of trust throughout the organization."

—*Trust is important for leading in captive environments.*

"To lead in a correctional environment you must have credibility. Staff places their well-being in your care and must have confidence that you know what you are doing from vast experience. Without that credibility, staff will elect to follow their own course of action."

—*Leaders develop credibility and trust through competence, character, and caring.*

Need for situational awareness

"Decisions made in corrections are often influenced by public policies and external stakeholders versus CEO's in the corporate world [who] lead the organization and are influenced by stakeholders in the form of stakeholders and consumers."

—*Managing the external environment is key.*

"One must balance the requirements of departmental policy, state and federal law, OSHA requirements, public opinion, contractual elements and lead in a manner that fosters growth in your subordinates, promoting change, and provide a secure, structured and safe workplace. Human rights laws and DoD regulations are also key as captivity operations during war time can lead to tribunals and other serious challenges if not done correctly. You must do these things under the scrutiny of the inmates who may not wish for you to succeed, but cannot afford for you to fail."

—*The need for situational awareness is clear.*

"We have to be vigilant about our surroundings and continue to evaluate our methods and tailor our approach to have the greatest impact on our staff without compromising safety and security."

—*Situational awareness must be constant.*

Empower to lead

"You need to know your staff and your inmates, and you need to know the policies and procedures that govern your agency. You have to be able to enable your staff to do their job and make decisions, but be ready to take over at a minute's notice during an emergency."

—*Knowing when and how to empower staff is paramount.*

"A leader in corrections needs to stay calm under pressure and should not make quick decisions unless the situation dictates it. Bounce decisions off of others and make an informed decision. In most cases, unless lives are imminently at risk, time is on the side of the correctional leader and their staff. Leaders should resist the temptation to react and employ use of force too swiftly. Be careful not to rush to a failure that will endure long in the minds of both staff and inmates."

—*Empower others when possible.*

"Our leadership style must have a component of courage as well as an emphasis on control and order—for the sake of safety. It is important to stay safe but it is also important to view inmates in a manner other than that they are dangerous to us. We must also view them as human beings whose lives we are trying to influence in a positive manner."

—*Staff need to be able to balance rehabilitation with appropriate safety protocols.*

As noted above, leading in a prison is in some ways quite different from leading in a traditional business environment due primarily to safety and security factors. The issue of personal safety, due to the threat of physical violence because of the nature and background of offenders, makes it essential for employees to be able to trust each other. A lack of trust is definitely a concern. Public safety is number one, but public opinion is also a serious matter in corrections. Correctional leaders must be aware of how employees carry themselves in the community and must accept as a condition of employment a code of conduct stricter than that of private sector or other public sector positions. They are required to answer to agency leaders, legislators, offenders' families, and the general public, all of whom have concerns and questions. The trust necessary when leading in a captive environment is similar to the trust needed among members of military units, for very much the same reason: members of the organization depend on their leader and one another for their physical safety and security.

In analyzing the above comments from correctional practitioners on how to lead in a correctional environment, it becomes clear that one needs to establish a balance between managing and leading. Leaders, to be effective,

must develop high-quality relationships with their followers. These relationships need to involve a high degree of trust, respect, and sense of mutual obligation. Relationships between leaders and followers that are considered high quality tend to promote safety-related behaviors in the organization.⁶

TRUST AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY

Psychological safety is defined as someone's perception of consequences for taking interpersonal risks at his or her place of work.⁷ Leaders need to work to create a culture of trust to promote psychological safety. The construct of team psychological safety suggests that it is "a shared belief held by members of a team that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking."⁸ Leaders need to ensure that all voices are raised and heard. Employees are rewarded for challenging processes if their leaders clear the way for them to do so. A "willingness to think of new ideas, explore novel directions, and behave creatively may require a safety net provided by a climate of psychological safety, since the process of exploration may be risky."⁹

Creating a culture whereby trust exists between leaders and followers, particularly in a correctional environment, is not always easy. "To earn trust, leaders must demonstrate competence, strong character, and caring."¹⁰ They also need to invest time in establishing positive, cooperative relationships that empower group members. The level of trust employees have in leaders determines the amount of influence leaders can exercise."¹¹ (To learn more about building trust and creating a culture based on trust, please see Chapters 9 and 17, in this volume.)

POWER AND ABUSE OF IT

Individuals in leadership positions are granted power based on their position (positional power), and power based on their personality (personal power). Power is "an individual's relative capacity to modify others' states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishments."¹² Power can be used in both a positive and a negative manner. If used appropriately, power can benefit a relationship, but it can damage a relationship if used inappropriately. In short, it can help, and it can corrupt.

People holding power may value it above everything else and pursue the acquisition of it throughout their lives; those who are motivated by personal gain perhaps pursue it in relation to the office they hold. Power may cause one to believe he or she is above reproach, particularly as one's power

increases, perhaps leading to corruption, cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally. D. Kipnis notes, "Corruption can also refer to the way in which the control of power changes the power holder's self-perceptions and his perceptions of others."¹³ Concerns arise when those holding power believe they can influence others based on the power they hold. This can promote the belief in the power holder that he is superior in his views over those with less power (typically his subordinates), resulting in leaders behaving counter to their values and beliefs. The power holders may also be led to believe that they are special, particularly if their subordinates flatter them.¹⁴

Power can be abused when the power holder has a strong need for it and is in control of resources. According to Kipnis, (a) "with the control of resources goes increased temptation to influence others' behavior to satisfy personal wants; (b) if power holders use strong and controlling means of influence to satisfy these personal wants, and compliance follows, (c) there arises the belief that the behavior of the target person is not self-controlled but has been caused by the power holder; as a result (d) there is a devaluation of the target persons' abilities, and (e) the preference to maintain social and psychological distance from target person; (f) simultaneously the power holder's evaluation of himself changes so that he views himself more favorably than the target person."¹⁵

This has applications for the 1974 Zimbardo Stanford prison experiment, in which student volunteers acted as prisoners and prison guards (Zimbardo's choice of words; we prefer correctional officers) for five days. Those assigned to be correctional officers had the most dislike and lack of respect for those assigned to be compliant prisoners. As the officers' ability to control the prisoners increased due to compliance, rather than the officers liking the prisoners, the opposite occurred.¹⁶ "With regard to prisons, we can state that the mere act of assigning labels to people and putting them into a situation in which those labels acquire validity and meaning is sufficient to elicit pathological behavior."¹⁷ (To learn more about fostering a sense of personal responsibility in group members, please see Chapter 6.)

In the real world, supermax correctional facilities maintain total control over inmate movement. The actions of correctional officers are routinized in accordance with supermax rules:

Because guards are encouraged to punish, repress, and forcefully oppose—by virtue of the fact that they are provided with no alternative strategies for managing prisoners—they have no choice but to escalate the punishment when their treatment of prisoners fails to produce the desired results (as it frequently does). Of course, over time, the correctional staff becomes accustomed to inflicting a certain level of pain and degradation—it is the

essence of the regime that they control and whose mandates they implement. They naturally become desensitized to these actions and, in the absence of any alternative approaches (both the lack of conceptual alternatives or the means to implement them), they deliver more of the same.¹⁸

Regarding comments on moral disengagement, "Civilized conduct requires, in addition to humane personal codes, social systems that uphold compassionate behavior and renounce cruelty."¹⁹

MAINTAINING A POSITIVE AND SAFE ENVIRONMENT

One important responsibility of leadership is to address the potential for desensitization of the correctional staff to degrading and unnecessarily painful treatment. Leaders can do this through the use of training programs that educate staff about the potential for behavioral drift, when staff slide toward inappropriate and counterproductive activities, as well as using objective, trained observers (i.e., psychologists) to monitor correctional staff behavior.²⁰ In the wake of the abuse of detainees held at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, the U.S. military established behavioral science consultant teams (BSCT, referred to endearingly as "biscuit" teams) at most major detention facilities in Iraq and Afghanistan. Their primary purpose was to objectively observe the leadership and the guard forces to detect and report on any possible evidence of behavioral drift, or shift in climate where abuses could occur or even be condoned by leadership.

Individuals who feel powerful exhibit approach-related moods and emotions, focus on social rewards, and view others through a prism of how others could assist in satisfying their needs and wants. The powerful also often act in a less inhibited fashion. Less-powerful individuals experience more negative moods, attend to punishment rather than rewards, and inhibit their behavior.²¹ Leaders should use their personal power as much as they can to gain commitments from staff and inmates. Positional power is used when necessary, typically when personal power does not achieve the desired results. For a leader to successfully use personal power, he or she must understand the psychology of inmates.

Psychology of Inmates

As stated earlier, leading effectively in a confinement setting is complex because of the population of inmates being led. They are varied in their attitudes toward the institution, their experiences, their education levels, and their psychological health. A leader must consider not only how his or her actions

will influence the corrections staff, but also how they will, in turn, affect the inmates. A leader must cultivate a style that appropriately develops the leader-follower relationship with staff to produce the most effective interactions between the followers and their charges—the inmates.

Reason for Confinement. Perhaps the most salient difference among people who are confined or detained is the reason for their detention. The reasons can range from having been convicted of a property crime to having committed violent acts against other human beings. In the case of military detention centers in a war zone, detainees may simply have been identified as possibly posing a security risk, but are not necessarily guilty of having committed any crime. It seems obvious that reasons for confinement likely result in differences in psychology among those who are to be led and managed by the corrections staff.

The reason an individual is confined is sometimes an indication of the inmate's psychological makeup. There are marked psychological differences between people who are convicted of murder and cannibalism compared to those who are convicted of theft, burglary, or assault. Such differences can be presumed to be tied to behavior, attitudes, and motivational styles.²² Thus, they will respond differently to the confinement setting and the context set by leaders. A leader should not have high expectations of appealing to the humanity of someone convicted of a crime against human beings. On the other hand, inmates convicted of crimes against property might respond to a leader's personal power.²³

Education Level. Differences in education level can be seen as reflective of intelligence or sophistication or, perhaps more accurately and relevantly, as an indication of the communication styles and means that will be most effective with the population. Leaders must consider how to publish and implement policy, directives, or other programs.

Length of Confinement. Prisoners who are confined for much of their adult lives do not age like unbound individuals who have been subjected to the typical environmental stressors of life outside a penitentiary.²⁴ Thus one might surmise that those inmates who have been imprisoned at different stages in their lives and for different lengths of time will have different reactions to various leadership styles or methodologies.

Leaders can anticipate that there will be wide variation in attitudes toward the institution and leadership, as well as varying motives and motivation toward rehabilitation, depending on the length and age of confinement. For example, someone who is confined with a life sentence and no possibility

of parole might not be motivated to embrace the policies and restrictions of the system if he or she does not see a reason beyond possible release to conform and comply.

Anecdotal reporting from the USDB suggests that there is often disproportionate representation of life without parole inmates housed in disciplinary segregation because they commit higher instances of serious misconduct. Often, those who agree to carry out sanctioned retribution against others within the inmate's informal justice system are "lifers" because they have nothing to lose. By the same token, other prisoners in a similar situation might be motivated to conform or to take advantage of rehabilitation or other educational opportunities for the sake of self-improvement or some other motivation, even if they believe they can never hope for release. These individuals, and the largely unexplainable differences among them, influence the efficacy of different leadership styles.

Psychopathology. While being an inmate does not unilaterally imply that an individual has a psychological disorder, a significant percentage of the inmate population meets the diagnostic criteria for having one or more psychological disorders. In a review of 2004 data from the Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities and 2002 data from the Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, a 2006 report from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service notes that 73 percent of females and 55 percent of males have a mental health problem.²⁵ It is not clear whether these problems were preexistent. Within federal prisons, the incidence breaks down to 61 percent of females and 44 percent of males, and in local jails, 75 percent of females and 63 percent of males. According to the 2006 report, more than 33 percent of state prisoners with a mental health problem and more than 25 percent of federal prisoners with a mental health problem had received treatment since incarceration.²⁶

All of these variables come together to produce a complex picture for leaders. In addition to considering the motivations, education, and possible psychopathology of inmates, leaders must respond to public opinion about how they perform their jobs when local and national politics call into question their actions and decisions. In some ways it is helpful to think of leaders in this environment as being at the center of numerous intersecting circles, all of which exert some pressure on them and which leaders need to appropriately and effectively balance, all while maintaining a legal and ethical posture. Positive psychology and its associated concepts are useful constructs for conceptualizing the task of leading in captivity and maintaining the delicate balance it requires.

LEVERAGING POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY AND AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

Correctional leaders can positively influence their culture when they view stumbling blocks as stepping-stones, when they foster hope, confidence, resilience, and optimism, and when they are true to themselves and to others. In 1998, Martin Seligman, president of the American Psychological Association at the time, coined the term "positive psychology." He offered, "Positive psychology is an umbrella term for the study of positive emotions, positive character traits, and enabling institutions."²⁷ Positive psychology consists of positive experiences that look at joy and happiness, positive individual traits, such as character, and potentially positive institutions, like the workplace, families, and schools.²⁸

Positive psychology also opened the door for the exploration of positive organizational behavior (POB), which "applies positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed and managed for performance improvement in today's workplace."²⁹ Capacities of POB include hope, confidence, resilience, and optimism. These comprise what is termed psychological capital, or PsyCap.

Hope is "a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal-oriented energy) and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals)."³⁰ Individuals who have an abundance of hope are able to devise healthy ways to get the things they want.³¹ In the correctional arena, hope has important implications for the workforce and inmates, both of whom need to set goals and generate pathways for achieving them.

Confidence, or self-efficacy, is the "individual's conviction about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context."³² When staff and inmates work on building their confidence levels to achieve specific tasks, both the inmate and the organization will benefit. Confidence building can result in enhanced job performance inside the facility for both inmates and staff and perhaps assist the inmate in obtaining a possible early release and help a staff member get a promotion.

Resilience is one's ability to recover, or bounce back, from adverse situations, sometimes with even greater levels of performance. People with high levels of resilience learn along the way. Resiliency has three components: "staunch acceptance of reality; a deep belief, often reinforced by strongly held values, that life is meaningful; and an uncanny ability to improvise and adapt to significant change."³³ In confinement environments, one's ability to bounce back from episodes is critical for staff and inmates. Leaders need to constantly

monitor their well-being. Both are subject to a variety of trying circumstances, typically involving high levels of stress.

Optimism is the fourth component of psychological capital. People view both good and bad things that happen to them as either temporary or permanent. An optimist will look at a negative setback as temporary. A pessimist will view the negative occurrence as permanent. If an encounter or experience is good, the optimist will make a permanent attribution, but the pessimist sees the positive experience as only temporary.³⁴ According to Peterson and colleagues, "PsyCap is a critical component of what inspires and sustains follower motivation."³⁵ Leaders can help staff and inmates in self-discovery and ascertaining their potential by assisting them in setting stretch goals, talking optimistically about the future, being a role model, and focusing on the positive.

AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

Authentic leadership can be referenced to Greek philosophy, particularly, "To thine own self be true." Authentic leaders are true to themselves. Their beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors essentially model the way for their followers to become leaders. Authentic leaders are not overly concerned about their own self-interest. This type of leader believes in doing what's right, narrowing the gap between espoused values and values in action. He or she is aware of personal vulnerabilities and is comfortable speaking about them, models psychological capital components, leads from the front, is concerned for the development of followers, and handles moral concerns appropriately.³⁶

Authentic leaders are transparent. What you see is what you get. Their leadership incorporates elements of positive psychology (looking at people's strengths rather than weaknesses) and the components of psychological capital (hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism). Authentic leadership development is a "process that draws upon a leader's life course, psychological capital, moral perspective, and a 'highly developed' supporting organizational climate to produce even greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors, which in turn foster continuous, positive self-development resulting in veritable, sustained performance."³⁷

Key components that comprise authentic leadership development are self-awareness (personal insight), self-regulation (realizing where one is currently in relation to where one wants to go), balanced processing (the unbiased collection and the interpretation of self-related information, positive and negative), and relational transparency (openness and trust in relationships). Accordingly, authentic leaders function as a positive role model in the development of their subordinates.³⁸

Self-awareness is realized when people take the time to reflect through introspection and make sense and meaning of what's going on around them. Self-regulation involves internalized regulation (when one's regulatory system is self-driven as opposed to being led by external forces), balanced processing (the collection and sensemaking of information), authentic behavior (exhibited by one's core values and beliefs, not others'), and relational transparency (seeing through a leader because he or she is open and trusting with those in close relationships).³⁹

In an unpublished study focusing on a western state's department of corrections, the National Institute of Corrections Academy and the Gallup Leadership Institute found that followers of authentic leaders expressed 16.2 percent greater trust in their leader than followers of leaders deemed less authentic. This was associated with 7.1 percent lower intent to quit, 5.2 percent more citizenship/helping behavior, and 7.7 percent higher performance. These data suggest that perhaps attention be given to the delivery of programs that focus on the enhancement of authentic leadership development and psychological capital.

For correctional leaders to become authentic leaders, they need to act in ways consistent with their inner thoughts as well as feelings. They must also be transparent in their intentions. Furthermore, the values and behaviors they espouse should be the same as their real values and behaviors.⁴⁰ Being aware of one's power sources and bases and influence strategies, creating and maintaining psychological safety, looking for the good in the bad, developing psychological capital, and practicing authentic leadership, will take one far while leading in captive environments.

Leaders in confinement environments should heed advice to create a culture that perpetuates solid beliefs, attitudes, and values that encourage frank dialogue; squelch in-fighting and nurture trust among all who lead; behave in a fair, firm, and consistent way to become trustworthy; and identify the strengths of corrections staff and inmates and leverage those strengths. Finally, they should rely on trained, objective professionals to provide them with the feedback on the environment and how they are doing.⁴¹

KEY TAKE-AWAY POINTS

Good leaders and managers in captive environments should remember and strive to do the following:

1. Be firm, fair, and consistent with staff and inmates.
2. Build a culture that brings alive its mission, vision, core values, and goals.

3. Be true to oneself and to others.
4. Be a "people developer."
5. Realize that inmates are people too and treat them with respect.
6. Create and sustain trust and promote psychological safety.
7. Create positive leader-follower relationships.
8. Become a lifelong learner.

KEY REFERENCES

- Edmonson, A. C. "Psychological Safety, Trust, and Learning in Organizations: A Group-Level Lens." In *Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches*, ed. R. M. Kramer and K. S. Cook, 239–272. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004.
- Gardner, W. L., et al. "'Can you see the real me?' A Self-Based Model of Authentic Leader and Follower Development." *Leadership Quarterly* 16 (2005): 343–372.
- Hannah, S. T., et al. "Leadership Efficacy: Review and Future Directions." *Leadership Quarterly* 19 (2008): 669–692.
- Luthans, F., and B. J. Avolio. "Authentic Leadership Development." In *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*, ed. K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, and R. E. Quinn. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2003.
- Seligman, M. E. P., et al. "Positive Psychology Progress: Empirical Validation of Interventions." *American Psychologist* 60, no. 5 (2005): 410–421.

NOTES

The thoughts in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the U.S. Department of Justice or the U.S. Department of Defense.

1. S. Stojkovic and M. A. Farkas, *Correctional Leadership: A Cultural Perspective* (Belmont, Calif.: Thomson/Wadsworth, 2003).
2. M. Brown and D. R. Beto, "Effective Correctional Leadership for the 21st Century," *Corrections Management Quarterly* 3, no. 1 (1999).
3. P. M. Carlson and J. S. Garrett, *Prison and Jail Administration: Practice and Theory* (Gaithersburg, Md.: Aspen Publishers, 1999), 28.
4. B. J. Avolio, *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1999).
5. B. M. Bass and B. J. Avolio, *Training Full Range Leadership* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Mind Garden, 1999).
6. D. A. Hofmann, F. P. Morgeson, and S. J. Gerrass, "Climate as a Moderator of the Relationship between Leader-Member Exchange and Content Specific Citizenship: Safety Climate as an Exemplar," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88 (2003): 170–178.
7. A. C. Edmonson, "Psychological Safety, Trust, and Learning in Organizations: A Group-Level Lens," in *Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches*,

- ed. R. M. Kramer and K. S. Cook (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004), 239–272.
8. A. Edmondson, "Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44 (1999): 350–383.
9. R. Kark and A. Carmeli, "Alive and Creating: The Mediating Role of Vitality and Aliveness in the Relationship between Psychological Safety and Creative Work Involvement," *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 30 (2009): 785–804.
10. Robert Mayer, James Davis, and F. David Schoorman, "An Integrative Model of Organization Trust," *Academy of Management Review* 20, no. 3 (1995): 709–734.
11. P. J. Sweeney, V. Thompson, and H. Blanton, "Trust and Influence in Combat: An Interdependence Model," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 39 (2009): 235–264.
12. D. Keltner, C. Anderson, and D. H. Gruenfeld, "Power, Approach, and Inhibition," *Psychological Review* 110, no. 2 (2003): 265–284.
13. D. Kipnis, "Does Power Corrupt?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 24, no. 1 (1972): 33–41.
14. H. H. Brower et al., "A Closer Look at Trust between Managers and Subordinates: Understanding the Effects of Both Trusting and Being Trusted on Subordinate Outcomes," *Journal of Management* 35 (2009): 327.
15. D. Kipnis, *The Powerholders* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976).
16. P. Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil* (New York: Random House, 2007).
17. P. Zimbardo, "Pathology of Imprisonment," *Society* 9, no. 6 (1972): 4–8.
18. C. Haney, "A Culture of Harm: Taming the Dynamics of Cruelty in Supermax Prisons," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 35 (2008): 956.
19. A. Bandura, "Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement," in *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of Mind*, ed. W. Reich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
20. S. Behnke, "Ethics and Interrogations: Comparing and Contrasting the American Psychological, American Medical and American Psychiatric Association Positions," *American Psychologist* 37, no. 7 (2006): 66.
21. J. Brehm, and S. Gates, "Supervisors as Trust Brokers in Social-Work Bureaucracies," in *Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches*, ed. R. M. Kramer and K. S. Cook (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004).
22. A. Raine, *The Psychopathology of Crime: Criminal Behavior as a Clinical Disorder* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1993).
23. H. J. Eysenck, "Personality and Crime," in *Psychopathy: Antisocial, Criminal, and Violent Behavior*, ed. T. Millon et al. (New York: Guildford Press, 1998), 40–49.
24. M. B. Reed and F. D. Glamser, "Aging in Total Institution: The Case of Older Prisoners," *Gerontologist* 19 (1979): 354–360.
25. D. J. James and L. E. Glaze, "Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates," U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006, <http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=235099>.
26. Eysenck, "Personality and Crime."

27. M. E. P. Seligman et al., "Positive Psychology Progress: Empirical Validation of Interventions," *American Psychologist* 60, no. 5 (2005): 410–421.
28. M. E. P. Seligman, *Authentic Happiness* (New York: Free Press, 2002).
29. F. Luthans and C. M. Youssef, "Human, Social, and Now Positive Psychological Capital Management," *Organizational Dynamics* 33, no. 2 (2004): 143–160.
30. C. Snyder, L. M. Irving, and S. A. Anderson, "Hope and Health: Measuring the Will and the Ways," in *Handbook of Social and Clinical Psychology: The Health Perspective*, ed. C. R. Snyder and D. R. Forsyth (Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon, 1991), 285–305.
31. Seligman et al., "Positive Psychology Progress."
32. A. D. Stajkovic and F. Luthans, "Self-Efficacy and Work-Related Performance: A Meta-analysis," *Psychological Bulletin* 124, no. 2 (1998): 240–261.
33. Seligman et al., "Positive Psychology Progress."
34. Eysenck, "Personality and Crime."
35. S. J. Peterson et al., "Neuroscientific Implications of Psychological Capital: Are the Brains of Optimistic, Hopeful, Confident, and Resilient Leaders Different?" *Organizational Dynamics* 37, no. 4 (2008): 342–353.
36. F. Luthans and B. J. Avolio, "Authentic Leadership Development," in *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*, ed. K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, and R. E. Quinn (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2003). On leadership efficacy, see S. T. Hannah et al., "Leadership Efficacy: Review and Future Directions," *Leadership Quarterly* 19 (2008): 669–692. Leadership efficacy is "a specific form of efficacy associated with the level of confidence in the knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with leading others. It can thus be clearly differentiated from confidence in the knowledge, skills, and abilities one holds associated with other social roles such as a teacher (i.e., teacher efficacy)."
37. B. J. Avolio and F. Luthans, *The High Impact Leader: Moments Matter in Accelerating Authentic Leadership* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006).
38. W. L. Gardner, "'Can you see the real me?' A Self-Based Model of Authentic Leader and Follower Development," *Leadership Quarterly* 16 (2005): 343–372.
39. R. Ilies, F. P. Morgeson, and J. D. Nahrgang, "Authentic Leadership and Eudemonic Well-Being: Understanding Leader-Follower Outcomes," *Leadership Quarterly* 16 (2005): 373–394.
40. S. Michie and J. Gooty, "Values, Emotions, and Authenticity: Will the Real Leader Please Stand Up?" *Leadership Quarterly* 16 (2005): 441–457.
41. The authors would like to thank Craig Crossley, a member of the Gallup Leadership Institute team involved in the western state department of corrections study, for providing us data regarding the outcomes of authentic leadership.