Impact of Organizational Structure in Corrections: Recommendations for Correctional Leaders

Approved: Dr. Nancy Gartner Date: December 17, 2018

Impact of Organizational Structure in Corrections: Recommendations for Correctional Leaders

A Seminar Paper

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty

University of Wisconsin-Platteville

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Criminal Justice

By

Kristen O'Hare

December 2018

Acknowledgements

I am not sure why I waited so long to further my education and earn a Master's Degree. This has been a challenging and rewarding experience. I have only grown stronger and more confident with my knowledge and work experience. I look forward to what the future may bring.

I would like to thank my husband, Cody, for encouraging me to go back to school and picking up the extra slack around the house. Thanks to my little girls, Brecklyn and Piper for understanding that mommy couldn't always play!

Thanks to my work supervisors and co-workers who have inspired and supported me in continuing my education.

Thanks to all the staff and professors at University of Wisconsin-Platteville for sharing their knowledge with me. Special thanks to Dr. Nancy Gartner for guiding me through this process and showing positive support.

Abstract

Impact of Organizational Structure in Corrections: Recommendations for Correctional Leaders

Kristen O'Hare

Under the Supervision of Dr. Nancy Gartner

Statement of Problem

Research has shown that staff burnout is high among correctional workers. Keinan and Malach-Pines (2007) conducted a study that reported correctional employees have a higher level of burnout than the general population; even higher levels than law enforcement. Burnout has negative effects on both the employee and the organization. On an individual level, employees experience greater health risks and familial problems. Correctional officers, in comparison to other occupations, spend 40 percent more days away from work due to injury or illness, have a suicide rate twice the general population, and a shorter life expectancy by 12-16 years (Stelter, 2017).

Burnout can cause a decrease in quality work performance and others to withdraw from their jobs. This can pose serious and detrimental effects on the institutional operations and safety of both staff and incarcerated individuals. On an organizational level, burnout leads to higher rates of absenteeism, turnover, and poor work performance. Costs to the institution can include sick pay, benefits, overtime, and an erosion of productivity (Lambert, 2001). The impact to the remaining workforce can include loss of expertise, increased mandatory overtime, and low morale (Lambert, 2001).

Stress is the biggest contributor to burnout (Maslach, 2003). Lambert, Hogan, and Allen (2006), indicate that prolonged job stress is damaging to employees, employee families,

incarcerated individuals, the organization, and society. There are many contributing factors to stress for correctional employees including task, organizational, external, environmental, and personal factors. Often, the perceived dangerousness of the job and frequent contact with inmates is regarded as causing the most stress. However, research has linked correctional job stress to organizational structure and related job characteristics (Lambert et al, 2006; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006.) Several studies have pointed to job characteristics found in and of the organizational structure to play a role in job stress (Lambert et al., 2006; Lambert, Hogan, Cheeseman, & Barton-Bellessa, 2013; Slate, Vogel, & Johnson, 2001). To mitigate job stressors related to the organizational structure, correctional agencies will need to make organizational changes.

Methods of Approach

This paper will utilize secondary research and empirical evidence gathered from scholarly journals, course textbooks, and respected internet sites relating to correctional burnout, stress, organizational structure, and best leadership and management practices. The literature collected is used to identify sources of organizational stress related to job characteristics and organizational structure of a correctional agency. The research will assist in examining different theoretical perspectives; as well as, leadership styles and management practices that correctional agencies can use to mitigate stress that is influenced by the organization.

Summary of Results

Correctional employees who experiences constant organizational stressors caused by the organizational structure are more likely to experience burnout. Burnout can be costly to both the employee and the organization. Research has indicated that employees experience less stress if they are able to participate in decision making, experience effective communication, and allowed

job autonomy. An employee's level of organizational stress is inversely related to how much input into decisions that directly affect their daily job tasks and how well they know what is expected of them to perform those job tasks.

The literature identified both feedback and participation as two important tools an organization can utilize in reducing employee job stress. The use of participative management styles and 360-degree feedback loops will help encourage employee participation in instrumental communication and decision making. The result of involving employees in these process helps facilitate empowerment and commitment to the organization.

Leadership is the last piece of the puzzle. Leaders play a vital role in influencing the organizational culture and facilitating the change. This paper recommends that management needs to take a transformative approach following, *The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership* (e.g. modeling the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart). This type of leadership will help enable the use of participative management and 360-degree feedback to create an organizational structure that creates less organizational stress for employees.

Table of Contents

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	i
TITLE PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
SECTIONS	
I. Introduction	1
a. Statement of Problem	1
b. Significance of the Study	2
c. Purpose of the Study	3
d. Method of Approach	3
e. Contributions	4
II. Literature Review	5
a. Organizational Stress	5
b. Organizational Structure	8
i. Centralization	9
ii. Integration	10
iii. Organizational Justice	10
iv. Instrumental Communication	11
c. Importance of Change and Leadership	15
i. Feedback	16

ii. Participation 18

iii. Leadership 19

III. Theoretical Framework 20

a. Organizational Theory 20

i. Organizational Behavior 20

ii. Closed Systems 21

1. Scientific Management 22

2. Bureaucratic Management 23

iii. Open Systems 24

1. Hawthorne Effect 25

2. Total Quality management 25

b. Leadership Theory 26

i. Path Goal Theory 27

ii. Transformational Leadership 28

IV. Methods 31

V. Recommendations 32

a. Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership 32

i. Modeling the Way 33

ii. Inspire a Shared Vision 33

iii. Challenge the Process 33

iv. Enable Others to Act 34

v. Encourage the Heart 34

b. Participative Management 35

c. 360 Degree Feedback 36

VI. Conclusion 38

VII. References 40

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

Impact of Organizational Structure in Corrections: Recommendations for Correctional Leaders

Statement of Problem

Research has shown that staff burnout is high among correctional workers. Keinan and Malach-Pines (2007) conducted a study that reported correctional employees have a higher level of burnout than the general population; even higher levels than law enforcement. Burnout has negative effects on both the employee and the organization. On an individual level, employees experience greater health risks and familial problems. Correctional officers, in comparison to individuals in other occupations, spend 40 percent more days away from work due to injury or illness, have a suicide rate twice that of general population, and a shorter life expectancy than the general population by 12-16 years (Stelter, 2017).

Burnout can cause a decrease in quality work performance and others to withdraw from their jobs. This can pose serious and detrimental effects on the institutional operations and safety of both staff and incarcerated individuals (Lambert, Hogan, & Allen, 2006). On an organizational level, burnout leads to higher rates of absenteeism, turnover, and poor work performance. Costs to the institution can include sick pay, benefits, overtime, and an erosion of productivity. Camp and Lambert (2006) reported that employees account for at least 70% of operating costs in corrections. The impact to the remaining correctional workforce can include loss of expertise, increased mandatory overtime, and low morale (Lambert, 2001).

Stress is the biggest contributor to burnout (Maslach, 2003). Lambert et al. (2006), indicate that prolonged job stress is damaging to an employee's health, employee's family,

incarcerated individuals, the organization, and society. In the workplace, there are two types of stress: occupational and organizational. Occupational stressors often relate to operational responsibilities and experiences that are inherent to the nature of the work (Acquardo Maran, Zedda, & Varetto, 2018). In corrections, exposure to violence and suffering, use of force, and preserving safety and security of self and others are examples of occupational stress inherent to the work. Organizational stressors are more intrinsic to the nature of the organization and the administrative procedure (Acquardo Maran et al., 2018). Examples of organizational stressors can be favoritism, unjust procedures and discipline, lack of autonomy, and poor management and leadership.

Occupational stressors often receive more attention in the literature as it relates to stress and burnout in correctional employees. Although the perceived dangerousness and frequent contact with incarcerated individuals is a part of the daily work environment, the experience of traumatic events are often irregular. On the other hand, organizational stressors exist daily. Research is now showing that there is a correlation between organizational stress in corrections to the organizational structure (Lambert et al., 2006; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006). Several studies have pointed to job characteristics found in the organizational structure to play a role in job stress (Lambert et al., 2006; Lambert, Hogan, Cheeseman, & Barton-Bellessa, 2013; Slate, Vogel, & Johnson, 2001). To mitigate organizational stressors associated with the organizational structure, correctional agencies need to make organizational changes.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this paper is to show that correctional agencies can play a bigger role in reducing organizational stressors. Correctional agencies regularly offer their employees

education and assistance programs to reduce or manage stress on an individual level. Organizations approach employee stress and burnout as an employee centered problem rather than blaming the work environment (Maslach 2003). This practice is reactionary and does not work toward eliminating the effects of stress. Instead, correctional agencies need to take initiative in making organizational changes to reduce and manage organizational related stress.

Purpose of the Study

Current research and recommendations on reducing employee burnout through organizational change has been limited. The purpose of the research is to make correctional agencies aware of how their organizational structure can contribute to an employee's organizational stress, resulting in burnout. Through the research and recommendations, correctional agencies will have a better understanding of how to take a more hands on approach of reducing organizational stress through organizational change.

First, this paper will focus on identifying the components and characteristics of organizational structure and how they contribute to an employee's organizational stress. Next it will examine the leadership theoretical framework that exists in the workplace. Lastly, the study will identify, examine, and encourage agencies to utilize different leadership and/or management strategies that can help correctional agencies alleviate stress inducing factors related to the organizational structure of the agency.

Method of Approach

This paper will utilize secondary research and empirical evidence gathered from scholarly journals, course textbooks, and respected internet sites relating to correctional burnout, stress, organizational structure, and best leadership and management practices. The literature

collected is used to identify sources of organizational stress found within an organizational structure of a correctional agency. The research will assist in examining different theoretical perspectives; as well as, leadership styles and management practices that correctional agencies can use to mitigate organizational stress and reduce staff burnout.

Contributions

This seminar paper will contribute to the field of criminal justice administration, specific to corrections. This paper should be a guide to correctional agencies on how to aid the reduction of employee burnout by mitigating organizational stress caused by organizational structure. The review of effective leadership styles and management practices will give agencies a proactive jump on making organizational changes.

SECTION II: LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review will contain three sections. The first section will define what organizational stress is and how it effects an organization. The second section will define organizational structure and how the organizational structure in corrections impacts correctional employee stress. The third section will explore the importance on creating change within the organizational structure and leadership development.

Organizational Stress

Before identifying organizational stress in corrections, it is important to understand the definition of stress and the impact it can have on a person. Stress is often caused by the response a person has toward physical or psychological stimulus. That person's adaptive response can be qualitative or quantitative (Griffin, Phillips, & Gully, 2015). Stress is often difficult to measure because each person may experience and perceive stress differently.

Not all sources of stress produce negative outcomes. Two types of stress are eustress and distress. Eustress is often considered a more positive form of stress. The results of this type of stress are often more gratifying (Griffin et al., 2015). This type of stress motivates employees to continue or increase productive job performance. Distress is often unpleasant and follows negative events or experiences (Griffin et al., 2015). This is the type of stress that can produce dangerous side effects.

Another important identifier of stress is acute and chronic. The difference between acute and chronic can be identified by the onset and duration of stress. Stress that comes on quickly for a short amount of time is considered acute. In corrections, acute stress can be contributed to an employee responding to an altercation or medical emergency. In contrast, chronic stress

occurs over time and is routinely experienced (Stinchcomb, 2004). This type of stress can be a result of the perceived dangerousness of working in corrections or influenced by the management style of a supervisor.

Literature reports that correctional employees experience high rates of stress resulting in burnout. Most of the literature focuses on occupational type stressors as being a strong indicator of stress. Occupational stressors often relate to operational responsibilities and experiences that are characteristic to the nature of work (Acquardo Maran et al., 2018). In corrections, exposure to violence and suffering, use of force, and preserving safety and security of self and others are examples of occupational stressors found in the workplace. For as long as corrections continues to incarcerate un-willing participants, these occupational stressors will continue to persist.

A growing topic in research, and a focus of this paper, is the impact of organizational stressors in corrections. Organizational stressors are more intrinsic to the nature of the organization and the administrative procedure (Acquardo Maran et al., 2018). Role and interpersonal demands of the job contribute to organizational stress.

Role demands are characteristics associated with a specific position within an organization. Employees who perceive their role expectations differently than management may experience role conflict. Role ambiguity occurs when an employee is not given enough information regarding duties and responsibilities (Lambert, Cluse-Tolar, & Hogan, 2007). Role Stress is often induced when an employee is faced with contradictory, conflicting, and vague expectiations (Stojkovic, Kalinich, & Klofas , 2015). Officers who are conflicted about their role in relation to organizational goals may feel stress resulting in a more punitive attitude toward incarcerated individuals (Farkas, 2001).

Interpersonal demands are connected to the relationships between peers, leadership and personal conflict (Griffin et al., 2015). Employees who do not perceive they are making an impact on others are left feeling incompetent (Lambert, 2010). Employees often experience organizational stress when the organizational structure does not allow them to partipate or demands servitude toward organizational needs (Griffin et al., 2015).

Organizations can suffer directly or indirectly from employee stress (Griffin et al., 2015). Prolonged stress and overwhelming demands can cause an employee to experience burnout. Burnout often refers to an emotional exhaustion of feeling drained, fatigued, and overextended (Griffin et al., 2015; Lambert, 2010). Keinan and Malach-Pines (2007) reported correctional employees have higher levels of burnout than the general population. Burnout not only effects the employee and their family but it effects the organization.

As more employees experience stress and burnout, the correctional organization will begin to see a drop in performance and an increase in absenteeism; resulting in voluntary and involuntary turnover. Lack of productivity and withdrawal from their jobs can present serious effects on the safety of institutional operations. A reduction in job performance in correction would mean employees are not doing security checks, missing deadlines, not caring, and taking longer breaks. Employees report becoming impersonal, callous, and treating incarcerated individuals as objects (Lambert, 2010).

Absenteeism and turnover begin to occur in an organization as employees struggle to cope with stress. According to Slate et al. (2001) 50% of absences from work and 40% of job turnover is stress related. In corrections, the reported rate of annual turnover is between 16.2 %

and 40% (Jurik & Winn 1987). A shortage of staff resources impact both the institution's and staff's ability to accomplish organizational goals (Lambert, Hogan, Griffin, & Kelley, 2015).

Employees are a valuable resource to an organization. In corrections, employees account for 70% of the annual operating costs (Lambert, et al., 2015). The personal effects of stress on employees can be detrimental to the costs of an organization. Employees can develop health related issues induced by stress. The increase in costs related to health care, disability, worker compensation, and sick leave can be damaging effects to an organization (Slate et al., 2001).

Organizational Structure

An organization is defined as a cohesive group of individuals working collaboratively to achieve common goals and objectives (McGovern, 1999) and share common visions, missions, & values (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). In corrections, the common mission and goals are to keep the public safe and rehabilitate incarcerated individuals. Organizations consist of owners, managers, members of the rank and file, clients, and public (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). In corrections, the institution is owned publicly or privately, and the employees of rank and file serve both the incarcerated individual (clients) and the public. In contrast to business organizations, correctional agencies are not involved in the production of goods or services to willing customers (Lambert, 2010).

The structure of an organization is made up of different functions that work toward the goal of the agency (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Together organizational structure is the formal system used to control, direct, manage, and influence employees (Lambert et al., 2006; Griffin et al., 2015). Organizational structure affects the performance of the employees by influencing

positive working relationships and can impact an employee's satisfaction and commitment to the organization (Griffin et al., 2015).

Examining the impacts of an organizational structure is important. An organizational structure exists throughout the entire work environment of an organization (Lambert et al., 2006). In corrections, there are various departments and positions found within the organization. Each department or position may have job characteristics that employees my experience relative to their role within the organization. However, those characteristics are not always fluid within the entire organization (Lambert et al., 2006).

This paper will look to examine four functions of organizational structure identified in a study by Lambert et al. (2006) within corrections as they impact employee organizational stress. The four functions are centralization, instrumental communication, integration, and organizational justice.

Centralization

Within corrections, the organizational structure is often centralized. According to Allen & Sawhney (2015), the authority of the organization is at the top of the hierarchy. Typically, corrections take on a paramilitary hierarchy structure. Taking a top down approach, decision making and communication trickle down from management to line staff on how to perform tasks and changes to policy or procedure. In a centralized structure, employees may desire more job autonomy, the power to self-govern (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Employees who desire more control over their position within an organization desire the ability to make decisions that affect both the organization and their own job (Lambert et al., 2006). At times the function of a

centralized structure may conflict with an employee's personal demand for autonomy within their position.

Integration

Within an organization there are different departments and positions. Each department and position contribute to the main objectives and mission of the organization. Integration refers to the solidity among departments, work groups, and positions within an organization (Lambert et al., 2006). Instrumental communication can be effective in integrating different departments and employees together; thus, creating a more enjoyable work environment. However, Lambert et al. (2006) report that minimal integration within an organization allows for different departments and employees to compete and create an 'us vs them' type of work environment. Failed integration within correctional departments can exist between security and treatment or security and medical.

Organizational justice

Organizational justice refers to how an employee views the legitimacy of the organization (Lambert et al., 2006). Procedural and distributive justice are two types of justice found within an organizational structure. Distributive justice often refers to the fairness of how procedural outcomes are perceived after the decision process is over; whereas, the procedural justice refers to process in how the outcome was generated (Griffin et al., 2015). Employees often determine fairness of outcomes regarding promotions, hiring, termination, discipline, and raises based on the procedure the organization used to make the decision. Employees want to see what rules

were followed and whether they were given a chance to express their opinion on the matter (Griffin et al., 2015).

Lambert et al. (2006) report that procedural justice had more of an impact on employee perceptions than distributive justice. Employees are okay with the outcomes if they perceive the organization was fair and just in following procedure. Low procedural fairness will increase negative outcomes in work performance because employees will predict their future within the organization based on the perceptions of current decision-making processes (Griffin et al., 2015).

Instrumental communication

Instrumental communication is another element of organizational structure that is often intertwined among other functions. Communication provides important information to employees throughout the organization. Information can be both general and specific as it relates to an employee's tasks, job, process, expectations, issues, and concerns; as well as, organizational goals, values, missions, and visions (Lambert et al., 2006). In addition to giving and receiving information, instrumental communication is explaining and answering questions effectively for employees to perform their job (Lambert, Hogan, Barton, & Clark, 2002).

Ineffective communication can have a negative impact on employees. Lambert et al. (2013) reported that correctional staff felt less connected with their job if they perceive conflicting demands, orders, and directions. For an employee to be an effective member of the organization they require instrumental communication to complete their jobs (Lambert et al., 2006).

Lambert and associates have taken the lead on research regarding employee stress and organizational structure. Lambert et al. (2002) studied the impact of instrumental communication and integration on correctional staff. The results of the study indicated integration and instrumental communication played a vital role in organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Staff who experience job satisfaction and commitment to their position and organization often experience fewer negative effects of stress.

Integration and instrumental communication often work hand in hand. Correctional employees want to work in a cooperative, not competitive, environment. Instrumental communication is useful in creating a cooperative environment by relating critical and useful information to employees (Lambert et al., 2002).

Lambert et al. (2002) attribute higher levels of job commitment and satisfaction to the level of involvement employees have in decision making and departments working as teams. However, the centralized, rank and file hierarchy can often limit employee participating in decision making. The philosophy of, 'need to know', often accompanies the rank and file hierarchy of disseminating information from the top down, often leaving lower level correctional employees out of the loop (Lambert et al., 2002). Employees who perceive a lack of communication and participation in decision making may begin to experience dissatisfaction leading to stress.

Another study by Lambert et al. (2006) focused specifically on the impacts organizational structure had on correctional job stress. In this study, centralization and integration had less correlation with job stress than instrumental communication and organizational justice. Regarding centralization, employees perceived more job stress with lack

of autonomy, than low input into decision making. Employees only experience more job stress when they lack input into decisions that directly affects their ability to carry out their daily job tasks (Lambert et al., 2006).

Integration was shown to have little impact on correctional employee stress. Lambert et al. (2006) suggested that employees are more concerned with completing their daily job tasks than integration between departments and work groups. Employees seem to be unaware of the negative impacts a lack of integration and input into decision-making can have in the long run (Lambert et al., 2006).

Like the previous study, instrumental communication plays an integral role in an employee's work environment. Employees want to know what is expected of them, changes in policy, and procedures as it relates to their job duties. Results indicated that instrumental communication is inversely related to an employee's job stress (Lambert et al., 2006). Employees who are provided contradicting and ambiguous information will lead to frustration and stress (Lambert et al., 2007)

Of organizational justice, Lambert et al. (2006) found that procedural justice had more impact on job stress than distributive justice. Procedural justice relates to the process of decisions and distributive justice relates to the outcomes. With distributive justice, the outcome is done. As it relates to unfairness, employees appear to be more concerned with the process of arriving to the outcome (Lambert et al., 2006).

Lambert, Hogan, and Jiang (2010) researched the relationship organizational structure had on emotional burnout. Similarly, to the previous studies, instrumental communication and

decision making had a significant relationship to burnout among correctional employees than integration. Correctional employees who lack clarity in their job tasks begin to experience feelings of frustration that can wear on them emotionally over time.

Together, instrumental communication and decision making can help correctional employees feel that they belong and are valued by the organization. Employees who do not feel they are an important part of an organization often feel powerless and helpless. Both feelings of powerlessness and helplessness lead to burnout. Decision-making gives employees a voice in the organizational process that builds a level of appreciation and trust by the organization (Lambert et al., 2010).

Again, integration failed to show a significant association with burnout. Stress reduction strategies have often suggested social support to cope and deal with stressors that can lead to burnout. Lambert et al. (2010) suggest that integration in a correctional organization may not lead to social support. Employees understand the importance of having cohesion between work groups but creating feelings of social support requires a level of trust and intimacy. However, employees may feel a stronger need to have support from their supervisors than their co-workers to avoid burnout (Lambert et al., 2010).

A review of the literature demonstrates there are components of an organizational structure in corrections that can lead to stress resulting in burnout. The centralized structure of most correctional organizations limits the autonomy and input into decision making an employee has over their position within the organization. Instrumental communication is not only necessary in delivering information from the top-down but in developing positive working relationships between supervisors and line staff. Effective communication helps build trust and

appreciation. Instrumental communication and decision making also play a vital role in the perception of organizational justice. Employees experience more frustration and stress when the procedural process of outcomes seems unfair. Employees want an opportunity to have their voice heard.

Integration has shown to have a positive effect on an employee's job satisfaction; however, little support has been shown that a lack of integration increases an employee's level of stress. Employee's recognize the importance of cohesiveness but seem to be more concerned with completing their individual job tasks. It is possible that there is a relationship between integration and job stress that has not been identified yet. Further research is needed.

Importance of Change and Leadership

Organizations approach employee stress and burnout as an employee centered problem (Maslach 2003). However, research has indicated that the organizational structure impacts an employee's stress and the result of that stress impacts the organization. Therefore, the organization should help lower levels of organizational stress it helped create and help employees function more effectively (Griffin et al., 2015). Making organizational changes will not eliminate all stress found within the workplace; but they can play a more integral role in reducing organizational stress.

Considering most correctional institutions have a centralized structure. Decision-making often occurs top-down with little to no reciprocity from line staff employees. Lambert et al. (2010), suggest that organizations who utilize effective instrumental communication and encourage correctional employees to have input into decision-making see greater success for the

organization and employee. Allowing employees to have input into decision making gives the employee a sense of control over their position and future within the organization. Farkas (2001) indicates that employees who are adequately informed on workplace concerns and given an opportunity to participate in decisions making processes, have better work productivity.

Employees want to know their expectations and role within the correctional organization. Management of correctional organizations need to deliver clear and concise information, not unclear and/or conflicting orders, directions, directives or tasks (Lambert et al., 2007). For the success of the organization and the employee, an effective method of communication to ensure all members of an organization are on the same page. The literature has identified feedback and participation as two important roles in reducing correctional employee job stress. Effective use of feedback and participation can increase instrumental communication and decision-making. Allowing employees to provide feedback and participate in the organization will facilitate a sense of empowerment and belonging with the organization.

Additionally, to make effective changes within an organization you need someone to lead and inspire others to follow. Allen & Sawhney (2015) state that leaders play a crucial role in influencing the organizational culture. If a change is needed, then the organization is going to invest in leaders who can help facilitate the process.

Feedback

Feedback is important to an organization because it helps improve communication, enhance quality of service, and allows employees to appeal grievances. Feedback can be used as a tool to measure the success of communication through understanding and clarification (Griffin

et al., 2015). Feedback allows for management to gather information and analyze and change processes as necessary. In organizations, feedback is often used to measure the success of outputs such as, products or services (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Regarding a reduction of employee stress, management can use feedback to help diagnose and solve organizational problems.

In a centralized structure, communication flows through the chain of command. In corrections the flow of communication often flows in one direction, top down. Each time information is passed down, 25% of the information is lost (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Without feedback, management cannot measure the effectiveness of the process, ensure the intended messages were received, or allow employees to air grievances. Thus, the need for two-way communication or upward communication (Allen & Sawhney, 2015; Griffin et al., 2015). Management that allows feedback has communication that can travel up and down the organizational hierarchy.

Lambert et al., (2007) reported feedback on job performance reduced correctional employee stress. Contradicting and ambiguous information can cause frustration for employees. Without feedback, management is unable to check whether information was received or interpreted correctly by employees. The more clear and concise information is delivered and received the less stress experienced by employees (Lambert et al., 2007).

Additionally, employees are more likely to feel support from management if they are provided with frequent feedback. Employees found their job to be more difficult and frustrating without meaningful feedback (Lambert et al., 2007). Feedback offers employees guidance and

support for how well they are performing. For greater success organizations need to explore different methods of improving feedback for employees.

Participation

Participation within an organization is about giving an employee a voice in making decisions that affect their own work. Rather than having management tell employees how to do their job they can ask for input (Griffin et al., 2015). Participation allows for an organization to show value in their employees through policies that encourage fair treatment and contribution of employee opinions (Baker, Gordon, & Taxman, 2015).

According to Slate et al. (2001), an organization that creates an atmosphere where the opinions of employees are valued in the decision-making process are less likely to have employees quit. Greater participation into decision-making may increase job autonomy, reduce job stress, and burnout (Farkas, 2001; Lambert et al., 2015).

Participation into decision making can help reduce organizational problems related to resistance, control and power. When implementing change, giving employees the opportunity to participate provides them a sense of power and control over their future in the workplace (Griffin et al., 2015). It is important to recognize, that not every decision needs employee input; however, when employee input into policy issues can greatly affect their work environment, it is reasonable and beneficial to do so (Slate et al., 2001).

Leadership

Members of management help create, maintain, protect, and perpetuate the current system. When trying to integrate change to an organizational structure, management needs leaders who can facilitate and rally employees toward change (Stojkovic et al., 2015). Leadership can be both informal and formal. Informal leaders have no authority only personal influence and formal leaders have authority bestowed upon them by the organization. Successful leaders in management can influence others by using both informal and formal aspects of leadership (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

Leadership development is important to creating organizational changes because management needs to create positive relationships with employees that build trust and support. These relationships help leaders unite and motivate employees toward a shared values and visions. Lambert et al. (2009) reported that individual supervisors not supervisory structures were relevant to stress. Employees experienced less stress if their supervisor was more approachable and pleasant, despite the supervisory structure.

SECTION III: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section of the paper will look at the theoretical considerations for understanding the relationship between the organizational structure and its employees. The impact leadership can have on meeting employee needs. The first part of this section will focus on organization theory as a concept and examine organizational models that influence today's correctional organizations. The second part of this section will look at leadership theory in relation to leadership development and identified two specific theories, path-goal leadership and transformational leadership.

Organizational Theory

When studying the impact of an organizational structure it is important to understand the relationship between the organization and its members. According to Allen and Sawhney (2015), organizational theory is the study of patterns and trends in organizational design and behavior in an organization. Understanding the concepts of organizational theory will provide a better understanding of the impact organizational design has on the behavior and function of the organization and its members. The first part of this section will examine organizational behavior. While, the second half will examine the organizational designs regarding closed and open systems.

Organizational Behavior

Organizational behavior is a part of organizational theory that focuses on the study of human behavior within the organizational setting, the relationship between the human behavior and the organization, and the behavior of the organization itself. The impact an organization has on an individual cannot be considered without considering the influence the individual has on the

organization (Griffin et al., 2015). Individuals come into organizations with their own personal characteristics, experiences, and backgrounds that influence the organization. Over time, the organization may begin to influence or change an individual's personal characteristics and experiences based on contact with managers, coworkers, and formal policies and procedures of the organization (Griffin et al., 2015).

Understanding organizational behavior is important for administrators. Management in organizations have a powerful influence over employees and the success of their organization. Companies with effective organizational behavior concepts and models will see more success with employees who are motivated and engaged with clear, communicated goals; compared to unhappy employees with role conflict and weak leadership (Griffin et al., 2015).

There are various models theorists' use to characterize an organization. Most models can be classified as a closed system or open system. Closed systems focus on internal events when explaining an organizations actions and behavior; whereas, an open system focuses on events occurring externally to the organization that may influence changes within the organization (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

Closed-Systems

Closed systems take on a more classical approach to organizational theories. In a closed system, the external environment (e.g., technology, cultural, legal, and political decisions) is considered constant and predictable and does not interfere with the organizational behavior. Instead, these models count on internal organizational processes and dynamics between organization, group, and individual behaviors (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Two classical models found in the closed systems are scientific management and bureaucratic management. The goal

of the classical models is to manage work in a way that increases productivity through a focus on internal processes (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

Scientific management

Scientific management is based on the belief that productivity is influenced by precise instructions, goal setting and rewards on motivation (Griffin et al., 2015). Following the industrial revolution in the 1890's, Frederick Winslow Taylor believed organizations could improve their output by improving individual productivity through standard procedures. Frank and Lillian Gilbreth made further contributions with their time-and-motion studies. Together the scientific model is made up of four principles: 1) standard procedures for performing each job, 2) select, train, and develop employees to do each skill and job, 3) mangers develop standard procedures and 4) managers supporting workers through careful planning of their work (Allen & Sawhney, 2016; Griffin et al., 2015).

Although scientific management was designed for industrial manufacturing organizations, the essence of scientific management has been influential in correctional organizations. Correctional officers and other lower level personnel are often governed by daily work procedures that were created out of necessity for safety and security (e.g., rounds, counts, and escorts of incarcerated individuals). Having a set standard may improve productivity but increase monotony of work (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

A criticism of the scientific management is treating workers as machines. Under the scientific method there is no room for individual preferences or initiative from employees (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Two correctional employees may not handle a situation the same way. And neither way may be wrong. Under the scientific management model, lower level staff may

become less productive if an individual's discretion and involvement is too controlled by management (Stojkovic et al., 2015).

Bureaucratic management

Bureaucratic management model focuses on the organizational system and how the workers and managers interact. The bureaucratic management is often found in a very structured work environment characterized by a rigid and well-defined hierarchy and strict formal rules (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Managers and employees are to maintain impersonal social relations to avoid favoritism. Max Weber, the founder of the bureaucratic model, encouraged supervisors to keep a distance from employees to maintain power. This would also help in the selection and promotion of employees based on performance and competence; thus, eliminating personal bias. Like scientific management, the bureaucratic management model focused on a system of rules and procedures to govern how employees performed their duties. Duties were to be divided into simpler more specialized tasks to create efficiency within the organization (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

The bureaucratic management model is reflected in a correctional setting. The correctional organization has a hierarchy of authority with the most power residing at the top. The organization adheres to formal rules and procedures for performing all organizational duties and duties are often delegated to more specific staffers. Weber's desire for impersonal social relations is hard to prevent; however, it is important for correctional employees to keep personal distance with incarcerated individuals to maintain authority. Furthermore, following Weber's standard for hiring and promotion of employees promotes greater organizational justice.

Bureaucratic management models can lead to rulification. According to Allen and Sawhney (2015), rulification occurs when an organization attempts to create rules and policies to meet the needs of every situation. This can be hard to apply because every encounter may be different and does not account for human emotion that surface during decision making. Organizations should be cautious in adhering to strict procedures because it can work against innovation, slow change, and create inflexibility (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

Communication is another challenge the bureaucratic structure has. Due to the rigid hierarchy of authority and distance in manager and employee relationships communication can often be lost, resulting in the grapevine effect. The grapevine effect is the rise in informal communication to provide information. Information may or may not be true; however, informal communication becomes a powerful source for filling the void created by strictly formal communication (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

Open Systems

In organizational theory, the open system models suggest that the external variables are more significant in explaining what is happening within an organization (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Unlike, closed systems, external and internal environments may change, and changes can influence an organization. Open system models are a part of the human relations movement and view organizations as cooperative systems. They also consider worker's values and feelings to be important parts of an organization's dynamics and performance. (Allen & Sawhney, 2015; Griffin et al., 2015).

The human relations movement realizes that organizations are affected by external environments. Employees bring external influences into the workplace from their social groups.

Rather than ignoring them, management needs to integrate the external influences into management strategies. Four themes that exist in the human relation movement are: recognizing individual differences, motivation, mutual interest, and human dignity (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

Hawthorne Effect

Between 1924 and 1933, George Elton Mayo discovered that productivity increased when employees thought they were being assessed. This phenomenon was known as the Hawthorne effect (Griffin et al., 2015). The studies also showed that organizations work as social systems, creating informal groups that function parallel to the formal structure within an organization. Employees were no longer considered interchangeable parts in a mechanical organization (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

Total Quality Management

In the 1970s and 1980s, W. Edwards Deming worked with Japanese organizations to deliver high product quality using the total quality management model. The total quality management model took a prevention-oriented approach through employee involvement instead of inspection-oriented approach (Allen & Sawhney, 2015). Organizations began working collaboratively with management, employees, customers, and statistics and technical methods to solve problems (Stojkovic et al., 2015).

The total quality management model is made up of four elements. First, the company values employee involvement and encourages active thinking to improve the current system. Second is valuing customer focus, not just what management thinks is important but what the customer thinks is important. Third, always striving to do better and focused on continuous

improvement. And fourth, creating benchmarks that identify areas of improvement and the best method of succeeding (Allen & Sawhney, 2015).

Correctional organizations that are entrenched in the bureaucratic model may find open systems models difficult to implement. However, correctional organizations that utilize evaluations and feedback loops incorporate elements of total quality management. Additionally, the use of benchmarks can help measure the success of employee trainings and delivery of quality of service to the incarcerated individuals.

Leadership Theory

Organizations need strong management and leadership if they are to be effective. To make necessary change in an organization, leadership is necessary to facilitate and support change; whereas, management is necessary to systematically direct and coordinate results (Griffin et al., 2015). To reduce the impact of an organizational structure, leaders can help facilitate a more effective change to reduce organizational stress.

Leadership theory is a is a process where individuals influence a group of individuals to accomplish organizational goals (Northouse, 2018; Stojkovic et al., 2015). Managers and supervisors are already in formal positions of influence over employees but may lack leadership skills. Managers and supervisors often lead in a linear fashion. Through effective leadership, managers and supervisors will learn that leading is an interactive event between employees and the organization (Northouse, 2018).

Correctional employees experience a lot of organizational stress related to the hierarchical structure, limited communication, and central decision-making processes. As a result, correctional organizations experience high turnover, absenteeism, and burnout. Path-goal

theory and transformational theory are two leadership theories that can help managers and supervisors meet the needs of correctional employees and facilitate a change to accomplish organizational goals.

Path Goal Theory

Path-goal theory emphasizes leaders motivating followers to accomplish organizational goals. The focus of path-goal leadership is to increase performance and satisfaction of followers by understanding the follower's motivation and nature of work characteristics (Northouse, 2018). Using path-goal theory helps shift the focus away from tasks and relationships and focuses on the needs and motivations of employees. In a correctional setting, the organizational structure tends to focus more on employee job tasks and performance output rather than the needs of the employee.

According to the path-goal theory, leaders are responsible for designing and facilitating a healthy and productive work environment. Path-goal leaders motivate followers by defining clear goals and how to accomplish them, removing or problem-solving obstacles, and providing support (Northouse, 2018). Each employee has their own set of needs that need to be addressed to be successful. Therefore, leadership is not always a one size fits all approach.

A path-goal leader can adapt their behavior to each situation to motivate their follower more effectively (Northouse, 2018). Path-goal theory identifies four leadership behaviors, directive, supportive, participative, and achievement oriented. Directive leadership focuses on giving followers clear and concise tasks and directions. Supportive leadership focuses on attending to the well-being of the follower. Participative leadership invites followers to be a part

of the decision making. Lastly, achievement-oriented leadership challenges followers to perform better (Northouse, 2018)

In corrections, employees identified a need to be included in decision making, having clear and concise directions, and job autonomy. Participative and directive path-goal leadership style may provide a counterbalance to the stress employees experience. Path-goal leadership predicts that participative leadership provides employees with greater clarity in role tasks and satisfaction in autonomy by being allowed to participate in decision-making processes. Directive leadership should help mitigate confusion and ambiguity by providing guidance and structure toward task completion (Northouse, 2018).

Transformational Leadership

Leadership is about how leaders can transform organizations to create the best results (Stojkovic et al., 2015). Transformational leadership is a leadership process that encourages and promotes change among people and organizations as it relates to emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals (Northouse, 2018). Like, path-goal leaders, transformational leaders must assess and satisfy followers needs.

There are four factors that make up an effective transformational leader: 1) idealized influence, 2) inspirational motivation, 3) intellectual stimulation, and 4) individualized consideration. The first factor is idealized influence. Leaders are often seen as role models with high moral and ethical standards. Their followers want to emulate them and share in their vision (Northouse, 2018). In corrections, managers should be setting an example for their employees and sharing the organization mission and values.

The second factor of transformational leadership is inspirational motivation. An inspirational leader will motivate followers to be committed to organizations vision and goals. Inspirational motivation is important in unifying work groups and building unity (Northouse, 20108). A correctional organization often has several departments completing different tasks for the same goal. Inspirational motivation is needed to keep departments united under larger organizational goals and working together.

Intellectual simulation is the third factor of transformational leadership. This type of leadership inspires creativity and innovation in followers. Leadership that uses intellectual stimulation promotes, encourages, and supports followers to problem-solve (Northouse, 2018). This type of leadership is important to corrections. As external environmental influences effect the way incarcerated individuals are managed, staff need to be able to adapt and problems solve solutions. Not every task or interaction in a correctional setting has a strict procedure attached. Employees need to be supported and encouraged to handle each situation appropriately through proper problem-solving.

The last transformational leadership factor is individualized consideration. This factor is important as the leader focuses on a follower's needs by listening and being supportive. Transformational leaders will often take on a role of coach or advisor to help facilitate growth in the follower (Northouse, 2018). Management cannot assume that employees know or have all the skills to handle each situation. Taking time to mentor and provide an opportunity to facilitate growth with promote the growth of a better employee.

Path-goal leadership and transformational leadership rely on creating relationship between leader and follower. In an organization this may be between supervisor and employee.

The development of leadership is important to the organization because it can help facilitate and create change, while addressing employee needs. Implementing concepts of both path-goal leadership and transformational leadership can help mitigate the impact the organizational structure has on employee stress.

IV: METHODS

This paper will utilize secondary research and empirical evidence gathered from scholarly journals, course textbooks, and respected internet sites relating to correctional burnout, stress, organizational structure, and best leadership and management practices. The literature collected is used to identify sources of organizational stress found within an organizational structure of a correctional agency. The research will assist in examining different theoretical perspectives; as well as, leadership styles and management practices that correctional agencies can use to mitigate organizational stress and reduce staff burnout.

Upon evaluation of this data, conclusions will be drawn, and recommendations made to provide current organizational strategies to help mitigate organizational stress caused by the organizational structure. Strategies will include organizational and leadership theories that seem applicable to meeting the needs of correctional employees.

SECTION V: RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper has demonstrated that there are components of an organizational structure in corrections that can cause employees stress leading to burnout. Past practices have indicated that organizations have taken an employee centered approach to reducing stress and burnout. This approach has failed to reduce the stressors impacted by the organizations structure. The purpose of this section will be to identify three organizational and leadership strategies: Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership, Participative Management, and 360 Degree Feedback. Correctional administrators should consider each strategy when trying to reduce the impact of organizational stressors.

Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership

Leadership development is important to an organization. Through effective leadership an organization can create change that addresses the employee needs. Before an organization can begin to implement new organizational strategies, managers, supervisors, and administrators need to learn how to lead effectively. Leadership is about developing a relationship between leader and follower(s) to empower, grow, and move toward shared aspirations (Posner & Kouzes, 2005).

Grounded in transformational leadership, Posner and Kouzes (2005) collected more than 11,500 surveys and conducted over 500 in-depth interviews to identify what made a successful leader. They focused on people who engaged in leadership activities that help organizations make great accomplishments. Posner and Kouzes (2005) identified five common practices known as *The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership*. The five practices are modeling the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart.

Modeling the Way

Leaders must lead others by setting an example. The foundation of modeling the way is credibility, others need to believe in the messenger in order to believe in the message (Posner & Kouzes, 2005). In a correctional organization, supervisors need to behave the same way they expect their employees to act. Most importantly, it is about being visible and showing others what is expected of them through their own display of behavior.

Inspire a Shared Vision

Great leaders believe they can make a difference and rather than command commitment they inspire it (Posner & Kouzes, 2005). Inspiring leaders often have a clear vision of what they want from their organization and communicate that vision with their employees. In a correctional organization it is important that work expectations, organizational goals, and vision is communicated clearly with employees at all levels.

Challenge the Process

According to Posner and Kouzes (2005), great leaders reach success by taking risks and learning from mistakes, not keeping things the same. Leaders are innovators who are willing to challenge the process. A part of challenging the process is also accepting change. Correctional supervisors must be open to receiving new ideas from anyone at any time and willing to make a change when needed. Additionally, if a change is needed, it is the job of the leader to bring about change without overwhelming their followers.

Enable Others to Act

Leaders enable others to act by fostering teamwork and strength among others. Not only is it important to engage those who can help facilitate change but also those who are affected by the results of the change (Posner & Kouzes, 2005). Employees who trust and feel respected by their supervisor will have more confidence to take risks and make changes that are best for the organization. The more ownership and autonomy employees have over their position the more connected and empowered they feel with the organization.

Encourage the Heart

The key to encouraging the heart is to give recognition for contributions and celebrating values and victories (Posner & Kouzes, 2005). Corrections is a tough environment for people to work in and employees are often over stressed and fatigued. A good supervisor will be able to push employees toward common goals by showing acknowledging, appreciating, and encouraging their work.

According to Posner and Kouzes (2005), leaders who engage in these five practices are more likely to motivate and increase employee job satisfaction and commitment levels. To measure the leadership potential of supervisors, organizations can utilize the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). The LPI is an instrument that supervisors and subordinates can participate in. The instrument covers 30 statements that address the basic behaviors found in exemplary leaders. Concluding the assessment, a 360 feedback is utilized to identify current leadership behaviors and productive ways to improve (Posner & Kouzes, 2005).

Participative Management

In reviewing the literature, multiple sources indicate that employees desire to be a part of the decision-making process. The lack of involvement in decisions directly affecting employees created a lot of organizational stress. Correctional organizations should implement participative management strategies. The purpose of participative management is for employees at every level to have the ability to contribute toward identifying and setting organizational goals, problem solving, and decisions that directly impact them (Linski, 2014). Kim (2002) found that successful participative management can lead to employee satisfaction thus, reducing absenteeism and turnover.

Two-way communication or upward communication is often difficult in the hierarchical setting found in correctional organizations. According to Kim (2002), participation is a process in which influence is shared among individuals who do not exist as equals in the hierarchical structure. Thus, participative management helps balance the involvement of mangers and their subordinates in information processing, decision making, or problem-solving.

To initiate change, supervisors will need to allow participation (Linski, 2014). If an organization can successfully implement participative management strategies, they can reap positive outcomes. Successfully use of participative management allows change to occur at every level. Employees who contribute to the organization gain more self-worth and become more responsible for their own work and are more willing to help others at other hierarchal levels (Linski, 2014). With participative management, mid-level supervisors can delegate more duties to lower level staff, therefore, having more time to assist upper management with achieving

organizational goals. In return, management can focus on the wants and needs of the employees, bringing everything full circle (Linski, 2014).

Participative management strategies may be slow moving in organizations where employees have not been accustomed to giving input or communication is lacking. In these situations, disgruntled employees may give feedback to increase their personal satisfaction rather than for the greater good of the organization. However, with time and exemplary leadership, employees will begin to see other employee' participation influencing the morale of the organization; resulting, in them becoming more participative (Linski, 2014).

360 Degree Feedback

Three hundred sixty-degree feedback is often referred to as a multi-source or multi-rater process. This type of feedback is often used for decision making or performance evaluations. The Leadership Practices Inventory is an example of performance evaluations. However, the purpose of this sub section is to focus on the benefits of 360-degree feedback on decision making. The focus of this paper is not changing one individual but in changing the organization.

Like most feedback processes, individuals receive an anonymous questionnaire that may evaluate, self, co-workers, subordinates, supervisors, customers, and the organization. Participants are either the rater or the ratee. There may be more than one rater and the ratee may be a person, group, or program. The success of 360 degree-feedback is in the review of results and ongoing development. The rater's role is not done after completing a questionnaire (Bracken, Timmreck, Fleenor, & Summers, 2001).

When used for decision making the best results are when supervisors share the results with the subordinates. Employees see that their supervisor and the organization are taking the

results serious and in turn, this can secure the supervisors support (Bracken et al., 2001). Like participative management, subordinates become engaged in the organization because their feedback is being used and that they are a part of the collaboration. Participants tend to feel better about themselves after the completion of the program if they had an opportunity to engage in dialogue about aspects of the program. These feedback sessions help promote upward communication throughout a hierarchal structure. (Bracken et al., 2001).

The key to successfully implementing a 360-degree feedback loop is hinged on communication. Before implementing any feedback process, it is important to communicate the purpose of the feedback as it relates to the organizational change. Most organizations default to an email or short brief prior to a rater taking a survey. Lawrence (2015) suggests that face-to-face briefings are more successful in guaranteeing all participants understand the purpose and end goal. These types of briefings are dual purposed. They allow participants to ask questions and voice concerns, as well, as showing the commitment the organization has to its employees.

Other important steps to take in the beginning are timing and selection. It is important to not overwhelm the raters with too many surveys or having them sent out during busy times of the year such as holidays, performance reviews, and end of the fiscal year (Lawrence, 2015). Selection is important for both evaluation tool and rater. An organization will want to select an evaluation tool that is specific to target areas or concern looking to be addressed. The wrong tool could solicit the wrong information. Additionally, rater selection is important. Selecting favorable or less favorable employees may skew the feedback.

SECTION VI: CONCLUSION

Correctional employees who experiences constant organizational stressors caused by the organizational structure are more likely to experience burnout. Burnout can be costly to both the employee and the organization. As an employee's work performance and commitment to the organization dips, correctional organizations will see an increase in absenteeism, turnover, and lack of productivity. These effects can be detrimental to the daily operations of the any correctional institution.

The first part of this paper provided evidence of how the organizations structure contributes to an employee's organizational stress. Research has indicated that employees experience less stress if they are able to participate in decision making, experience effective communication, and allowed job autonomy. Most correctional organizations use a paramilitary hierarchy structure. This type of centralized structure often stifles up ward communication and collaboration with lower level employees. The need for instrumental communication from supervisor to line staff and between different correctional departments is needed for employees to know what is expected of them. An employee's level of organizational stress is inversely related to how much input into decisions that directly affect their daily job tasks and how well they know what is expected of them to perform those job tasks.

Traditionally, most correctional organizations offer employee's individualized assistance with stress management. Since the organizational structure can be a source for employee stress, the organization should take a more integral role in eliminating organizational stress. The second part of this paper identified organizational and leadership strategies that can help reduce the negative effects of an organizational structure.

The literature identified both feedback and participation as two important tools an organization can utilize in reducing employee job stress. The use of participative management styles and 360-degree feedback loops will help encourage employee participation in instrumental communication and decision making. The result of involving employees in these process helps facilitate empowerment and commitment to the organization.

Leadership is the last piece of the puzzle. Leaders play a vital role in influencing the organizational culture and facilitating the change. This paper recommends that management needs to take a transformative approach following, *The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership* (e.g. modeling the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart (Posner & Kouzes, 2005)). This type of leadership will help enable the use of participative management and 360-degree feedback to create an organizational structure that creates less organizational stress for employees.

SECTION VII: REFERENCES

Acquadro Maran, D., Zedda, M., & Varetto, A. (2018). Organizational and occupational stressors, their consequences and coping Strategies: A questionnaire survey among Italian patrol police officers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *15*(1), 166.

Allen, J. M., & Sawhney, R. (2015). *Administration and management in criminal justice: A service quality approach* (2ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Baker, T., Gordon, J., & Taxman, F. (2014). A hierarchical analysis of correctional officers' procedural justice judgments of correctional institutions: Examining the influence of transformational leadership. *Justice Quarterly*, *32*(6), 1-27.

Bracken, D. W., Timmreck, C. W., Fleenor, J. W., & Summers, L. (2001). 360 feedback from another angle. *Human Resource Management*, *40*(1), 3-20.

Camp, S. D., & Lambert, E. G. (2006). The influence of organizational incentives on absenteeism: Sick-leave use among correctional workers. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *17*(2), 144-172.

Farkas, M. A. (2001). Correctional officers: what factors influence work attitudes?. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, *5*, 20-26.

Griffin, R. W., Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. (2015). Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations. Scarborough, Ontario, Canada: Nelson Education.

Jurik, N. C., & Winn, R. (1987). Describing correctional-security dropouts and rejects: An individual or organizational profile?. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *14*(1), 5-25.

Keinan, G., & Malach-Pines, A. (2007). Stress and burnout among prison personnel: Sources, outcomes, and intervention strategies. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *34*(3), 380-398.

Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership. *Public Administration Review*, *62*(2), 231-241.

Lambert, E. (2001). To stay or quit: A review of the literature on correctional staff turnover. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *26*(1), 61-76.

Lambert, E. (2010). The relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with job satisfaction, turnover intent, life satisfaction, and burnout among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice Studies*, *23*(4), 361-380.

Lambert, E. G., Cluse-Tolar, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2007). This job is killing me: The impact of job characteristics on correctional staff job stress. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *3*(2).

Lambert, E., Hogan, G., & Allen, N. (2006). Correlates of correctional officer job stress: The impact of organizational structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *30*(2), 227-246.

Lambert, E., Hogan, N., Barton, S., & Clarke, A. (2002). The impact of instrumental communication and integration on correctional staff. *The Justice Professional*, *15*(2), 181-193.

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Cheeseman, K., & Barton-Bellessa, S. M. (2013). The relationship between job stressors and job involvement among correctional staff: A test of the job strain model. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *52*(1), 19-38.

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Griffin, M. L., & Kelley, T. (2015). The correctional staff burnout literature. *Criminal Justice Studies*, *28*(4), 397-443.

Lambert, E., Hogan, N., & Jiang, S. (2010). A preliminary examination of the relationship between organizational structure and emotional burnout among correctional staff. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *49*(2), 125-146.

Lambert, E., Hogan, G., Moore, N., Tucker, L., Jenkins, B., Stevenson, K., & Jiang, M. (2009). The impact of the work environment on prison staff: The issue of consideration, structure, job variety, and training. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *34*(3), 166-180.

Lawrence, P. (2015). A best practice model for the effective deployment of 360 feedback. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, *29*(6),

13-16.

Linski III, C. M. (2014). Transitioning to participative management. *Organization Development Journal*, *32*(3).

Mahfood, V., Pollock, W., & Longmire, D. (2012). Leave it at the gate: Job stress and satisfaction in correctional staff. Criminal Justice Studies, *26*(3), 1-18.

Maslach, C. (2003). Job burnout: New directions in research and intervention. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12(5), 189-192.

McGovern, G. (1999). The revolution inside. Retrieved from: http://www.gerrymcgovern.com/nt/1999-12-06revolution-inside.htm.

Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Posner, B. Z., & Kouzes, J. M. (2005). *The five practices of exemplary leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Slate, R. N., Vogel, R. E., & Johnson, W. W. (2001). To quit or not to quit: Perceptions of participation in decision making and the impact of organizational stress. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, *5*, 68-78.

Stelter, L. (2017, June 9). *Are You Suffering from Burnout?*. Retrieved from: https://inpublicsafety.com/2017/06/are-you-suffering-from-burnout/

Stinchcomb, J. B. (2004). Searching for stress in all the wrong places: Combating chronic

organizational stressors in policing. *Police practice and research*, *5*(3), 259–277.

Stojkovic, S., Kalinich, D., & Klofas, J. (2015). *Criminal justice organizations: Administration and management* (6ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

Tewksbury, R., & Higgins, G. E. (2006). Prison staff and work stress: The role of organizational and emotional influences. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *30*(2), 247-266.