REAL TIME, INTELLIGENCE - LED OPERATIONS: 
MAKING COLLABORATIVE POLICING WORK

By

John Byers

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
In
LEADERSHIP DEGREE

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

Eileen Piggot-Irvine, PhD, Faculty Supervisor

Tony Williams, PhD, External Reviewer

Niels Agger-Gupta, PhD, Committee Chair

ROYAL ROADS UNIVERSITY
May 2013

© John Byers, 2013
ABSTRACT

Currently responsible for policing over one million citizens, the Calgary Police Service (CPS) has earned its reputation as a progressive law enforcement organization in part by focusing on the early recognition and acknowledgement of evolving crime trends. To maintain essential public trust CPS remains attuned to the constant shifting of legal and moral public accountability, an issue highlighted by judicial inquiries that have illustrated a consistent lack of police interagency cooperation. Since police are restricted by geographic jurisdictional boundaries, the answer to inter-jurisdictional challenges appears to be the timely sharing of intelligence, something the CPS has proposed through its newly developed Real Time Operations Centre (RTOC). This study investigated the question of how CPS might best develop an Alberta law-enforcement collaborative based upon the paradigm of a central real-time operations centre (RTOC), feasibility of this model, and potential challenges to its implementation.

This study conducted qualitative action research with the leaders of all major law enforcement organizations in the Province of Alberta. Research data generated by one-on-one interviews with each participant was thematically analyzed to produce knowledge sufficient to plant the seeds of change for both organizational transformation and future inquiry.

Study findings suggest it will be incumbent upon police leaders to create and develop the organizational social awareness necessary to enhance and leverage social capital essential to inter-agency cooperation and collaboration. Identifying positive aspects of a strong organizational culture will create a culture of well-being able to address crucial communication issues and the critical alignment of resources.
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CHAPTER ONE: FOCUS AND FRAMING

We enter an era of unprecedented public scrutiny as the challenges faced by law enforcement become extraordinarily complex, and in the ensuing collision systemic failure in police organizations has been highlighted in public forums across the country. Most prominent among these remains the Bernardo Inquiry in which Justice Archie Campbell, delivering his condemnation of a failed criminal investigation that allowed inter-jurisdictional rapist and murderer Paul Bernardo to flourish, commented that an “astounding and dangerous lack of cooperation between police forces” (p. 20) coupled with a litany of errors, miscalculations and disputes led to the “systemic failure” (p. 4) of police and other organizations involved. Campbell emphasized, “A commitment for change is required from the police and law enforcement communities” (p. 28) and recommended the implementation of “mechanisms to ensure unified management, accountability and coordination among police forces and law enforcement agencies” (Ontario Justice, The Campbell Report, 1996, p. 4).

When judicial criticism of the police arose in the United Kingdom following the murder of two young girls, Sir Michael Bichard called the “errors, omissions, failures and shortcomings [of two police agencies] deeply shocking” and recommended protocols to enhance information sharing with other agencies (House of Commons, 2004, p. 1).

Police organizations continue with their struggle to collaborate effectively with one another, conscious of the observations of Lynch and Lynch (2005) that “For progress to continue, there must also be communication between organizations that represent different levels and types of law enforcement” (p. 210). Despite the repeated warnings, Justice Campbell’s scathing indictment recently repeated itself with release of The Report of the Missing Women Commission of Inquiry (2012). Following a formal inquiry into the investigation by police forces in British
Columbia into inter-jurisdictional mass murderer Robert Pickton, Commissioner Wally Oppal concluded, “the inability to fully address cross-jurisdictional issues was a critical police failure” (p. 85). In earlier testimony, Peel Regional Police Chief Jennifer Evans advised the Commission of Inquiry of a “systemic communication breakdown” between the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) and the RCMP similar to problems that existed during the Bernardo investigation (Evans, 2011). Citing a lack of information sharing, Evans testified that both agencies were plagued by poor communications and a lack of leadership (Puri, 2012). Addressing these issues in his summary, Commissioner Oppal commented, “Policies, memoranda of understanding, and other mechanisms to build relationships should all be in place so that a multi-jurisdictional approach can be implemented quickly and smoothly” (British Columbia Justice, 2012, p. 85).

I am a member of the Organized Crime Section of the Calgary Police Service (CPS) with first-hand knowledge of the efforts to enhance the law enforcement community’s collaborative effectiveness since The Campbell Report. As a sworn police officer with over 35 years of experience I also have intimate knowledge of a police culture resistant to change and reluctant to trust. Although I am acutely aware of the potential obstacles to developing a true law enforcement collaborative, I understand from my professional experience the importance of such a protocol to the CPS and its stakeholders.

Recognizing the unequivocal requirement for interagency collaboration, the CPS introduced its Real Time Operations Centre (RTOC) on February 14, 2010. Promising to provide better-coordinated resources and accurate, actionable information to frontline police officers in a timely fashion, the CPS has extended an invitation to law enforcement agencies throughout Alberta, yet the reluctance of some stakeholders to participate remains palpable. With an opportunity to support the conceptual implementation and acceptance of this new policing
paradigm within my own organization and partner law enforcement agencies, my inquiry topic examined the question, “How can the CPS develop an intelligence-led, real time law enforcement collaborative?” Sub topics examined in support of the inquiry included:

1. How can CPS engage collaborative practice?
2. What is the importance of culture, communication and trust in collaborative practice?
3. How can CPS develop a model of organizational change for collaborative practice?

**Significance of the Inquiry**

The RTOC disseminates intelligence to front line police officers to enhance public protection and increase officer safety. With intelligence generated from stakeholder submissions, the risk of disseminating incomplete or erroneous information arises with only partial stakeholder cooperation, while full stakeholder participation promises a welcome new standard in policing (CPS, 2010).

“By sharing their diverse knowledge and experience - expert, professional, and lay - stakeholders can create solutions to their problems and, in the process, improve the quality of their community life” (Stringer, 2007, p. 11). This “collaborative exploration” proposed by Stringer (2007) is significant because it “results not only in a collective vision but also in a sense of community” (p. 11), encouraging participation. A coordinated RTOC relies on the unadulterated commitment of stakeholders at all levels of multiple organizations. This operational model becomes a collaborative congruent with the conventional wisdom of Senge (2006) who wrote, “The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap people’s commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in an organization” (p. 4).
The principle of centralization is a new concept in law enforcement promoted by the RTOC. Short (1998) advised that “to work effectively, every system needs a structure to which all participants agree” (p. 60), clearly reflecting the congruent philosophy of Senge (2006) that development of a common vision is necessary before a “commitment to the whole” (p. 161) can be achieved and illustrating that the collaborative endeavor proposed by this research must exemplify true collaborative practice.

A successful RTOC collaborative will assuage judicial concerns and allow CPS to establish contemporary interagency efficiencies. Most importantly, this promises to maintain the public trust essential to effective policing (Dunham & Alpert, 2005; Lynch & Lynch, 2005).

Organizational Context

Undertaking the organizational inquiry of the RTOC, I am aware that “preunderstanding refers to such things as people’s knowledge, insights and experiences before they engage in a research programme” (Gummesson, 2000, as cited in Coghlan & Brannick, 2010, p. 57). As a longtime CPS employee with a background in intelligence and organized crime, I possess “both explicit and tacit knowledge” (Coghlan & Brannick, 2010) that defines an “insider researcher” as well as an intimate knowledge of CPS “cultures and informal structures” (p. 114). This knowledge was used in my research.

Responsible for the safety of over a million citizens, the 100 - year - old CPS follows a Mission Statement “To maximize public safety in Calgary with vigilance, courage and pride” (see Appendix A). Core values of honesty, integrity, respect, fairness and compassion, and courage (Calgary Police Service, 2012) are espoused by an organization that I believe follows the true spirit of Senge’s (2006) learning organization. CPS is a hierarchical structure with 1,900 sworn members in 3 Bureaus, 11 Divisions and 33 Sections that can be broken down into any
number of Units or business groups depending upon their individual mandate (see Appendix B).
Answering to a civilian Police Commission (2009), strategic planning and operations are the
responsibility of the Chief of Police who relies upon senior officers for direction and advice
while some 500 civilian employees offer support throughout the organization.

As the autonomy afforded each Division was extended to every Section, CPS executive
soon realized a potential for conflict in even the most routine operations. Without protocols to
keep colleagues and partner agencies appraised of their respective activities, the potential for
significant operational conflict presented an immediate risk to the safety of officers and to the
public. Deconfliction, a conflict reduction process adapted from the United States Military and
combined with the concept of intelligence-led policing (ILP), was incorporated into a real time
venue and the Real Time Operations Centre (RTOC) was created.

Based upon Fusion Centres developed in the United States post-9/11 (Serrao, 2010), the
RTOC is the first operations centre of its kind in Canada and will “model the way” (Kouzes &
Posner, 2007, p. 31) for Canadian law enforcement through an innovative concept of real time,
ability to learn and share knowledge vastly more important than previously attained expertise”
(p. 45). Ratcliffe (2008) clarified, “Intelligence-led policing provides an objective mechanism
to formulate strategic policing priorities” (p. 7).

The RTOC has become an acknowledged “intelligence hub” (CPS, 2011) facing key
challenges that include “the ability to gather and share information” and “manage large volumes
of information” (p. 18). The main feature separating the RTOC from its American counterparts is
the “ability to coordinate and reallocate police resources” (p. 18), and the CPS-Environmental
Scan 2012-2014 highlights this real time resource management as one of the most important functions of the new centre (see Appendix C).

The reluctance of police to share information is a historical phenomenon originating from a strong cultural dogma. Officers legally bound to protect informant identities often feel justified in protecting their information as tenaciously and while certain information must be treated as sensitive this need not be a universal application. Unfortunately, over time it has become simple to manage large volumes of intelligence by over-classifying rather than disseminating. The end result is a storage facility for intelligence rather than a clearing house, one of the necessary functions the RTOC intends to fulfill. To do so successfully, it will be necessary to confront the existing “mental models” (Senge, 2006) of CPS members and their law enforcement partners.

**Systems Analysis of the Inquiry**

Having investigated organized crime for over 20 years, I am aware that the criminal element respects no geographical boundaries, a fact acknowledged by CPS, Alberta Justice and the Government of Alberta (Alberta Justice, 2012; ALERT, 2012). Accordingly, the Alberta government has initiated Alberta Law Enforcement Response Teams (ALERT) and currently supports over 400 municipal officers, RCMP members and Sheriffs in elite integrated teams with a mandate to “dismantle serious and organized crime across the province, enhancing safety for all Albertans” (2012).

These ALERT entities include Alberta Specialized Law Enforcement Training (ASLET), Criminal Intelligence Service Alberta (CISA), Integrated Threat Risk Assessment Centre (I-TRAC), Safer Communities and Neighborhoods (SCAN), Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit (CFSEU), Fugitive Apprehension Sheriffs Support Team (FASST) and Integrated Child Exploitation (ICE).
The Alberta Police Act (2011) includes CPS as one of seven independent police agencies in the Province (Figure 1). Were the CPS - RTOC to become central to these agencies it could be considered an intelligence hub (Figure 1). RCMP “K” Division members in 104 detachments are supported by Alberta Sheriffs and four First Nations agencies for a collective total of 6,200 sworn police officers across the Province of Alberta (Government of Alberta, 2011). Each municipal agency is engaged in joint forces operations (JFO) with their integrated ALERT partners, primarily RCMP members and although resources are shared, these JFO’s traditionally struggle with opposing agendas and procedures.

Unfortunately, members thrown together from different agencies can experience communication difficulties, and rather than “alignment” (Senge, 2006, p. 220) they often exhibit “defensive routines” (Senge, 2006, p. 220) specific to individuals or their organizations.
Schneider and Hurst (2008), in their Joint Forces Operation (JFO) case study, examined this phenomenon and other obstacles faced by police officers engaged in a collaborative effort. Underlying issues of this nature present a subtle yet very real impediment to the development and success of the RTOC.

Keyser (2011) asked, “How do we communicate actionable information more effectively?” (p. 33). *Actionable information* aptly describes the raw data and information processed into useable intelligence before dissemination by the RTOC to its stakeholders. That the RTOC is dependent upon these stakeholders for the very information it processes epitomizes what Baker (2009) has alluded to as “information reciprocity” (p. 13).

As the RTOC struggles with a system not yet fully mapped, Senge’s (2006) position that “planning is learning” (p. 8) becomes relevant and consistent with the continual learning cycle reflected in an action research interacting spiral. In such a spiral, participants “explore the details of their activities through a constant process of observation, reflection, and action” (Stringer, 2007, p. 9). In this environment of constant trial and error, the “framework for collaborative creativity” (Coghlan & Brannick, 2010, p. 24) is welcomed, as is Lewin’s (1999) three stage model of the change process that includes being motivated to change, changing, and making the change survive and work. While the literature illustrates that the successful RTOC model will be one of “constant creation and innovation” (McGehee, 2001, p. 54), the overriding message seems to be that the desire to implement change is paramount. With this in mind, we may be wise to recall the words of Ratcliffe (2008) when he qualified his comparison of the paradigm of intelligence - led policing to existing conceptual frameworks with the caveat, “Defining policing frameworks can be like trying to nail jelly to a tree” (p. 88).
An endeavor with seemingly tremendous potential, the RTOC intends to link frontline police officers directly to investigative support and provide deconfliction for CPS members and those law enforcement partners that choose to participate. Since “enrollment and commitment require freedom of choice” (Senge, 2006, p. 207) it will be incumbent upon the RTOC to create a compelling vision that encourages commitment from others.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In conjunction with direction from the Courts and the public, the CPS has implemented a real time operations centre (RTOC) intended to be the hub of a law enforcement collaborative that will better coordinate resources and disseminate actionable intelligence in a real time format. With a distinct lack of interagency cooperation identified by the judiciary (The Campbell Report, June 1996) presenting a risk to the public in a new, complex global village, the message has been clear: mutual collaboration is compulsory for police.

In order to ensure future success of the RTOC, the CPS must create a law enforcement collaborative within the RTOC between organizations not renowned for their trust of outside agencies. Clashing organizational cultures and subcultures, contradictory policies, mandate disparities, and opposing agendas are all detrimental to law enforcement interagency collaboration (Plecas, McCormick, Levine, Neal, & Cohen, 2010; Schnobrich-Davis & Terrill, 2010).

Exploring viability of the proposed initiative, this review will examine current literature pertinent to the concept of ILP, issues hindering advancement, and justification for development of the proposed RTOC collaborative. Complexity of this initiative is apparent as this chapter examines the many variables of collaboration, policing issues affected by collaboration, and leadership in relation to collaboration. Possibly the most important sections of this chapter deal with organizational culture, an examination of police cultural issues, the role of leadership in culture, cultural resistance and the resultant defensive behaviors. The chapter concludes with a final exploration of the concept and essential development of trust.
Defining Collaboration

The basic concept of collaboration resonates with Kouzes & Posner’s (2007) idea that “collaboration is a critical competency for achieving and sustaining high performance” (p. 224). In fact, nowhere is the case for collaboration stated more strongly than existing conventional literature such as Senge’s (2006) ‘networks of collaboration’ and ‘collaborative learning’; Short’s (1998) ‘differentiated interactions’ and Kaner, Lind, Toldi, Fisk, and Berger’s (2007) “struggle in the service of integration” (p. 223). These traditional concepts are embraced by the current literature where recurrent themes of trust, information sharing, communication and cooperation present as essential elements (Brewer, 2009; Careless, 2002; Chesterman, 2001; Colcord, 2009; Desouza & Hensgen, 2005; Linden, 2003; McGuire, 2006; Schneider & Hurst, 2008; Schnobrich-Davis & Terrill, 2010; Vangen & Huxham, 2006).

Unfortunately, the literature fails to reach consensus on a definition of collaborative practice. Chesterman (2001) commented, “It is not surprising that there is no one definitive theory of collaborative working” (p. 379) given the various perspectives and diverse frames of reference in something as complex as the public service (Bolman & Deal, 2008). This is consistent with Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill’s (2010) contention that “while the literature is replete with analyses examining collaborations in general, an agreed upon list of successful elements does not exist” (p. 511). Ambiguity arising from this preponderance of existing literature in the general review of collaborative efforts is exacerbated by a paucity of work on failed collaborations that exhibit “limited evidence of their effectiveness in achieving stated goals” (Cross, Dickmann, Newmann-Gonchar & Fagan, 2009).

Although the literature supports the conceptual RTOC model, Chesterman (2001) warned, “The forces against collaborating are strong and subtle” (p. 378). Vangen and Huxham
Intelligence-Led Policing (2006) advised that “most collaborations make painfully slow progress and others die without achieving anything” (p. 3), an observation succinctly summarized by Jupp (2000) with the conclusion that “partnerships are good in theory but incredibly difficult in practice” (p. 24). Although the forces against collaboration exist in all organizations, they are exacerbated in a law enforcement environment. As introduced in the following subsection, these forces become demonstrably arduous with the introduction of interagency initiatives such as the RTOC collaborative proposed by this study.

**Collaboration in law enforcement**

Acknowledging the need for collaborative change, Ratcliffe (2008) described law enforcement as historically “fragmented” (p. 24) and lacking “both vertical and horizontal coordination” (p. 24). Calling this level of fragmentation “unparalleled”, Stewart (2011) observed, “There is no centralized authority responsible for coordinating the cornucopia of law enforcement agencies existing at every level of government” (p. 409). His study concluded “collaboration [for all law enforcement agencies] has become more critical than ever” (p. 422), findings Stewart qualified with his observation that the desired system “cannot take shape, however, until efforts are made to improve the level of cooperation, communication, information sharing, and trust between federal and local law enforcement agencies” (p. 422). Described by the literature as potential barriers to collaborative practice, these key issues have also been identified by this study as essential elements to development and implementation of the RTOC.

Drucker (1985) reminded us that, “Effectiveness is doing the right thing, and efficiency is doing things right” (as cited in Baker, 2000, p. 189). Baker (2000), a proud soldier and experienced police officer, contended that, “Because of their unique position, [police] serve as a yardstick for excellence and character [and] should be subject to ongoing scrutiny and
evaluation” (p. 189). He qualified this with his belief that, “If police leaders plan their vision and journey well, evaluation will be part of the process” (p. 189). Bayley’s (2011) argument that the police, “Prefer to be judged by what they do rather than what they achieve” (p. 313) serves only to strengthen Baker’s (2000) position which emphasizes a “need for defining excellence and developing evaluation systems” by asking the question, “Without evaluations how can we measure achievement” (p. 189)? Although the intent of this study was simply to plant the seeds of change with which to begin the collaborative process, the literature illustrates that evaluation will be a necessary future consideration for leaders pursuing implementation of an RTOC collaborative. Such evaluation will provide valuable insight into existing and potential institutional hindrances to genuine collaboration (Bayley, 2011; Baker, 2000).

One answer to Baker’s (2000) question may be found in Bayley’s (2011) suggestion that a lack of transparency may account for what he refers to as *institutional defects* found in his blunt comparison of police and university management and his conclusion that, “In both policing and higher education the people are wonderful but the systems are stupid” (p. 315). Baker (2000) and Bayley (2011) both make compelling arguments that promote the notion of individual responsibility for the end product rather than the process, something clearly absent from police management. We are reminded how complicated that process can be by Bayley’s (2011) closing statement that, “Unhappily, both institutions [police and universities] make it impossible for talented, dedicated and farsighted front - line personnel to be as effective as they and their communities want them to be” (p. 316).

Findings of this study provide the tools of change necessary to address the systemic challenges described by Bayley (2011) and to facilitate the proposed RTOC collaborative. To be used effectively, CPS executive must remember that change comes from within, that which we
control, and that for the RTOC to adopt genuine collaboration, the spirit of collaboration must exist as a personal philosophy within the culture of CPS. Suggesting that we have not created but rather colluded with and thus contributed to the management patriarchy surrounding us, Block (1993) reinforces our need to understand this personal contribution and argues that half of the work that needs to take place for any change needs to be done on ourselves (Short, 1998). Rather than deflect leadership responsibility this philosophy appears to emphasize a need for strong leadership, clarification of vision, and mission and values statements that must guide any collaborative process. These are all essential elements of genuine collaboration discussed in the final chapter of this thesis. Presented in a communicative framework, the individual improvement and responsibility alluded to in this section is examined with a broader view of information sharing and relationship building in the following subsection.

**Communication**

Information is vital to the function of the real time operations centre and what we do with that information will be paramount to its success. Receipt of information from which actionable intelligence is derived is wholly dependent upon information sharing between stakeholders. Russell-Einhorn, Ward, and Seeherman (2004) defined law enforcement collaboration as “law enforcement operations or operational planning involving two or more enforcement agencies that cross geographic or criminal justice system boundaries” (p. 4). Using this definition Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill (2010) argued that “interagency collaboration among law enforcement agencies can [generally] be categorized within four distinct models: task forces, partnerships, law enforcement councils, and data sharing networks” (p. 508). While it is difficult to corroborate such a broad generalization, current literature is conclusive that empirical research into overall collaborative efforts has identified effective communication as a key component to success.
Intelligence-Led Policing (Jefferis, Smith, Novak & Travis, 1998; McGarrell & Schegel, 1993; Schegel & McGarrell, 1991; Smith, Novak, Frank & Travis, 2000), even while researchers agree that further research is needed. Illustrative of this consensus is Bertolini and Theis’ (2010) address of failed collaborative efforts and their realization that “These early failures were mainly due to poor planning, a lack of direction, and a poor communication strategy” (p. 10). Subsequently addressing “the art of collaboration” they concluded, “the most difficult part of the process is building the initial relationship” (p. 10).

With respect to organizational change such as that proposed by my action research, Lewis, Hamel and Richardson (2001) discussed communication efficiency and consensus building, two necessary communicative dimension tasks “which may be used to predict implementers’ choices of approach to their communication with stakeholders” (p. 6). Necessitated by their conclusion that “Stakeholder communication is especially important in these [non-profit] organizations, as it is in all organizations, during planned change” (p. 8), their study ultimately provided “insight into how individuals involved in the implementation of major change programs manage those relationships communicatively” (p. 33). This insight, imperative to successful implementation of the RTOC collaborative, is complemented by the following results of an earlier study conducted by Bowling (2009).

Bowling’s globalization thesis (2009) examined the paradigm of transnational policing, an innovative concept designed to combat organized crime. From a global perspective, Bowling explained the “new possibilities for ‘horizontal’ communication and collaboration among police officers” (p. 3). Ironically, these arose from the same technology and interconnectedness that created “new opportunities for illegality and facilitates criminal collaborations” (p. 3) from which the need for global policing arose. Block (2008) concurred with the transnational concept,
a term which refers to activity transcending national boundaries. Mann (1997) stated in concurrence, “Police need to seek cooperation partners across borders to share intelligence, coordinate operations, secure evidence, and track down suspects” (p. 74). Reasoning that local incidents are often determined by faraway events, Held and McGrew (2003) recommended broader thinking about policing practices affected by globalization.

Despite the inception of Interpol in 1923, transnational policing has been slow to fully develop, presumably due to the “[Pandora’s box of issues and problems] created by cross-border criminal investigations” (p. 2) described by Anderson, Den Boer, Cullen, Willmore, Raab and Walker (1995). However, recent research into the development of transnational policing (Andreas & Nadelmann, 2007; Brown, 2008; Goldsmith & Sheptycki, 2007; Sheptycki, 2007) illustrates an increased pace “so rapid that practice on the ground is running way ahead of the research, law and policy that might guide it” (Bowling, 2009, p. 2).

Ironically, an interesting paradox presents in the literature with this recently documented development of transnational police cooperation. Still replete with the travails of local police collaboration (Fedorowicz, Laso-Ballestros & Padilla-Melendez, 2008; Nash & Walker, 2009; Stewart, 2011; Terpstra, 2011; Wuestewald & Steinheider, 2010), the literature illustrates a contradiction incongruent with current knowledge and offers no explanation for thriving international police collaboratives when establishing these same collaboratives domestically remains all but impossible. This begs the questions of whether the transnational phenomenon is reactionary, focused primarily on the threat of terrorism (Serrao, 2010) and whether a timeline drawn post-9/11 might conceivably illustrate a correlation between global events and current international cooperation. Further research may ascertain whether these transnational police cooperatives (Anderson, 1989; Nadelmann, 1993; Sheptycki, 2004) operate as true collaboratives
or on the same ad hoc basis currently adhered to by most law enforcement agencies - when circumstances dictate. Clarification could provide valuable insight into proposed domestic collaboratives such as the subject of this study. For instance, a review of effective communication practices could streamline CPS efforts to design and implement an RTOC collaborative. This information could enhance research when applied to an examination of communication techniques such as those addressed in the following subsection.

The introduction of multiple organizations into CPS operations has exacerbated an existing communications problem within the Service that the RTOC has proposed to resolve. As the issues facing police broaden and become more complex, the wide “distribution of personnel greatly contributes to internal communication barriers” (Keyser, 2011, p. 34). The RTOC has embraced the position that the sharing of important, sometimes critical information is an eventuality illustrated by the contention that “we are moving from a work culture in which hoarding information is a source of power to a work culture in which hoarding information is impossible” (McGehee, 2001, p. 46). These are eventualities that must be realized before effective communication becomes suitable for a real time, intelligence - led venue such as the RTOC law enforcement collaborative.

Real Time, Intelligence - Led Collaborative Policing

Brewer (2009) defined interoperability as “the capability of a public safety agency to communicate . . . with another public safety agency, on demand . . . and in real time” (p. 52), a practice promoted by Colcord (2009), Senge (2006), and McGehee (2001), with the importance of “real - time information on events unfolding” (p. 110) emphasized by Desouza and Hensgen (2005). Despite this apparent support, a survey of Public Safety Communications Officials
(Careless, 2002) found 46% of respondents identified a “lack of interoperability” (p. 73), and 42% “a lack of intelligence sharing between agencies” (p. 73) as major hindrances to their duties.


**Information technology**

It is clear from the findings of this research study that mutually acceptable information technology will be a key consideration to CPS leaders responsible for the future structuring of ILP frameworks in the RTOC and the proposed law - enforcement collaborative.

Acknowledging the need for police interagency cooperation and communication, Zhao, Bi, Chen, Zeng, Lin and Chau (2006) employed a “process - driven collaboration methodology” with “COPLINK”, part of “an integrated law enforcement information and knowledge management” analysis system (p. 625). In doing so they recognized a critical need to develop technologies to facilitate “the efficient flow of information and documents [that would enable] collaboration among law enforcement officers” (p. 617). Extolling the virtues of police communications system COMPSTAT (Computer Comparison Statistics), Bratton and Malinowski (2008) researched ways to leverage data “to benefit the organization [and then] to share that information across organizations” (p. 265). Developing and incorporating technology into the RTOC for efficient information sharing will be paramount to stakeholders in conjunction with deciding what information is to be shared, how it will be shared, and the parameters
surrounding future use of information and intelligence. Illustrating the importance of strong leadership, these are matters that must be decided at an executive level. For CPS leaders tasked with the implementation of collaborative change in the RTOC, building and maintaining stakeholder relationships will be key. This application of strong leadership principles in the promotion of collaboration is emphasized in the following subsection.

**Leadership and Collaboration**

Offering suggestions on “how to improve the amount and value of collaborative activities” (p. 131), Waugh and Streib (2006) recommend “new leadership strategies [that] derive their power from effective strategies and the transformational power of a compelling vision, rather than from hierarchy, rank, or standard operating procedures” (p. 131). This holistic approach is embraced by Wenger, McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. (2002) and put into practice by Wuestewald and Steinheider (2010). In their case study of *Collaboration in Policing* and, borrowing a page from Marks and Sklansky’s (2008) case study, they formed a leadership team comprised of empowered rank-and-file members to manage “the inherent challenges of collaborative inquiry” (p. 104). These approaches are reflective of *organic* communities of practice whose design “is more a matter of shepherding their evolution than creating them from scratch” (Wenger et al., p.111). Further literary discussion of the “building blocks” of collaboration emphasizes Waugh and Streib’s (2006) multi-faceted leadership strategies. Although written specifically from an emergency management perspective they are particularly relevant, as is their endorsement of a “better understanding of the nature of collaboration” (p. 138). Expanding upon this principle, Hakesley-Brown (2002) referred to the future model of cooperation as “creative collaboration” and argued that “leadership needs to take on a more collaborative approach, grounded in human values and therefore more in sympathy with the
work” (p. 401). CPS leaders are in a unique position to set the organizational tone for collaboration and, since change starts at the top, in doing so set the stage for transformational change that will facilitate the RTOC as proposed.

**Transformational leadership**

Bratton and Malinowski (2008) claim that cultural change has occurred in their organization now that institutionalized leadership practices have been fully invested in performance management. They claim this will be enhanced with continual process refining and the “ability to provide managers with real-time feedback on their progress against agreed-upon goals and established benchmarks” (p. 264). Bratton, a recognized police leader, epitomized that leadership when he stated, “I also view the future as an opportunity to expand our partnerships and collaborative efforts with our academic and business communities” (p. 264). According to Yukl (2010), “Effective leadership is needed to revitalize an organization and facilitate adaptation to a changing environment [however] leading change is one of the most important and difficult leadership responsibilities” (p. 298).

Development of a “clear and compelling vision” (p. 309) is paramount to guiding organizational change (Yukl, 2010) along with the development of a mission statement and the identification of organizational values. In order to effectively lead the CPS through organizational change towards development of a successful police collaborative, it will be necessary for its leaders to employ these and other key principles highlighted by the literature on change and the leadership of change.

Since the RTOC is a relatively new concept to policing, its implementation will involve wholesale organizational change. Yukl (2010) advised that “Large-scale change in an organization usually requires some change in organization culture” and that “By changing the
culture of an organization, top management can directly influence the motivation and behavior of organization members” (p. 305). These changes will demand patience on the part of leaders who must provide transformational leadership in the form of mutual trust, coaching in the form of learning, and stimulation for individual empowerment as outlined by Yukl (2010). The patience required by leaders implementing change is reflected in Henry Ford’s observation that “Coming together is a beginning; keeping together is progress; working together is success” (n.d.), and leaders driving these changes must remain cognizant of the positive and negative implications of organizational culture.

Organizational Culture

Individuals are agents within and of a culture. As such we are all part of a cultural ‘whole’. As Fontane reminds us:

Man is not just an individual, he belongs to the whole; we must always take heed of the whole, for we are completely dependent on it. (Theodor Fontane, n.d., 1819 - 1898, as cited in Kappeler, Sluder & Alpert, 2005, p. 231)

Cultural influence is acknowledged empirically as a force so powerful that, while “some argue that organizations have cultures; others insist that organizations are cultures” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 269). Nowhere is this influence considered more prevalent than the law enforcement community where, with the unique role and status afforded police, “some scholars have adopted a culturalization perspective of the police as a unique occupational subculture” (Kappeler et al., 2005, p. 235). Schein (1992) offered his perspective with this definition of culture:

A pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid
and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 12)

By contrast, a subculture is that group of people within a given culture that, “while sharing many values and beliefs of the larger culture, also have a separate and distinct set of values that set them apart” (Kappeler et al., 2005, p. 235). By definition, the nature of police work and therefore police culture dictate some degree of societal isolation, and with the many sub-specialties and functions within policing comes an increased potential for the development of internal subcultures. Granot’s (1997) view that, “The distinctive cultural characteristics that develop in all organizations strain inter-organizational relationships under the best of circumstances” (p. 305) illustrates how interagency conflict can be exacerbated exponentially through the development of various subcultures under the umbrella of an overarching police culture. Collaboration proposes the amalgamation of distinct, sometimes dysfunctional, and always significant police organizational cultures.

Organizational culture is often characterized as the “superglue that bonds an organization, unites people, and helps an enterprise accomplish desired ends” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 253) or simply “the glue that holds organizations together” (Goffee & Jones, 1996, p. 134). Yet police organizational culture has been held to account for a myriad of ethical shortcomings including police deviance and corruption (Dunham & Alpert, 2005, p. 291). Unlike civilian organizations, “most connotations of police culture are negative” (Paoline, 2003, p. 200) (Chan, 1997; Fitzgerald, 1989; Manning, 1977; Reiner, 1992; Skolnick, 1966; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993; Prenzler, 1997). The literature shows that transformational leaders can never ignore the ubiquitous nature of culture, no matter how subtle, and some potential cultural issues faced by CPS in this collaborative initiative are identified and examined in the following sections. It will
be important for CPS leaders to remember that commensurate cultural transformation is a prerequisite for organizational change.

**Police Culture**

It’s a Cop Thing.

You Wouldn’t Understand. (Crank, 2004, p. 11)

Crank’s quote accurately reflects a common reaction from police officers when questioned about their culture. With existent seemingly abundant anecdotal evidence of the ethos that guides police, an objective review that examines facts and origins of what is often collectively viewed as a subversive subculture is imperative. In relation to a structural analysis of this nature, Senge (2006) advised, “The reason that structural explanations are so important is that only they address the underlying causes of behavior at a level at which patterns of behavior can be changed” (p. 53). This of course assumes the necessity for cultural change in order to facilitate organizational change, a requirement that the literature makes clear.

Despite the negative connotations generally associated with police culture, many researchers have attempted to address what they view as nothing more than an unfair generalization of this group. Paoline (2003) captured these collective thoughts with the observation “there are positive aspects of police culture that should not be understated (Chan, 1996; Waddington, 1999)” (p. 200). Writing from a police perspective and asking, “What exactly is the ‘police culture’ and what exactly is so bad about it?”, Oldham (2006) claims that police have allowed themselves to be painted in a negative light and need to be reminded of “the concepts of duty, dedication and self-sacrifice” (p. 1) to which they adhere. Using Janet Chan (1997) as example, Waddington (1999) highlighted her statement that “Police culture has become a convenient label for a range of negative values, attitudes and practice norms among
police officers” (as cited in Waddington, p. 293). Waddington condemned use of the term convenient as a descriptor for any explanation “because precious little is actually explained” (p. 293) and, calling the voluminous literature on police subculture “condemnatory” Waddington pursued an alternative conception that he designated as “appreciative” (p. 287). Haslam, Jetten, Postmes, and Haslam (2009) advised that social identities “constitute much of what we live for and what we live by” (p. 18) and corroborated related literature which confirms that a healthy, positive social identity results from belonging to a group that provides “a sense of meaning, purpose and belonging” (p. 1) such as the police.

Borrowing from Swidler’s (1986) image of culture as a “tool kit” of “symbols, stories, rituals, and world - views” (p. 273), which probably borrows from Hannerz’ (1969) long established “cultural repertoire” or “toolkit” (pp. 186-188), and paralleling recent literary efforts of Chan (1996; 1997; 2001) and Paoline (2003), Crank (2004) writes from a perspective that addresses police culture in terms of identifiable themes “which are areas of cultural activity that unite elements of predisposition, action, and social structure” (p. 4). Consistent with Senge’s (2006) structural explanations, breaking culture down into themes may provide the insight and inroads necessary to facilitate cultural change.

The concept of themes is shared by Dunham and Alpert (2005) in their examination of “police subcultures’ dominant themes of social isolation and solidarity” (pp. 246-248), Waddington’s (1999) disclosure that “it has become a commonplace of police research that the police subculture is neither homogenous nor monolithic” (p. 290), and research protocols followed by Paoline (2003) who advised that, “Recent research is beginning to directly question the existence and conceptualization of a monolithic police culture, and is focusing on the complexity of culture and variation among officers” (p. 207). While academic debate continues
over the role of organizational culture, there is a consensus among researchers (Cockcroft, 2005; Balthazard, Cooke & Potter, 2006; McDermott, 1999; Swidler, 1986; Yukl, 2010) that the study of police culture needs to be expanded and diversified as reflected in Paoline’s (2003) comments that, “studies of police culture should employ a number of methodological approaches [in multiple research settings] [in] assessing the attitudes, values and norms of police culture” (p. 210).

Analogous with the complexity and diverse cultural frames espoused by Chesterman (2001) and Bolman and Deal (2008), Crank (2004) described police culture as an improperly examined and untapped phenomenon, elaborating:

All areas of police work have meaning of some kind to cops, and as every reformer and chief who has sought to change any organization knows, these meanings tend to bind together in sentiments and values impossible to analytically separate and individually change. (p. 3)

No matter how daunting it may seem, CPS leaders attempting collaborative change to facilitate the RTOC must remember that they have the potential to affect positive cultural influence only if proposed changes are approached in the appropriate manner.

**Leadership and Culture**

Bolman and Deal (2008) highlight a literary controversy surrounding the relationship between leadership and culture by asking the question, “Do leaders shape culture, or are they shaped by it?” (p. 269). In their review of the worldwide GLOBE leadership study, we were advised that leadership had been defined as, “…the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members” (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004, p.
With the 11-year investigation researchers also claimed to have confirmed their hypothesis that “societal and organizational culture influences the kind of leadership found to be acceptable and effective by people within that culture” (House et al., 2004, p. 2). Notwithstanding the reciprocal relationship illustrated here, Yukl (2010) jumped off the metaphorical fence to adopt a point of view congruent with accepted literature and advised, “Leaders can influence the culture of an organization in a variety of ways” (p. 306). Yukl’s guidelines for leading change, complete with 14 “guidelines for implementing a major change” (p. 317), are corroborated by the literature in general, including Paoline’s (2003) observation “that culture may differ across organizations and is defined by top management” (p. 207) (Deal & Kennedy, 1983; Schein, 1992, 2004; Trice & Beyer, 1993; Tsui, Zhang, Wang, Xin, & Wu, 2006).

The primary purpose of leadership is to enable positive change, and only recently does the literature seek to develop sustainable outcomes for organizational transformation – an outcome of positive change. Sustainability of the proposed law enforcement collaborative relies on change implementation and its integration within existing organizational culture. Recent research from Zuber-Skerritt (2012) has enhanced the concept of sustainability exponentially. This research has enhanced traditional thinking in regard to such literary cautions as, “If senior leaders or others attempt to impose change that is not in line with culture and its defining values and norms, the change may become policy, but it will be a superficial alteration at best” (Belasco, 1990, p. 202). Gehl (2004) too emphasizes the importance of cultural considerations, advising, “The ability of police leaders to recognize culture and mediate the negative influences is a key element to the development of effective multiagency teams” (p. 2).

The role of leadership in relation to organizational culture may well be best reflected in the following excerpt:
Beyond the assumptions held by leaders, their skills and qualities (including their personal styles and leadership strategies) have a profound impact on organizational culture. This impact can be positive and transformational (e.g. Kouzes & Posner, 2002) - sending signals for achievement oriented and cooperative behaviors and thereby creating and reinforcing a constructive culture. However, this impact can alternatively be negative and dysfunctional (e.g. Kets de Vries & Miller, 1986; Litzky et al., 2006) - implicitly requiring passive and aggressive behaviors and creating a defensive culture. (Balthazard, Cooke & Potter, 2006, p. 715)

A defensive culture is a tangible threat to the successful development of the RTOC and proposed law enforcement collaborative. Its implications are examined in the following section.

**Cultural resistance to collaboration and defensive behaviors**

Leaders who ignore organizational culture do so at their own peril, but of what challenges are they warned and how might these be dealt with? A suitable albeit basic answer is found in the following broad explanation offered by Delattre (1989):

> Institutional habits run deep; they are often tied to acceptance of the inevitability of the way things have been done. People, set in their ways, resent efforts to change anything, not only in police work but also in education, business, and government. (as cited in Gehl, 2004, p. 2)

reminded, “If people are not ready for change, they will resist” (p. 315). Commenting on the relationship between leadership and culture, Senge (2006) continued, “Rather than pushing harder to overcome resistance to change, artful leaders discern the source of the resistance [and] focus directly on the implicit norms and power relationships within which the norms are embedded” (p. 88).

Arguably the most comprehensive work on defensive behaviors comes from Piggot-Irvine (2012) who, expanding upon the previous research of Argyris (2003) and Dick and Dalmau (1999), offers her hypothesis that “Avoidance, power and control are at the heart of defensive tendencies and they are associated with deeply rooted values and often undetected strategies that destroy authentic collaboration” (p. 96). Expounding upon the destructive ability of these “strategies of defensiveness” (p. 97), and reminiscent of the theory of Short (1998), Piggot-Irvine guides us through a practical process from “advocacy and inquiry” to “productive dialogue” (pp. 96-100) that leads to the “productive reasoning” (p. 99) necessary to facilitate genuine collaboration.

Intertwined throughout her thesis is Piggot-Irvine’s (2012) acknowledgement that trust is essential to any collaborative effort. It is difficult to argue with her reasoning that trust is “a hard earned outcome from effective collaboration” (p. 91) rather than the “natural consequence of collaboration” (p. 91) implied by many authors. Rather than using a perceived lack of requisite trust as an excuse not to pursue implementation of the proposed RTOC - law enforcement collaborative, Piggot-Irvine’s assessment provides incentive to introduce this implementation in conjunction with a corresponding effort to build that trust.
Trust

Yukl (2010) identified one of the principle reasons for resistance to change as a “lack of trust” or “distrust of the people who propose it”, adding that this distrust “can magnify the effect of other sources of resistance” (p. 299). Reminding us that “The root meaning of the word collaboration is to [co - labour]”, Piggot-Irvine (2012) pointed out that this is “based on shared goals and shared vision, openness, trust and democratic ideals” (p. 90). Supported by Atkinson and Butcher’s (2003) “theories that frame trust development” (pp. 1-17), Baker’s (2003) “social capital” and his “emphasis on giving rather than getting … the power of reciprocity” (p. 12), Short’s (1998) advice to “demonstrate respect” and “be genuine” (p. 127), and Kouzes and Posner’s (2007) advice “learn to develop a cohesive and collaborative team, beginning with trust as the framework” (p. 221), the concept of trust figures prominently throughout relevant literature. Although one might not immediately concur with Butler’s (1991) contention “that managers have a greater need to know what causes trust than to understand the construct itself” (as cited in Atkinson & Butcher, 2003, p. 17), upon reflection in the context of Flores and Solomon’s (1998) authentic trust it becomes evident through the literature that development of the construct itself is paramount. Development of an authentic trust that expects and survives failure may be the ideal solution, an effort that would seemingly fit perfectly with the authentic collaboration proposed by Piggot-Irvine (2012).

Finally, Lencioni (2005) weighed in with comments particularly pertinent to the type of teambuilding this study proposes, with his conclusion that:

Members of great teams trust one another on a fundamental, emotional level, and they are comfortable being vulnerable with each other about their weaknesses, mistakes, fears,
and behaviors. They get to a point where they can be completely open with one another, without filters. This is essential… (p. 7)

Lencioni’s comments illustrate the long road that lies ahead for this collaborative initiative.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter explored the relative literature in conjunction with pertinent inquiry topics. These included the implications of collaboration; communication, technical and information management challenges facing police, leadership issues, and cultural influences with the potential to decide outcomes of any policing initiative or proposed change. A theoretical yet rudimentary understanding of these challenges is established to provide leaders and stakeholders with valuable insight into organizational transformation. Methodology into the identification and investigation of topics relevant to a law enforcement collaborative, the RTOC, CPS and its stakeholders is examined in the following chapter.
CHAPTER THREE: INQUIRY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Research Approach

This chapter defines the chosen research methodology, in correlation with the overarching structure and conduct of the study. The criteria and a rationale for participant selection are offered pursuant to a subsequent introduction of study participants. Description of study conduct includes the approach taken for generation and organization of research data and the process designed and followed to facilitate meaningful analysis of that data. Evidence to support rigor and corroborate trustworthiness of the study is presented with supportive literature, followed with an acknowledgement of ethical considerations that concludes the chapter.

Because police agencies in general have failed to establish the type of interagency cooperation necessary to address modern multi-jurisdictional issues (British Columbia Justice, 2012, p. 90), this study was designed and undertaken to address the question, “How can the CPS develop an intelligence led, real time law enforcement collaborative?” and to identify challenges involved with the included issues:

1. How can CPS engage collaborative practice?
2. What are the importance of culture, communication and trust in collaborative practice?
3. How can CPS develop a model of organizational change for collaborative practice?

This research study was based upon the theoretical foundations of action research as presented by Stringer (2007, pp. 19-38), while research conduct borrowed from both Stringer’s action research practice and the insider action research of Coghlan and Brannick (2010). The investigation has involved qualitative research to determine, or in Stringer’s words, “understand how things are happening, rather than merely on what is happening, and to understand the ways
that stakeholders [perceive, interpret, and respond to events related to the issue investigated]” (p.19).

Action research provides a participatory structure that allows the researcher to become facilitator and for those key people who would otherwise be subjects to instead become participants in an inclusive practice. As an insider researcher I have valuable insight into the culture and informal social structures of my own organization, and although other principle organizations are geographically removed, because they are also law enforcement agencies I also have insight, albeit limited, into their operations. Coghlan and Brannick (2010) advised the insider research facilitator to remain open to new ideas as they explained, “epistemic reflexivity is the constant analysis of your lived experience as well as your own theoretical and methodological presuppositions” (p. 115). This goes hand in hand with the cited moral view of Ferguson and Ferguson (2001) “to be honest about the perspectives from which you operate and be open to disconfirming evidence - perhaps seeking it out through interviews” (as cited in Coghlan & Brannick, p. 159).

Respectively defined as the ability to “foster an inquiring approach”, illustrate an “ability to inquire into and work with others”, and involve others in “creating communities of inquiry” (Coghlan & Brannick, 2010, p. 5), first, second and third person inquiry represent three effective yet distinctly different approaches to research. Reason and Torbert (2001) suggest that “what is required now is explicit integrating of all three persons with action and inquiry” (as cited in Coghlan & Brannick, p. 6) and my research has attempted to incorporate this diversified approach with stakeholders.
Credited with introducing a perspective of action research to the social sciences, Lewin (1947) explained the basic premise and reasoning behind his purist model of action and research with:

A change towards a higher level of group performance is frequently short-lived, after a ‘shot in the arm’, group life soon returns to the previous level. This indicates that it does not suffice to define the objective of planned change in group performance as the reaching of a different level. Permanency of the new level, or permanency for a desired period, should be included in the objective. (pp. 34-35)

Developed continually since Lewin (1947) introduced his humanistic approach, the construct of action research has evolved into a cyclical, abstract process of delineation in a practical research approach that involves subjects as co-researchers in “a non-linear pattern of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting on the changes in the social situations” (Noffke & Stevenson, 1995, p. 2), an “enquiry with people, rather than research on people” (Altrichter, Kemmis, McTaggart & Zuber-Skerritt, 2002, p. 130). A hands-on process that does not separate the “investigation from the action needed to solve the problem” (McFarland & Stansell, 1993, p. 14), Zuber-Skerritt (1996) advised that “action research has been established as an appropriate research paradigm for educational, professional, managerial and organizational development” (p. 3), a viewpoint corroborated by the relative literature (Coget, 2009; Coghlan & Jacobs, 2005; Dick, 2004; Dickens & Watkins, 1999; Reason & Bradbury, 2001; Sherman & Torber, 2000).

Glesne (2011) told us, “Action research has at its essence the intent to change something, to solve some sort of problem, to take action” (p. 15) and explains “The [action] research process is collaborative and inclusive of all major stakeholders with the researcher acting as a facilitator
who keeps the research cycles moving” (p. 23). Consistent with these recurrent cycles, Ferrance (2000) clarifies again, insisting the paradigm “is not problem-solving in the sense of trying to find out what is wrong, but rather a quest for knowledge about how to improve” (p. 2).

I employed a holistic approach in my qualitative research to generate data that I knew “focuses on qualities such as words or observations that are difficult to quantify and that lend themselves to interpretation or deconstruction” (Glesne, 2011, p. 283). Stringer’s (2007) “interacting spiral” (p. 9) facilitated the review and analysis of opinions, concerns and any ideas or suggestions shared by participants, while my insider status assisted with the deconstruction and analysis of data from which my research intended to generate sufficient knowledge to move to the final phase of Stringer’s (2007) “look-think-act research cycle” (p. 41), planting the seeds for both organizational transformation and future inquiry.

**Project Participants**

In an attempt to construct meaningful research, I selected my participants based upon their respective positions and potential to effect change, implementing what Stringer (2007) refers to as “purposeful sampling” (p. 43). During this study I relied upon the leaders that I interviewed to “speak out early” (Kraut, 2009) as representatives of their respective organizations.

Eleven partner law enforcement agencies were initially identified as key stakeholders in this study. With 6,200 sworn police officers in the Province of Alberta, in order to keep the study manageable and within allotted time restrictions, only the senior officer from each stakeholder agency was interviewed. In one instance two senior officers from the same organization were interviewed, representing 12 agencies including CPS and accounting for a total of 13 study interviewees, all of whom are introduced here in no specific order.
Chief Edward (Ted) Miles brings over 32 years of policing experience to his current position as Chief Executive Officer of the Alberta Law Enforcement Response Teams (ALERT), where he oversees 400 members currently integrated into Combined Forces Special Enforcement Units (CFSEU) within municipal agencies throughout the Province.

Chief Darrell Kambeitz of the Camrose Police Service has held the top job in this central Alberta city of 20,000 for the past five years and shares 31 years of police experience.

Chief Alfred (Alf) Rudd of the Taber Police Service (TBS) brings 41 years of diversified policing experience to his current position in this southern Alberta town of 8,000.

Warden Darcy Emann, Institutional Head of Drumheller Correctional Facility, shares 24 years of experience with the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). Warden Emann oversees some 400 CSC employees at the CSC - Prairie Region facility designed to house 550 inmates.

Chief Andrew (Andy) McGrogan brings to the table 32 years of experience with the Medicine Hat Police Service (MHPS). Chief McGrogan serves a population of 62,000 and is also the Alberta representative of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP).

Chief Vince Caleffi took over the Alberta Sheriffs in 2006 after beginning his career with CPS in 1976. Chief Caleffi retired in July 2012 with over 35 years policing experience.

Chief Gary Leslie of the Lacombe Police Service (LPS) has served as Chief for the past five years in this central Alberta city of 12,000 and is scheduled to retire in May 2013 after 30 years in policing.

Deputy Commissioner Dale McGowan, Commanding Officer of RCMP “K” Division, has over 34 years of police experience with the RCMP.
Chief Superintendent Marlin Degrand, Deputy Criminal Operations Officer, Integration and Specialized Investigations, RCMP "K" Division, shares 26 years of experience with the RCMP.

Chief Rod Knecht became Chief of the Edmonton Police Service (EPS) in 2011 and shares the accumulated knowledge of a 36 year policing career that began with the RCMP.

Mike Skappak, Regional Director, Enforcement and Intelligence Division, Prairie Region, Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), has served with that organization for 30 years.

Chief Rick Hanson of the Calgary Police Service (CPS) shares 38 years of police experience that included two years with the RCMP as Chief Superintendent in charge of Integrated and Federal Policing for the Province of Alberta.

Chief Tom McKenzie, Lethbridge Regional Police Service (LRPS), shares 36 years of policing experience with LRPS where he has been Chief since 2007.

Without hesitation, each of these leaders graciously agreed to participate in this research study and gave freely of themselves to do so, and while at times I felt this should have surprised me, it never did. Upon reflection I understood that these people epitomize leadership because they are never satisfied with the status quo and recognize learning as progress.

In order to make sense of the abundant rich data generated by study participants, I used an inquiry team to support my research. The participation of two respected colleagues constituted a mean tool by which I was able to gauge study progress while utilizing their extensive knowledge in support of the structure, framing, queries, and analytical processes employed in my research. Senior CPS members, the sound reasoning and direction offered by these individuals was instrumental to this action research study.
Inquiry Methodology

Consistent with the spirit of the literature I chose to conduct interviews as an appropriate data collection technique for my study. Complimented by my personal knowledge, the individuals interviewed were representative of a larger whole and brought vast experience and knowledge to the table. The following sections address the tools used to generate raw data, conduct of the study in generating that data, analysis of all raw data generated and the ethical considerations that have guided my practice.

Data collection tools

In an effort to get to the heart of my participants’ opinions, so that they felt free to “say what they are really thinking, or to express what they are really feeling” (Stringer, 2007, p. 69), I chose the guided reflection of structured interviews as my primary data collection tool. Recognized as an effective research tool, interviews are included as one of “a number of methods of systematically gathering data from members of an organization” (Kraut, 2009, p. 301). Citing relevant literature, Kraut explained that interviews were “obviously the source of data being used to fuel change” (p. 303), and summarized that “True leaders can speak out early and shape the social reality and meaning [for others in the organization]” (p. 309) (Nadler, 1977; Dunham and Smith, 1979; and Lawler, Nadler and Cammann, 1980).

Weiss (1994) claimed to be “particularly struck by the density of information provided by qualitative interview studies and by their usefulness for understanding the complexities of respondents’ experiences” (p. viii). Dismissing admitted shortcomings as relatively minor, Weiss praised “qualitative interviewing [as] a fundamental method for learning about the experience of others” (p. ix). Calling qualitative interview “one of the most important data gathering tools in qualitative research,” Myers and Newman (2006) also described it as being
“fraught with difficulties” that were “often ignored in the final write-up of the research” (p. 1). Other alleged pitfalls included intrusiveness of the researcher, the interview takes place between strangers, and the interview itself is a very artificial situation (Kvale, 1987; Kvale, 1996; Mason, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2005; Silverman, 2000). Despite these issues, none of which appear insurmountable, the qualitative interview remains one of the most effective data collections tools available to researchers, compared to night goggles, “permitting us to see that which is not ordinarily on view and examine that which is looked at but seldom seen” (Packer, 2011; Rubin & Rubin, 2005, p. vii, as cited in Myers & Newman, 2006, p. 1).

Researchers such as Schwandt (2007) dismiss the notion that inquiry can determine the truth or accuracy of a social construct and focus instead on merit; whether the inquiry “advances a social agenda or offers cultural criticism” (as cited in Glesne, 2011, p. 49). Although the implications for research methods can arguably be considered ambiguous, I structured my qualitative research to ensure study trustworthiness and credibility in accordance with the relevant literature (Coghlan & Brannick, 2010; Glesne, 2011; Stringer, 2007).

To reflect Stringer’s (2007) “principle of inclusion”, I interviewed participants from each stakeholder agency, since “researchers enhance the credibility of the study by ensuring that the perspectives of all stakeholding groups are incorporated into the study” (p. 58). Veracity of my research was augmented further by drawing clear concepts and ideas from the “experiences and perspectives of participating stakeholders” and grounding reports and other communication in “the terminology and language of the research participants to ensure that it reflects their perspective” (p. 59), practices identified by Stringer as “referential adequacy” (p. 58).

We know from Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2004) that, “change begins when emotionally intelligent leaders actively question the emotional reality and the cultural norms
underlying the group’s daily activities and behavior” (p. 195), and in an effort to stimulate that change I structured my interview questions to pertain specifically to the underlying organizational issues described as “the hidden dimensions: people’s emotions, the undercurrents of the emotional reality in the organization, and the culture that holds it all together” (Goleman et al, 2004, p. 195) (see Appendix F).

**Study conduct**

Because the interview participants are extremely busy professionals, I made initial telephone contact with them or their executive officer in order to introduce myself and the research project. Although in most instances much less formal, this cursory introduction followed the general format outlined in the attached Telephone Script (see Appendix D), lending a personal touch and lessening the likelihood of a potential participant dismissing the Letter of Invitation that followed via email (see Appendix E). Once participation was confirmed, Consent Forms outlining the roles and rights of both facilitator and participants were forwarded via email (see Appendix F). The topic of the research study is displayed on all three Appendices, with the five research questions contained only on the latter two.

Following an agreement to participate during my initial telephone introduction, I forwarded each participant a copy of the Letter of Invitation, attached as Appendix E, and a Letter of Consent, attached as Appendix F, primarily so they could familiarize themselves with the upcoming interview questions presented on each document and with the intention that interview information captured would be enriched by providing interviewees ample time for consideration, personal reflection and even discussion with colleagues prior to the interview.

For the convenience of study participants I travelled to their respective locations and conducted interviews in the comfort of their private offices. While Stringer’s (2007) advice that
“Interviews should be treated as informal conversations” (p. 69) seems to be in direct contradiction to Glesne’s (2011) contention that “Interviewing is a complex act” (p. 121), I know from experience that the truth lies somewhere between both observations and that anything done to simplify the process and stimulate results is paramount. My only stipulation was that the venue chosen be conducive to audio recording of the conversation to ensure accuracy of the information collected. I used field notes to guide my practice only for general tombstone information and because of the nature of the business this did not present a distraction to any of the participants.

Seeing no reason to complicate a straightforward process, other than a new Sony digital recorder my data collection tools were relatively simple, with pen and paper upon which I scribbled addresses, telephone numbers, names, dates, times and directions to guide my practice - field notes. I kept a notebook with more formal notes completed after each interview to aid my recollection of any interview anomalies or ambiguities, whether perceived or real.

Since I remained apprehensive that my wafer-thin digital recorder might fail, my guilty confession is that as back-up, I religiously carried an electric Marantz digital recorder, the size of a small import, which I insisted on plugging into a wall outlet at every interview I attended. Ironically, this went unquestioned by all study participants, some of whom probably recognized the Marantz and all of whom I’m sure hail from an era when size may in fact have mattered.

As an insider action researcher, I understand that I am also a part of the prevalent culture and as such approached my research cognizant of Coghlan and Brannick’s (2010) apt description of the strong cultural dogma existing within the participating agencies:

Schein (2004) describes organizational culture as patterns of basic assumptions which have been passed on through generations of organizational members and which are
unnoticed and taken for granted. Accordingly, the approach to uncovering cultural assumptions is a dialogue between organizational members and an external process consultant who facilitates the exploration of what assumptions underlie artefacts and values. (p. 116)

Although Schein (2004) makes no distinction between “external consultant” and “external process consultant” my intended role during the study in this context was that of the latter and I approached study interviews with the intention of uncovering cultural assumptions by developing and encouraging an appropriate dialogue.

Continuing to borrow heavily from Stringer (2007) for study interviews, I encouraged individual responses with global “grand tour” inquiries and prompts such as the extension, encouragement, and example questions offered by Stringer (2007, pp. 70-71). To enhance the richness of data collected and ensure the iterative nature of the study, I worked closely with my project sponsor in the ongoing appraisal and revision of these expansion questions, which I found prevented any unintentional or inadvertent directing of responses.

Interview recordings were professionally transcribed, all within 48 hours, most within 24 hours, then proof read and edited for accuracy (see Appendix G). Interview audio was retained on disc, and audio was downloaded and retained electronically alongside electronic copies of the completed transcripts. Each interview transcript was printed and a copy retained to assist with the thematic analysis. It was originally thought that a copy of their respective transcript would be returned to each participant for review, however without a continuum to guide this it was thought that we may simply be asking participants to edit these for a second time. Determined to be an onerous, unfair request of study participants, this proposed step was eliminated prior to start of the research.
Data analysis

Although on the surface my data collection, which I like to term data generation, may appear to be based solely upon an interview technique, my research has satisfied the “three data-gathering techniques [that] dominate in qualitative inquiry: observation, interviewing, and document collection” that Glesne (2011) prescribes as necessary, “to get at the deepened, complex understanding” (p. 48).

Study rigor was maintained through a constant effort to ensure trustworthiness of the research, constant checks that as Stringer (2007) tells us, “are designed to ensure that researchers have rigorously established the veracity, truthfulness, or validity of the information and analysis that have emerged from the research process” (p. 57). Prompt transcription, proofreading, editing and analysis of all recorded data, my use of “field notes” and the “member checking” (Stringer, 2007, p. 72) that I conducted both during and after each interview were all essential to the integrity of my study and consistent with the spirit of all relevant literature (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Glesne, 2011; Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008).

Data analysis followed many of the basic guidelines suggested by the literature (Stringer, 2007; Coghlan & Brannick, 2010; Glesne, 2011; Weisbord, 2004). Written transcripts of recorded interviews enhanced the integrity of this study and were very useful in the ensuing analysis once I satisfied myself that these were an accurate, verbatim account of the respective interview. This employment of the “verbatim principle” increased the likelihood of “capturing the meanings inherent in people’s experience” (Stringer, 2007, p. 99), while minimizing my propensity to “conceptualize events through [my] own interpretive lenses” (p. 99).

Employing Stringer’s (2007) basic principles of “look, think, act” (p. 8), I initially read each interview transcript at least twice, not simply to appease Glesne’s (2011) contention that
once is never enough but to assuage my curiosity at the fact that, although I had been present and conducting these interviews, I gained new insight each time I reviewed them. Following this I began categorizing and coding, searching the data “to identify the significant features and elements that make up the experience and perception of the people involved in the study (stakeholders)” (Stringer, 2007, p. 98), with the intention that each interview initially be analyzed independently so that ultimately I could “explore how categorizations or thematic ideas represented by the codes vary from case to case, from setting to setting or from incident to incident” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 48), an analytical technique that provided further insight into my findings.

After categorizing and coding individual transcripts by identifying words, themes, and phrases through context, repetition and relationship to the relevant literature (Glesne, 2011; Stringer, 2007; Neuman, Wiegand, & Winterdyk, 2004) I was able to conduct a collective analysis of all available data. Once compiled and re-coded this facilitated the identification of certain patterns that emerged in conjunction with the relevant literature and I was able to sort these findings into nine loose categories (see Figure 2, Chapter 4). Further examination allowed for the re-categorization of data yet again with the funneling of nine categories into five (see Figure 3, Chapter 4), after which I was able to distill down and again scrutinize the results for any similarities, consistencies, or patterns that may have developed throughout the analytical process.

While employing a process similar to Stringer’s (2007) “interacting spiral” (p. 8), this analysis included the transfer of recorded words, themes and phrases to a matrix spreadsheet where they were coded, tabulated and the results quantified. Following this process I was able to
provide additional clarity to study findings by funneling down the quantified results using a literary assessment.

**Ethical Issues**

Sensitive challenges are presented by human research, and since my research intended to follow this format, principles behind Boser’s (2006) argument that “ethics need to be integrated into each stage of the action research cycle” (as cited in Coghlan & Brannick, 2010, p. 136) were applied throughout. Since ethical dilemmas are not always obvious, important considerations included relevant literature such as that of Morton (1999) describing the ethical dilemmas of “role contamination” (as cited in Coghlan & Brannick, 2010, p. 137), Humphrey’s (2006) cultivation of the art of journeying between two different worlds as insider and outsider, and the study of ethical dilemma through the ambiguity of roles as described by White and Wooten (1986). With these in mind my research was guided by respect for human dignity and abided by core principles of respect for person, concern for welfare, and justice (Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada [Tri-Council], 2010, p. 8). With an overarching view towards ethical practice, I ensured that the conduct of my research conformed to the guiding principles and practice of the Royal Roads University *Research Ethics Policy* (2007).

Described as “one of the most important qualitative data collection methods” (p. 238), Qu and Dumay (2011) elaborated that “a well - planned interview approach can provide a rich set of data” (p. 239). With this promise comes the caveat that the insider researcher must remain objective, and Qu and Dumay (2011) offer three important skills for doing so: “Stepping back from a particular viewpoint, stepping in and out of the interview (p. 260), and developing
discourse” (p. 261), and since it remained incumbent upon me to suppress any personal bias I practiced these skills throughout the study. Careful personal reflection upon discordant views offered a divergent direction for ensuing interviews as I consistently practiced my ability to “self-critque [my] methods and approaches” (p. 261), something Qu and Dumay advised, “will allow us as researchers to continually develop our skills and contribute to the knowledge and skills of others” (p. 261).

Because research methods were limited by the constraints of time, resources and practicality, the full potential of interview data has been realized with a transparent, ethical study conduct that utilizes accurate recordings and verbatim transcripts. Although participants have been identified in the text of this study, each was assigned a code and pursuant to ethical research protocols have been identified only by that code during all subsequent analysis and study findings.

Chapter Summary

Included in this chapter were a review of the research study, a brief systems overview, framing and justification for chosen research methodology, a description of data collection tools, general conduct of the study and the analysis of research data. All have been examined in detail to provide a clear understanding of research protocol and to illustrate the strict adherence to ethical practice followed by this research project in consideration of the relative ethical concerns also outlined here.

This chapter contains the individual introduction of project participants followed by an explanation for this selection criteria and the rationalization behind participant identification. Justification for this recognition is clarified with the “rich, thick description [excerpted profusely in] writing that allows the reader to enter the research context” (Creswell, 1998 as cited in
Glesne, 2011, p. 49) in adherence to the research principles of “trustworthiness” and “validity” espoused by Glesne (2011). Literature to support the preservation of these principles is found throughout the findings documented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR: ACTION INQUIRY PROJECT RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter details initial study findings supported with evidence excerpted directly from the research data. This is followed immediately by refined study findings realized from a further scrutiny of research data that allowed concatenation and enhancement of the initial findings. The refined study findings are itemized and corroborated by direct excerpts from the research data. Study conclusions based upon inferences drawn from the research data and study findings are presented next, followed by scope and limitations of the inquiry.

This study entailed the identification and investigation of relevant issues pertinent to a collaborative policing initiative of the Calgary Police Service by asking the overarching question, “How can the CPS develop an intelligence-led, real time law enforcement collaborative?” Establishing the necessity of collaboration with an examination of relative literature, this study also explored those challenges analogous to such an initiative including the corresponding questions outlined in the previous chapter.

The applicable research methodology was reflective of qualitative research based upon the theoretical foundations of Stringer 2007, Glesne, 2011, Coghlan & Brannick, 2010 and others. Study results have been primarily derived from the analysis of interviews conducted with research participants during which they were asked to respond to the following five questions:

1) What if any benefit(s) do you see to a law-enforcement collaborative such as the one proposed here?

2) What do you see as barriers to the successful establishment of a policing collaborative in the Province?

3) What are your thoughts on the perceived reluctance of police officers to share information and intelligence with their law enforcement counterparts and what, if
any, are the cultural issues that need to be addressed before we can realize full interagency information sharing?

4) This study proposes the ongoing, unrestricted sharing of information between law enforcement agencies. Does current policy within your agency endorse or inhibit this type of collaboration and what changes would need to take place in order for your agency to adapt a collaborative model such as the one proposed?

5) What do you think would be the best way to develop and implement a true policing collaborative based upon a central operations centre such as the RTOC?

Study data is detailed in this chapter in an *Overview of Study Findings*, explored more thoroughly in *Refined Study Findings*, and followed by the *Study Conclusions* determined by these findings.

All research participants were invited to share their personal views and insights in relation to the interview questions. I searched the resulting transcripts for words, terms, phrases and meaningful metaphors for anomalies, repetition and commonality in context and was able to identify common threads and themes that emerged from the literature. Further analysis of the selected material in relation to the literature assisted me in ascertaining relevant study findings that I was able to loosely sort into nine descriptive categories. I have provided a qualifying statement for each category.

1. **Leadership** - police leaders recognize an urgent need for police in the Province to work effectively together in an ongoing, collaborative effort

2. **Information Management** - there is a vital need for the development of clear interagency communication protocols that facilitate the timely sharing of information and intelligence
3. **Resource Management** - interagency sharing of information is essential to avoid investigative duplicity, understand the policies, procedures, mandates and capabilities of partner agencies, and to perform deconfliction as necessary to ensure the safety of officers and the public

4. **Culture** - there is a distinct requirement for automatic systems to enhance or replace individual personal relationships upon which interagency cooperation currently relies

5. **Administration and Bureaucracy** - common business rules and tools are required to fully facilitate collaboration

6. **Legislation** - we can always find an excuse for *not* sharing

7. **Inclusiveness and Cooperation** - there is a need to find more inclusive, cooperative ways of delivering police services

8. **Technology** - trying to keep current with the right technology is a challenge

9. **Funding** - failed programs, initiatives and a new economic reality has added another dimension to police budgets – *accountability*

**Overview of Study Findings**

Individual findings have been examined and presented separately with supportive excerpts from research interviews that, where possible, are presented in participants’ own words. Research participants were coded AB01 through AB12 in no particular order and despite there being 13 interview participants, because they contributed on behalf of the same organization, two participants share the same code. The concatenation of 644 critical elements of collaboration identified in research interviews and their respective prioritization by study participants is illustrated in Figure 2.
Figure 2. Prioritization of 644 critical collaboration elements

Leadership

Although there was no definitive answer on how to develop the collaborative model, a clear consensus developed amongst participants during discussion of the merits of a collaborative initiative. Each spoke passionately about the need for police collaboration, “maybe not speaking about the benefits of collaboration, it’s the absolute need for collaboration if we want to really advance public safety (AB01, p. 4). Excited at the prospect of a law enforcement collaborative operating effectively throughout the Province, positive opinions expressed by participants ranged from “unbelievable” (AB02, p. 4) and “tremendous” (AB06) to “brilliant” (AB08, p. 18) as well as the general opportunity to “provide better service to the communities” and “be more effective as an organization” (AB04, p. 3). The collective insight of study participants may have been effectively captured with the observation, “you just see the need for collaboration, for working together, for sharing information” (AB12, p. 12).
A common thread presented with an inferred sense of urgency to collaborate as many interview participants referenced previous (Campbell, 1996; O’Connor, 2004) and recent judicial inquiries (Oppal, 2012) and the clear message that has been sent to law enforcement (AB10, p. 5; AB11, p. 15; AB12, pp. 7-8). Previously accepted parochial interests and relatively recent public accountability contrasted to form the views of one participant:

I think we’re getting forced into it, quite frankly, even if we won’t accept it - if we in policing won’t accept the fact that we’ve got to start to break down the barriers, to stop fighting amongst ourselves or being jurisdictionally selfish, I think the law is forcing us to do it. The public is forcing us to do it. I think we’re at a tipping point in policing. I think the face of policing is going to change considerably. (AB12, pp. 23-24)

Public accountability figured prominently amongst participants who related their belief that collaboration is something the public rightfully expects and assumes of police. Some of these thoughts included, “We’re here to serve the citizens…and the expectation is that we are collaborating” (AB07, p. 68), “the expectation is, from Albertans, that we do this” (AB08, p. 23), and “citizens of this country - they all believe that there’s a bigger collaborative effort than actually goes on. I think they’d be horrified to find out that that’s not the case in some instances” (AB05, pp. 33-34).

The data gathered from study participants triangulated what the literature said about collaborative practice. The insight offered by participants was reflective of the literature as well as their roles as leaders, with references to relevant leadership elements of vision, mission statement, commitment, and respect prevalent throughout the interviews. One of the most poignant comments reflecting true leadership in the pursuit of formal interagency collaboration was presented as, “There’s no reason not to, ‘cause it’s the right thing. There’s a million
Information management

Without exception, every participant addressed the importance of communication and information management in the pursuit of interagency collaboration. Although comments ranged widely, with participants drawing upon their respective background or field of expertise to tailor their response, no matter the venue each insisted that a common records management system (RMS) was essential to a venture of this nature. While some referred to major crimes, organized crime, drugs, or intelligence gathering, common consensus was:

“The closer we get to everything from writing reports the same so that they look the same, to the way we manage our information the same, the way that we handle sources the same, source information, if we can standardize a number of those practices, it breaks down the cultural differences.” (AB01, p. 15)

Supportive statements included, “…we don’t have a common place to collect intelligence. And it’s been our experience that the intelligence that we have is of provincial, national, international significance but who knew?” (AB04, p. 5). Most participants concurred with the contention that “there is no power to the intelligence unless it is used - intelligence needs to be shared” (AB02, pp. 7-8).

Participants pointed out that a common database would not come without challenges of its own, such as the question of “access” (AB12, p. 55) and the proposition this be limited, “It cannot be an all or nothing kind of proposition. It has to be scalable” (AB10, p. 16). The question of managing a common database raised the issue of, “Not only how it’s going be used but who gets access to it, who controls access to that information?” (AB11, p. 6). Questions
arose out of disclosure concerns, including, “How do we handle the disclosure aspect, the rules and expectations in terms of disclosure?” (AB10, p. 37) and “Where did you get this information from and how valuable is it?” (AB12, p. 14). After confiding that his “organization functioned very much in silos - one group didn’t talk to another group, didn’t share information” one participant lamented, “We still think in silos” (AB12, pp. 10, 11). Two other participants agreed with this feeling that information silos remained prevalent (AB10; AB11).

Despite the potential difficulties identified by study participants in doing so, all leaders supported improved overall methods of information management, particularly the collection and dissemination of intelligence. Many participants offered advice on the key process of “information sharing” with the view that this was imperative to collaboration (AB05, p.5; AB06, p. 5; AB07, p. 22; AB09, p. 47; AB10, p. 9; AB12, p. 7).

Resource management

Many research participants envisioned the development of a law enforcement collaborative as an opportunity for the alignment, sharing, and management of resources (AB01, p. 12; AB02, p. 9; AB03, p. 29; AB05, pp. 5, 7, 32; AB08, p. 23; AB10, p. 17). In relation to the subject of organized crime, one participant expressed his concern that without essential collaboration, “You’re looking at all those different police agencies that are only doing surface policing”, something he referred to as “just dealing with everyday problems, car accidents, and all that other stuff…” (AB09, p. 44). His thoughts were reflected in comments that related directly to the potential for general improvement in efficiency and effectiveness (AB04, p. 3; AB08, p. 23; AB12, p. 56), and those making reference to the need for “best practice” (AB01, p. 14; AB12, pp. 12, 16). The suggestion that it was imperative to, “move to that holistic kind of approach to enforcement and policing” (AB10, p. 5) was corroborated by other comments
Commenting that, “there’s a lot of redundancy and I think there’s a lot of overlap in what we do” (p. 16), AB12 suggested, “we don’t all have to reinvent the wheel all the time” (p. 16) and recommended collaborative training efforts because “it doesn’t matter where in the world it happens to be - the policing challenges are exactly the same - but we can learn from that too, we can dip into the wells and find out how other people are doing things without having to make the same mistakes over and over and over again” (p. 16). His view that common training was key to understanding policies, procedures, and mandates of partner agencies was strongly supported by other study participants (AB01, p. 26; AB04, p. 20; AB05, p.22; AB06, pp. 18, 19; AB07, pp. 27, 29).

Management of the proposed centre was an issue of some debate by study participants, whose proposals for the effective management of a resource collaborative included a “joint management team” (AB01, p. 6), a “strong executive [responsible for the mandate and the vision of that actual RTOC]” (AB05, p. 32), the “leveraging of existing resources” (AB10, p. 6), and “hands-on leadership” (AB10, p. 28). Although the question of control was of obvious concern to half of the study participants (AB02, p. 21; AB08, pp. 17, 18, 36; AB09, p. 34; AB10, pp. 32, 33; AB11, p. 6; AB12, pp. 48, 54) most broached the subject reluctantly as if the term control was a dirty word, surprising in light of the relevant ‘command and control’ policing framework.

The issue of risk in its many forms was an expressed concern of participants when contemplated in the context of a collaborative effort, with issues ranging from “assessment and
mitigation of risk” (AB02, p. 4) and “managing risk” (AB02, p. 13) to disparity of “risk tolerance” (AB10, p. 34) between agencies.

Alternatively, those who viewed risk as a catalyst to change addressed it in a more positive light. Recognizing the strong need for collaboration, one participant illustrated his frustration with the statement, “It takes some strong leaders to say enough is enough - let’s be more efficient here - let’s take a little bit of a risk” (AB05, p. 26). Another intimated that risk was essential with the assertion that “somebody’s got to make the first step and say, ‘Here it is, let’s make it work’” (AB11, p. 10). This was congruent with the expressed view that, “There’s more risk in not sharing information than there is in sharing information. It’s a policing cost that we have to accept in our profession as part of what we do” (AB01, p. 21).

**Culture**

Of the many issues raised regarding interpersonal and interagency relationships there was no disagreement that this is a culture in need of repair, nor did they argue with the expressed opinion of two participants that, “Quite frankly, we’re not willing to share with each other, we’re not willing to cooperate to the level that I think the public expects us to share and cooperate” (AB12, p. 7) and “I think the citizens of Alberta would be disappointed and frightened if they knew that we don’t share that information amongst ourselves as police officers” (AB03, p. 14). Reasons given for non-cooperation were myriad, and when offered by every participant some insight into the complexity of the issues was gained. Many comments overlapped with a central theme of trust or distrust and were illustrated by comments such as, “Collaborative policing needs to have its own identity…it will help leave the culture behind” (AB01, p. 13), and “the big one is the organizations themselves…those police leaders have to be prepared to open their doors and share their information with their colleagues in a real time daily basis or this will not work”
Many of the participants who deemed trust to be an essential element of collaboration specifically blamed a lack of trust for the current reluctance of police to collaborate. “Competitiveness” and “protectionism” were identified as factors negatively affecting internal and external cooperation.

Some participants reiterated the principle that “knowledge is power” while others related their reliance upon personal relationships to share that knowledge, oftentimes admittedly dependent upon the confidence they held in their respective counterparts to do so. This was reflected in the statement “The reality is that organizations don’t have relationships but people do, in those organizations.”

Two participants offered advice to counter the reliance on unreliable or unpredictable personal relationships upon which interagency communications are often based. Both recommended that a tangible system be put in place to perform these liaison duties consistently rather than the often sporadic contact upon which police currently rely:

If we don’t talk together, we don’t share information, then we’re all going in different directions. It’s when we find opportunities to collaborate that we’re more successful. And we have to identify those opportunities to collaborate. We’re not always aware of opportunities to collaborate unless we have a system that’s going to provide that opportunity to us and identifying where two agencies may be going down the same path and not understanding or not knowing that they are. So just having that simple ability to
identify those opportunities through a collaborative approach, especially if it’s one that’s supported with a database, then we can identify those opportunities a lot more efficiently; rather than just by happenstance”, we can clearly set out to find collaborative opportunities. (AB04, pp. 3-4)

This recommendation was mirrored closely by the suggestion, “We’re working on our way there but we need systems that are a little bit more automatic as opposed to relying upon relationships” (AB10, p. 42).

Traditional thinking, or “the way things have always been done” was identified by a number of participants as detrimental to collaboration (AB06, p. 22; AB07, p. 6; AB10, pp. 4, 14, 23), as was the frivolous “lip service” often paid in lieu of actual cooperation (AB01, p. 28; AB12, p. 50). Countering this was the notion that current organizational demographics were seen as key to organizational change by a participant who intended to take full advantage of inexperienced junior ranks, commenting:

These people think differently, they do things differently, they social network all the time, they network all the time, and I think the opportunity to change this is now because when you’ve got all those people new to an organization, to a culture, they don’t think the same way as the old guy. (AB12, p. 31)

Administration and bureaucracy

There are some cultural differences, barriers, when we get into the specialized units of organizations, and I think all it would take is some common business tools, some common business rules, where we could overcome a significant amount of those differences that are within those organizations. (AB03, p. 14)
This overarching statement encompasses this dimension very well and leads to further issues regarding administration of the proposed collaborative. Most participants concurred with the need for commonality in systems, offering such proposals as an expressed need for “Common communications, common records management, common intelligence tool[s], common dispatch [and] some analytical tools. Everybody speaks the same language, everybody does the same thing” (AB04, p. 12). Questions arising of “Who has control, who’s directing resources, whose priorities are more important?” (AB01, p. 12) were countered with the participant contribution “That’s what I mean by we will work out our own rules as to how, collaboratively, you’d have joint governance of the system” (AB04, p. 27). It was suggested that this common practice would enable agencies to “Draw everybody into one collective group to share information, to be able to understand what each other is able to do and can do, and what expertise they have at their fingertips” or risk “running into duplication and, in some cases…there’s a lot of duplication” (AB05, p. 5). Understanding one another’s capabilities is of course essential to effective administration of the RTOC or any such program.

Counter to common consensus, one participant expressed his concern that “Policies and procedures interfere” (AB07, p. 15). Recalling previous failed government initiatives, AB07 objected with:

But we had that [before], we’ve had that with other things. As it works into our systems and we try to implement this, and we try to use it, we run into barriers. So the legal departments, risk management, get upset about this and there’s a concern about this information sharing. (AB07, p. 15)

Echoing the disappointment with previous government, another participant expressed his frustration with the explanation, “I mean we had 9/11 happen, we saw the disaster down there
because agencies weren’t talking to each other, you’d think we’d learn something from shit like that!” (AB08, p. 16). This same participant remained optimistic about the study proposal, and while warning that naysayers will question, “Who’s in charge, who’s gonna be the boss? Who’s gonna be the guy - who’s operationally in control” (AB08, p. 18) he insisted, “Listen, we can work this out. This is not brain surgery!” (AB08, p. 18).

**Legislation**

Study participants seemed torn on the issue of regulation with many apparently struggling to work either within or around the confines of existing legislation. Some participants described the complexities of being bound by conflicting legislation since federal agencies governed by the Access to Information Program (ATIP) are often expected to abide by provincial privacy legislation prescribed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIP), with police in the Province governed by the Police Act.

Explaining the impact of inter-jurisdictional legislation on information sharing, one participant described the interagency conflict this can lead to and emphasized the importance of experience and knowledge when dealing with complex legislation, commenting:

> It’s a complex issue. So it’s not that we’re not willing, there are some times we have to work around it, in a legal way, to get it. But it’s having people there that know that they can do it and how to do it if they just can’t hand it over right away. They have to know how to do it. Sometimes that’s the issue. (AB05, p. 31)

I sensed the frustration with another participant when he wondered aloud:

> So do we have to undertake a whole new set of standards for the Province, a whole new set of things that are going to deal with release of information, that are going to deal with how we’re expected to behave and what not? (AB07, p. 37)
Participants were split in their opinions regarding legislation with almost half acknowledging government intervention as necessary in order to make collaboration a reality (AB03, p. 15; AB04, p. 26; AB06, pp. 14, 21; AB08, p. 36; AB09, pp. 8, 30; AB10, p. 7). Some conceded to this only grudgingly, a general attitude reflected in the comment:

Some of my colleagues don’t like this statement - I believe it’s going to take a legislative initiative to make that happen and by that I mean the [Solicitor General] or the Premier is going to have to make a decision as to whether police in the Province are going to share information with each other. (AB03, p. 15)

Others endorsed their support more strongly, blaming the current lack of legislation on, “An unwillingness of our government to lead” (AB06, p. 14) and labeling this a barrier to collaboration. In fact, five of the participants placed ultimate responsibility for collaboration within the Province squarely on the shoulders of the provincial government (AB03, p. 40; AB04, pp. 34-38; p. AB06, pp. 14-16, 21; AB07, p. 15; AB09, pp. 30-34).

Four participants expressed confidence that police agencies could establish an acceptable collaborative effort of their own volition (AB01; AB10; AB11; AB12). All expressed urgency to see this to fruition, citing various judicial inquiries and their belief that government would intervene were this not to develop. While AB10 welcomed this process of engagement as an “opportunity” (p. 39), that contrasted sharply with the view that, “I would prefer that the way to do business doesn’t have to be legislated. The fact that we should cooperate or share information, share systems, share processes, that that shouldn’t have to be legislated, that the light should come on and we should be doing that on our own” (AB12, p. 49). This was seen as different approaches to the same end result.
Three participants (AB04; AB07; AB08) proposed changes to the Police Act to facilitate collaboration. One suggested a novel approach with the suggestion, “I would say that the concept of policing you could make provincial - and that’s what the Police Act, in essence, is for. The concept you could make provincial without making the agencies provincial” (AB08, p. 44). This was seen as a unique and intriguing proposal.

**Inclusiveness and cooperation**

Participants were unanimous in their support of full inclusion and cooperation within the law enforcement community in regard to the proposed collaborative, however with some participants more geographically isolated than others a concern was expressed over the viability of a single database location. The caveat that access must be available to everybody was proposed (AB10, p. 17) in concurrence with a suggestion that “3 or 4 RTOC’s” (AB03, p. 23) be developed to accommodate universal access.

“Common metrics” (AB02, p. 9), “common mind” (AB03, p. 10), “common interests” (AB02, p. 9) and “best interests” (AB07, p. 32) were all used analogous to the predominant concept of “common good” (AB03, p. 10; AB05, p. 12; AB06, p. 29; AB07, p. 40; AB09, p. 10) espoused by all participants. Similar support was offered with comments promoting the concepts of “respect” (AB01, p. 14; AB05, p. 11, 20; AB07, p. 25) and “mutual understanding” (AB01, p. 20; AB05, p. 17; AB10, p. 32; AB12, p. 23).

More specific to the nature of this particular study was the espoused need to “have the right people in place” (AB11, p. 8) and for everyone to “have a voice at the table” (AB01, pp. 52, 57; AB05, p. 28). Some participants stipulated the need for a clear agreement on sharing and use of shared information, clarifying that this must be done primarily through Memorandums of
Understanding (MOU) or formal Joint Forces Operations (JFO) (AB04, pp. 52, 53; AB05, p. 13; AB11, p. 7).

**Technology**

Although this study did not specifically address the technological implementation of this proposal, that this would certainly be a consideration was not lost on study participants. With the perceived failure of the Alberta Police Information Intelligence Initiative (APi3) fresh in the minds of all, some took the opportunity to criticize what they perceived as a failed government initiative (AB01, p. 45; AB07, pp. 42, 48, 62; AB08, pp. 37-40; AB12, pp. 34-41). While all of these participants felt the concept was good, they shared the belief that program implementation was fumbled and any opportunity for success had been lost. Sharp criticism provided valuable insight into a process articulated in the following excerpt:

I mean, the frustrations were there, but you know, everybody has - you know, when you have six little agendas there that don’t mesh, it’s just repetitive, repetitive information over and over and over again. And [you’ve got to] remember that those were the leads of the organizations, they’re not the ones working with it - they’re getting information from their guys, and their guys aren’t necessarily playing in the sandbox all that well either, you know, so the IT guys here might be saying, ‘Well you know you can’t do this, you can’t do that, you can’t do this, you can’t do that.’ So that’s what the Chief goes with, right? Because they’re not techies, they just say, ‘Our organization says this,’ and then of course the APi3 would say, ‘Okay, we’ll work with your organization,’ and some of them would work together, some of them wouldn’t. It was a mess. I’ve never seen anything so disorganized in the sense of focus, ever. Ever! And millions of dollars. I’m talking millions of dollars! (AB08, pp. 39-40)
His frustration tangible, this participant summarized by offering what he saw as a simple solution:

But it could have been one politician, one politician somewhere saying that, under the Police Act, that there’ll be one database for RMS that will control the following types of information. All agencies operational within the Province of Alberta will utilize a single database. (AB08, p. 40)

Although conceptually sound, the six-year wait for a working prototype did not bode well and many participants had already turned their back on the APi3 initiative, mainly out of funding concerns.

Despite the disdain shown by some, other participants remained supportive of APi3 and a distinctly different perspective was shared when a participant claimed:

I am a champion of the current APi3 initiative. That initiative is still alive and well and hopefully coming to fruition very quickly. There has been some stumbling blocks as that’s developed but we’re hoping that the original vision will someday be a reality. (AB03, p. 7)

Another participant who remained supportive of APi3 but was forced to withdraw his organization from the initiative explained:

I mean if it’s the provincial government that are saying, ‘You know, this is important for the Province,’ then, you know, the Province, instead of seven years ago saying, ‘We’re gonna collaboratively approach APi3,’ maybe what they should have said is, ‘We’re gonna legislate everybody to be on APi3 and this is what it’s gonna look like and this is what it’s gonna cost.’ How do I go to my governing body and say, ‘I’m gonna leave this
system we spent a million bucks on, [and] we’re gonna go to this new system that I’ve never seen, and I have no idea what it’s going to cost.’ (AB06, pp. 14-15)

Although he was unable to adopt APi3 because of prohibitive costs, one participant espoused the virtues of APi3 as:

I think the Province is on the right track - I mean, they’ve created this absolutely phenomenal tool that will work with all our police agencies, but for some reason I don’t think we’ve got buy - in yet on APi3 and that’s really too bad. (AB09, p. 8)

This participant elaborated, “I think APi3 is going to be the starting point” (AB09, p. 11) before sharing his suggestion to integrate APi3 through existing resources with, “The Province might have to force APi3 to go into those ALERT positions. [The] Province is paying for those ALERT positions and so the Province should be able to say ‘You know what? We want you to use this product” (AB09, pp. 8-9).

Focusing on application of the proposed RTOC, another participant offered considerations that echoed a requisite simplicity of use that presented throughout the interviews:

I think that one of the impediments is what are we going to use for that common database? There used to be ACIIS (Automated Criminal Intelligence Information System), or there still is - there’s NCDB (National Criminal Data Bank) which is a complicated database that nobody likes using, there’s too many rules around it, it’s not easy. The first step is, we need a simple system [an agreed - upon system that’s easy, that’s not complicated]. (AB11, p. 16)

This condemnation of ACIIS reverberated in the diatribe of another participant who expressed dissatisfaction with the federal and provincial governments, national policing services and APi3:
I don’t know if you’ve picked up any piece about what’s going on with national policing services but the RCMP are trying to basically wash their hands of - I think there’s about twenty - eight different services that they provide, and one of them is ACIIS. So you’re familiar with ACIIS, probably more familiar than I am with it, but I know this about ACIIS, is that it was built in the 70’s, it hasn’t been refreshed, it’s cumbersome, it doesn’t integrate with any modern records management systems, folks aren’t using it - so there’s one attempt to share intel that the federal government actually built, and they needed it. So a barrier is, proper technology, for sure - and the unwillingness of our federal government to provide a system nationally and update it. So when I was talking about APi3 at the final hour, before we pulled out, is I said “You know what? This APi3 product is gonna become ACIIS in the future. The provincial government’s gonna get this thing running and they’re gonna run as far from it as they can, just like they did ACIIS. And ten years from now we’re gonna be trying to keep the thing going with duct tape. So that was our other fear. (AB06, p. 15)

In contrast, this same participant praised the value of information system APSNET (Alberta Public Safety Network):

An earlier initiative for police services to actually share information through their records management system and it was about a million dollar project and Al Sauve was the project coordinator on that and he was an EPS member at the time, and - so we still use it. APSNET still exists and we still can gather information after the fact from other police agencies in the Province, and it’s not bad. (AB06, p. 2)

However, criticism of past and current information systems was not exclusive to ACIIS or NCDB and continued with the disappointment in CISA (Criminal Intelligence Service
Alberta) expressed by one participant as, “I think if the Province is paying for a resource for policing then policing ought to be able to use that resource, and that didn’t happen” (AB04, p. 11).

As one of the philosophical cornerstones of APi3, the conceptual soundness of a “single source of truth” (AB12, p. 36) was praised by one participant while another recalled, “They threw the words ‘single source of truth’ around so much that we all wanted to vomit” (AB06, p. 1), yet he too concurred with the concept of APi3. One participant summarized a failed APi3 initiative with the subtle observation, “Specifically, technology has changed” (AB12, p. 36), and captured this particular study finding with the observation, “And it’s changing all the time, technology’s changing so rapidly, we cannot as a single organization afford to invest in this and keep up” (AB12, p. 53).

**Funding**

Police funding has traditionally relied primarily on justifiability as opposed to affordability. This reflects the political system police have been thrust into through no fault of their own, however failed programs, initiatives and a new economic reality has added another dimension to police budgets – accountability.

In consideration of potential barriers to the proposed collaborative, funding was identified as a necessary consideration of this as with any new policing initiative. Although police are responsible for their own budgeting, financial responsibility was often projected onto various levels of government as illustrated in interview comments such as, “Can we afford to do this or can we not afford to do this? Who’s paying?” (AB06, p. 35). Although police agencies are obligated to approach various levels of government for funding, this projection of financial responsibility continued with participant complaints of the “unstable political environment”
Notwithstanding the diversity of institutions involved in this research and a disparity between financial structures, when they did arise, the issue of costs almost seemed to emerge as an afterthought with participants. Reasons for the omission could reflect a collective reluctance to discuss financing, regional differences, or a perceived insignificance. As unlikely as the latter seems, it cannot be ignored after one participant described historical financial indiscretions as:

Give us a million dollars and we’ll use it for this, and then we went over and used it for that - or we didn’t deliver on what we said we were going to deliver on. So some of the trust of policing is as a result of us not delivering on what we said we were going to. Because we were not accountable. (AB12, p. 24)

This frank disclosure provides some insight into previous budget process and may explain why some participants now associate costs to a fiscal prudence reflective of the new economy (AB02, p. 22; AB05, p. 8; AB12, p. 39). Reflected in the comment that, “We’ve never been more accountable than we are today…” (AB12, p. 24) current fiscal reality was evident in the comments of participants as they considered potential benefits of interagency collaboration. Some financial benefits were acknowledged by participants in specific terms such as, “savings in term of funding and expenditures [and] streamlining in efficiencies and effectiveness overall” (AB02, p. 4), “the alignment of resources, the sharing of resources, is always cheaper than having all separate entities” (AB08, p. 23) and “the ability to share information just makes everything more efficient. It’s not gonna cost as much money, it’s not gonna cost as much time, it’s not gonna cost as much effort. We’d be more efficient” (AB12, p. 57).

(AB06, p. 16) created by government inconsistencies apparent in the absence of “commitment” (AB07, pp. 63-64) and attributable to a political “lack of leadership” (AB03, p. 10; AB07, pp. 45-47).
Intelligence-Led Policing

Surprising in light of the existing plethora of ineffective, failed, or questionable policing initiatives, the comment, “I have to know what the sustainability is of this and what the costs are around it” (AB06, p. 41) was the sole interview reference made to the topic of sustainability. This promises to become more prominent as a new accountability for public service funding may very well be cultivated in the form of sustainability.

**Refined Study Findings**

A closer scrutiny of the Overview study findings facilitated the concatenation from nine to five refined principle categories, results illustrated in Figure 3 below. The rationalization used to develop a basis for this categorization is discussed in the following subsections.
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*Figure 3. Refined critical study findings categorized*

**Leadership issues**

No strangers to change, participants spoke freely of the potential challenges facing the proposed initiative and an intrinsic need for leaders to remain flexible in their approach to such matters (AB02, p. 14; AB06, p. 35; AB12, p. 49). Recalling some unexpected complications arising during previous change initiatives, and the need to persevere through unforeseen
complications, the underlying message was that commitment and tenacity were always necessary since nothing was ever straightforward enough to be taken for granted.

Examining merit of the proposed operations centre, it was at times disappointing to hear self-defeating statements such as, “Well let’s face it, everybody’s got enough to do” (AB04, p. 15) and “police leaders have to make sure that their own back yard is looked after before they worry outside of their jurisdiction” (AB03, p. 10). However, these two comments were the exception to a study norm better reflected in the RTOC collaborative appraisal from AB12 who stated unequivocally, “Well, we, collectively, should be starting it - and I would say the Alberta Association of Chiefs of Police should be sitting down saying, ‘We should be doing this. Now what needs to be done?’” (p. 53).

**Cultural concerns**

Significant cultural concerns were identified with this research, with negative cultural issues acknowledged by study participants blamed for an overall “resistance to change” (AB10, p. 24) that was generally viewed as detrimental to this or any other proposed initiative. Many participants described a general reluctance to cooperate or share information as a result of individual or interagency lack of trust or distrust (AB02, pp. 9, 16; AB04, p. 24; AB06, pp. 18, 37; AB09, p. 3; AB11, pp. 3, 5; AB12, p. 21), and explained this as “learned behavior” (AB09, p. 02) or “the way things had always been done” (AB06, p. 22; AB10, p. 23). Describing this dysfunction as “complex” (AB04, p. 55; AB07, p. 7), other participants offered explanations that included “protectionism” (AB07, p. 27; AB10, p. 13), “selfishness” (AB11, p. 4), “competitiveness”, “rivalries” or “competing interests” (AB03, p. 14; AB08, p. 31; AB10, p. 13), and even “the little petty bullshit things that get in the way” (AB10, p. 25). “Power culture” (AB08, p. 31) and “pride and egos” (AB04, p. 55; AB12, p. 13) were congruous with a
participant observation that, “People can’t check their rank at the door or their organization at the door” (AB05, p. 11).

Inclusiveness and cooperation

The proposals by study participants of “mutual understanding and respect” (AB01, p. 10; AB05, pp. 11, 17, 20; AB07, p. 25; AB10, p. 32), “flexibility in leadership”, and “compromise” in equal partnerships (AB07, p. 40; AB08, p. 42; AB06, p. 26) all mirrored an essential balance of “power and control.” Leaders espousing these principles presented as sincere and recognized that finding a middle ground between stakeholder organizations is key to ensuring collaborative success.”

Communication challenges

Many of the participants expressed an urgent need for the open sharing of information in the essential real-time format proposed (AB05, p. 7; AB06, p. 18; AB10, p. 7; AB12, p. 43).

The responsible management of shared information was of significant concern to study participants, yet of more significance was the commonly held belief that only a small portion of information classified and protected by police actually warranted that effort. Participants who commented on the volume of information in need of protection generally concurred with espoused views such as, “I’d say probably less than one percent” (AB11, p. 4), and “There’s a very small amount of information, I think, that needs to be kept secret” (AB02, p. 7), and:

There is intelligence that needs to be secured in policing. But it is a very small percentage of what we deal with. I believe that is probably .09 percent of the information that is held by the police across Alberta. So the rest of it, the 99.1 percent, should be shared in an open format under the right security and the right conditions. (AB03, p. 13)
Alternatively, that information or intelligence in need of protection raised the concern of participants. These concerns included questions of access (AB03, p. 14; AB10, p. 16; AB12, p. 55), potential legal ramifications surrounding such issues as “understanding where dissemination ends” (AB10, p. 20), implementation of major case management protocols (AB05, p. 7), and disclosure “expectations and obligations” (AB10, p. 37).

Most participants agreed that a model such as the proposed operations centre would facilitate the processing of information into actionable intelligence in a timely fashion that would allow for the operationalization of that intelligence (AB02, p. 27; AB03, p. 14; AB04, pp. 3, 25; AB05, p. 5; AB10, p. 5; AB12, p. 13).

Resource management

Study participants linked the topic of technology so closely to funding and financing that it was at times difficult to differentiate between the two. While there was an established need for the adaptation of a common “records management system” (RMS), (AB01, p. 3; AB03, p. 5; AB04, p. 3; AB05, p. 6; AB06, p. 37), viewpoints differed on financial responsibility with over half of study participants expressing the opinion that proposed technical advancements of this nature remained the financial responsibility of the provincial government. With API3 still on the technological “backburner,” the possibility exists that the expressed financial dependency may be reminiscent of previous government agendas (AB03; AB04; AB06; AB07; AB09).

Study findings corroborated the perceived significance of the RTOC as a potential resource management tool, with favourable participant views encompassing a range from enhanced officer and public safety through effective “deconfliction” (AB03, p. 29; AB04, p. 3; AB05, p. 5; AB06, p. 13) to the “streamlining of efficiencies” and “increased [operational] effectiveness” (AB02, p. 4; AB03, p. 9; AB04, p. 3; AB08, p. 23). Specific resource
management benefits envisioned by participants included “increased accountability” to partner agencies and to the public (AB05, p. 33; AB12, p. 24), elimination of “overlap, duplication, needless redundancy and repetition” of efforts (AB05, p. 5; AB12, p. 10) and the potential “alignment,” “leveraging” and “sharing of resources” (AB08, p. 23; AB10, p. 6).

Resource management challenges identified by participants included the development of a joint management team and management oversight (AB01, p. 6; AB05, p. 27), as well as prioritization and workload distribution (AB01, p. 12; AB10, p. 30).

**Study Conclusions**

Study findings reviewed in this chapter originated entirely with study participants, the leaders of law enforcement in Alberta, and illustrate the knowledge inherent to these individual leaders from which ostensibly viable research conclusions have been realized. Individual participants have generally acknowledged the need for a common law enforcement operations centre. What is not illustrated by these study findings is the collective will or determination necessary amongst stakeholders to undertake and determine the success of an RTOC initiative.

With the possible exception of those attached to federal agencies, study participants understandably drew a close parallel to this research study project and APi3, a government initiative that may have appeared similar to the study proposal. Although conceptually these two initiatives share similar principles, in practice the RTOC remains an anomaly.

Conceived by the Government of Alberta, the Alberta Police Information Intelligence Initiative (APi3) intended to create a single records management system (RMS) for all policing agencies in the Province of Alberta. Introduced conceptually in 2006, APi3 was well received by the Alberta law enforcement community. At that time the Alberta government of the day announced its intention to develop a working prototype prior to delivery by way of a centralized
database that would facilitate seamless information sharing from the RMS of each policing agency in the Province.

On March 18, 2013 Alberta Solicitor General Jonathan Denis announced his termination of the APi3 initiative, basing this decision in large part upon opposition encountered from the police agencies involved. After spending an estimated 80 million dollars over almost eight years in an effort to enhance police information sharing, Denis no longer viewed the project as viable (Van Rassel, 2013).

Denis’ frustration is clearly reflective of the difficulties encountered in development of police collaborations and information sharing. Sources quoted by Van Rassel (2013) squarely blame the failure of APi3 on the defensiveness and reluctance of police leaders to adopt the methods or technology of other agencies. This epitomizes the cultural resistance and defensive behaviors examined in Chapter Two and discussed later in this chapter. Senge’s (2006) contention that organizational leaders are also part of their respective cultures could explain the shortcomings and subsequent failure of this executive initiative.

Even when leaders remain cognizant of their potential influence on organizational culture, when faced with constant organizational, political and jurisdictional considerations, it is extremely difficult for police leaders to coordinate any collective effort towards the development of a law enforcement collaborative. However, CPS has laid the groundwork for a successful initiative with the development of a functional RTOC. In doing so, CPS has placed itself in a unique position to act as a catalyst for effective, sustainable change. Continued enhancement of the current RTOC will enable CPS to develop a model of organizational change for collaborative practice that will allow them to “model the way” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, pp. 87-94) for stakeholders.
The distribution of comments gathered during data collection has been categorized to illustrate study findings in Figure 4. This perspective shows Leadership and Culture as the two key elements garnering primary interest in the success or failure of the RTOC initiative. These results could be used to effectively direct resource development towards the proposed RTOC law enforcement collaborative.

![Figure 4. Essential elements of interagency collaboration](image)

**Leadership issues**

The overwhelmingly positive response to this research by study participants illustrates a clear desire and a recognized urgent need for a law enforcement collaborative. Since Gehl (2004) told us, “there is no question that multiagency teams are essential to the future of policing” (p. 5), it would appear to be incumbent upon CPS to engage stakeholders in a collaborative practice by stepping up and inviting the partners identified in this study to participate. Since *leadership* has also been identified by this study as imperative to this change initiative, it will be necessary for CPS executive to “empower competent people to help plan and
implement the change” and to “fill key positions with competent change agents” (Yukl, 2010, p. 319).

Study interview comments aligned well with the literature and reflected a principled character seemingly inherent to participants. Some referenced Murphy’s law, the adage that tells us that, “Anything that can go wrong will go wrong”, and the wisdom of their collective perseverance is found in the words of Snowden and Boone (2007) who told us that, “…there is no immediately apparent relationship between cause and effect, and the way forward is determined based on emerging patterns” (p. 72). This same tenacity was not reflected in the comments of two participants who alluded to the prioritization of their own organizational concerns before worrying about those outside of their jurisdiction. Their words were hauntingly familiar to Oshry’s (2007) spatial blindness, where “…we see what is happening with us, but not what is happening elsewhere, we don’t see how our world impacts theirs and how theirs impact ours, and we take personally much that is not personal” (p. xvii). Although such generalization may reflect the stark reality of policing, comments of this nature could prove detrimental to any collaborative effort.

The comments of study participants were generally reflective of a preferred leadership role, an attitude of assertiveness and empathetic team - building congruent with the “social awareness” described by Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2004), where, “The very act of showing one another empathy leads the team to create and sustain positive norms and manage its relationship with the outside world more effectively” (p. 177). Goleman et al (2004) elaborated, “[social awareness] - is the foundation that enables a team to build and maintain effective relationships with the rest of the organization” (p. 178). Closely related to social awareness is the concept of social capital, described as:
Those resources available in and through an organization’s personal and business networks, including such things as ideas, business opportunities, power, goodwill, trust, information, investment capital, and more. And because this capital resides in the relationships that people share with one another, the amount of social capital a firm possesses depends heavily on the quality, quantity and nature of personal and business relationships among its members - and among employees and outside stakeholders.

(Baker, 2003, p. 12)

Research attributes compelling evidence to the benefits of social capital to “formal and informal relationships and networks” that include “strategic alliances” (Baker, 2003, p. 12). It can be imperative for leaders to leverage their social capital that at some point may serve to establish the “social identity” examined by Hogg and Ridgeway (2003) in their study of “social identity theory” (p. 97). Tajfel (1981) and Hogg and Ridgeway (2003) advised, “the social frame provided by intergroup beliefs influences whether people seek social mobility between groups, competition between their own group and another, or creative efforts to redefine the social evaluation attached to their group” (p. 97). In short, this may enhance interagency cooperation and allow police agencies to do what participants claimed they could not - “play nice in the sandbox” (AB01; AB08; AB09).

**Cultural concerns**

Cultural issues identified by this study as paramount to the proposed undertaking dictate the need to address underlying issues of resistance peculiar to organizational culture. In this respect, building inter-organizational trust will be key (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, pp. 20-21). It will be important to remember that, “Like a good marriage, trust on a team is never complete; it must be maintained over time” (Lencioni, 2005, p. 35).
All of the cultural idiosyncrasies mentioned in these research findings illustrate what Piggot-Irvine (2012) has deemed, “The key strategies of defensiveness: Avoidance and control” (p. 97), “anti - learning processes that are at the root of misunderstandings, distortions and misinterpretations in action research groups” (p. 97). As observed by study participants, these are complex behaviors that Senge (2006) told us are unfortunately confronted “with a language designed for simple, static problems” (p. 249) when, “the leverage lies in recognizing defensive routines as joint creations and to find our own role in creating and sustaining them”, Short’s (1998) “looking inside” (p. 23) if you will. The “advocacy and inquiry” extolled by Short’s (1998) “differentiation” (p. 149) are key elements of “productive reasoning” (p. 99), described by Piggot-Irvine (2012) as a balanced dialogue, “that leads to mutual understanding and agreement (or agreement to disagree) about issues” (p. 99) and a forthright, honest approach necessary to successfully correct these implicit defensive behaviors since:

It requires significant, profound shifts involving exposure, examination and alteration of defensive values at a deeply personal level which is both cognitively and emotionally difficult and is a lengthy process…the approach on its own is extremely complex and usually involves months, maybe years, of training. (Piggot-Irvine, 2012, p. 97)

Leaders undertaking development of this law - enforcement collaborative must be prepared to commit to a prolonged process and remember Senge’s (2006) observation that, as part of the culture, they too are a part of the problem.

**Inclusiveness and cooperation**

The unmitigated need to participate and to act in full cooperation with one another was established by police with this research. In doing so, police have themselves intimated the overwhelming endorsement of a conceptual real time operations centre to enable such an
endeavor. Interview comments were strikingly consistent with the parameters of collaboration established by Burke and Biggart (1997) whose assessment that, “Obstacles to the success of relationships between organizations are real indeed, but they are not insurmountable” (p. 725), was parroted by one study participant (AB10, p. 38) and supported by the comments of others. A general optimism throughout these study interviews of the viability and success of a collaborative explained a close parallel between the views expressed and insight offered by relevant literature.

Burke and Biggart (1997) consider an essential balance of “power and control” key to collaborative success. Other factors important for success in inter-organizational relationships were noted as mutual gain, committed leaders, alignment of rewards, respect for differences and good luck. The luck component is defined by the literature as those events or changes over which we have no control, and refers specifically to the ability to create contingency plans and to maintain “a degree of flexibility and a willingness to renegotiate” (p. 726) in the face of such eventualities.

**Communication challenges**

These study findings are congruent with relevant literature and illustrate that communicating values and encouraging internal and external communication will enhance interagency cooperation, develop a sense of community and inclusiveness, and pave the way towards an alignment of resources (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Senge, 2006; Yukl, 2010). Gehl (2004) referred to poor communication as a major systemic barrier to effective multiagency teams. As a resolution he proposed three protocols significant to the formation of these teams including (a) “communications that drive timely decision making, (b) communications that ensure the multiagency team can function
Information management and technology, both key elements of communication, were identified by this study as paramount to proposed development of the RTOC and any such future initiatives. These two dimensions address the question of what we share and how we share it, and like all topics of this research they are inextricably linked and referenced accordingly, often appearing in juxtaposition with one another. As such, information management and technology have been examined under a single umbrella of communication in accordance with the concept that, “The life-blood of organizational functioning is communication, internally and outwardly with other organizations and the community at large” (Granot, 1997, p. 306).

Concern over a lack of communication protocols raised by study participants fell directly within the parameters of what information needs to be shared and how it should be shared. The prior initially manifested in participant interviews as a need for clear, unambiguous policy directing the handling, processing, assessment and dissemination of intelligence. These integrity issues speak strongly to organizational values, something yet to be established within a proposed collaborative. The “consistency in processes” (AB12, p. 45) recommended must develop from a collaborative process, just as Kouzes and Posner (2007) told us that, “A common understanding of values emerges from a process, not a pronouncement” (p. 65).

The comments of study participants that expressed an urgent need for collaboration were corroborated by prior research on public service organizations (health and social services) that established, “Indeed, there is a tangible sense of urgency about the need to improve the way in which information is exchanged” (Richardson & Asthana, 2006, p. 659). The paradigm of intelligence-led policing drives the collection of raw information, its analysis, assessment and
dissemination as actionable intelligence in real time. Baker (2009) told us, “Collation and targeting processes demand excellent analysis, improved strategic tactical planning, and command decision-making” (p. 13). These elements have all been factored into the current RTOC and the proposed collaborative initiative.

Evolving through a history of command and control, police communications are traditionally formal and linear. Current technology, however, offers an opportunity that Bowling (2009) related, “opens up new possibilities for ‘horizontal’ communication and collaboration among police officers in the field. This has the effect of reducing bureaucratic drag and political control” (p. 3), both demonstrated pertinent issues with participants of this study. Simplicity of use was considered by all study participants as paramount to the selection and development of acceptable technology.

**Resource management issues**

Since managing resources is essentially a component of team building, it is significant that the “alignment” alluded to by participants is what Senge (2006) referred to as “a necessary phenomenon of team learning” (p. 217). To emphasize the importance of alignment, Senge lamented, “The fundamental characteristic of the relatively unaligned team is wasted energy” (p. 217). While this “wasted energy” can easily be viewed as the equivalent of the “overlap, duplication, needless redundancy and repetition” described by study participants, Senge (2006) contrasts any negativity with the following benefits of alignment:

When a team becomes more aligned, a commonality of direction emerges, and individuals’ energies harmonize. There is less wasted energy. In fact, a resonance or synergy develops…[There is commonality of purpose, a shared vision, and understanding of how to complement one another’s efforts]. (p. 217)
In the absence of other reliable team building methods, this study has illustrated that the concept of team learning must figure prominently into the incorporation of the proposed operations centre. Since team learning involves “mastering the practices of dialogue and discussion” (Senge, 2006, p. 220) and embraces the “staggering potential of collaborative learning - that collectively, we can be more insightful, more intelligent than we can possibly be individually” (p. 221), Aristotle’s philosophy that “the whole is greater than the sum of its parts” (n.d.) will be key to dealing with challenges to the development of the RTOC collaborative.

Scope and Limitations of the Inquiry

One factor affecting the scope and limitations of my inquiry may be sheer volume of the respective contributions of individual research participants. Stakeholder groups were well represented by the leaders chosen to participate, and in keeping with Stringer’s (2007) advice, “To ensure that participants are given the maximum opportunity to present events and phenomena in their own terms and to follow agendas of their own choosing” (p. 72), study participants were given veritable free rein to comment both on and outside of the interview questions presented.

Following Maxwell’s (1996) guidance that, “Your research questions formulate what you want to understand; your interview questions are what you ask people in order to gain that understanding” (as cited in Stringer, 2007, p. 104), I found that my questions often expanded in direct response to the contribution of individual participants. “In the process of listening to your respondents, you learn what questions to ask” (Stringer, 2007, p. 104) and I subsequently found myself asking more questions as participants expanded upon their answers. No time constraints were placed on study participants, with the assumption that leaders would participate only as long as they felt their contribution remained relevant. Although every participant was given an
equal opportunity to contribute to the research, varied responses resulted in what may be perceived as a disparity since resulting interview transcripts are disproportionate by volume.

I recognized that my senior position as a police officer with CPS could potentially cast doubt upon my objectivity, and took precautionary measures to ensure the subjectivity and credibility of this study. The ever-present threat of bias from cognitive dissonance and confirmation bias were treated with the same personal discipline, honesty, and self-reflection as any potentially harmful mental models. In conjunction with the fail-safes built into my research methodology, specifically the verbatim transcripts used in the collection of study data, personal bias did not become a factor in this research study.

The intentional exclusion of First Nations police services is an infringement upon overall scope of this study, yet in no way was this decision designed to minimalize the contribution made by First Nations police services in the Province. First Nations police in Alberta include four agencies consisting of the Blood Tribe Police Service (1989) in Standoff, the North Peace Tribal Police Services (1995) in Fort Vermillion, the Tsuu T’ina Nation Police Service at Tsuu T’ina, and the Lakeshore Regional Police Service in High Prairie. These agencies exist under either a Tripartite Policing Agreement (TA) or a Community Tripartite Policing Agreement (CTA) made with government to provide policing services or to enhance RCMP policing service to 18 First Nations communities in the Province of Alberta.

Unfortunately, time restrictions, ethical considerations and procedural issues in no way allowed for the inclusion of these First Nations police services in this research study. Although these organizations are closely aligned with participating agencies, findings and conclusions should not be generalized beyond the specifics of the study, which focused only on those
agencies not exclusively delivering policing services to First Nations communities in the Province.

**Chapter Summary**

In order to enhance and ultimately leverage the individual “social capital” (Baker, 2003) essential to interagency cooperation and collaboration, it will be incumbent upon organizational leaders to create and develop the necessary social awareness (Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2004) within their respective organizations. Successful interagency collaboration involves identification of those positive aspects of a strong organizational culture (Paoline, 2003) that can be used to create a culture of wellbeing and will include addressing crucial communication issues and concentrating on the critical alignment of resources. Since this holds true both internally and externally, stakeholder agencies must first ensure the order of their own organizations with a view to collaborative expansion. A focus on the issues addressed in this chapter will assist with development of those positive workplace relationships conducive to a collaborative environment and congruent with study recommendations outlined in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE: INQUIRY IMPLICATIONS

Substantive literature relative to this CPS policing initiative has been presented in support of prospective solutions and possible resolution to the overarching inquiry question of, “How can the CPS develop an intelligence-led, real time law enforcement collaborative?” This chapter proposes recommendations correlated with organizational implications for change, and based upon those prospective resolutions presents a potential implementation plan and accompanying timeline. Leadership implications for organizational change are addressed in this chapter, followed by implications that arise should study recommendations not be implemented. The chapter concludes with an exploration of implications for future inquiry.

Study Recommendations

Since this study involves systemic change that begins with CPS, it is imperative that CPS executive strive for effective, sustainable change within their organization “grounded in systems thinking and the related learning disciplines [that] can make a difference, by fostering collective rethinking and innovation and serving as a convener for microcosms of larger systems” (Senge, 2006, p. 349). Only through the embodiment of collaboration will CPS be able to successfully expand aspirations of genuine collaboration to external stakeholders, modeling both externally and internally the very collaboration they seek.

The following five recommendations to assist CPS with the development and eventual implementation of an effective intelligence-led, real time law enforcement collaborative in the form of a real time operations centre (RTOC) have been determined through those study findings and conclusions documented in this thesis. With seeds of change in the wind, these
recommendations, grounded in literature, will determine the path these changes follow. It is recommended that:

1. Organizational leaders commit to a practice of authentic collaboration;
2. Stakeholders establish clear communication protocols;
3. Stakeholder resources are aligned through clear, compatible policy reflecting that alignment;
4. Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) are established to enhance interagency integration, information management and resource sharing; and
5. Agencies implement collaborative protocols to address cultural issues through the development of authentic interagency trust.

**Organizational leaders commit to a practice of authentic collaboration**

As shown by this research study, it has become incumbent upon police leaders to commit to a practice of authentic collaboration amongst law enforcement stakeholders in the Province. An interesting conundrum arising from this study raises the question of why, with the strong support of participants illustrated by this study, is an authentic collaboration not the current reality rather than just a good intention? Is it possible that the difficulties encountered in establishing collaborative practice may only be as difficult as stakeholders want to make them, the paradox of “authentic collaboration” defined by “its complexity and relative simplicity” (Piggot-Irvine’s, 2012, p. 89)?

Although the influence leaders exercise over their respective organizations cannot be understated, rather than intending sole responsibility for collaboration with executive leaders the recommendations of this study instead suggest utilization of leaders from every level of stakeholder organizations. From middle and lower - level managers to regular employees, these
“helpers, seed carriers, and connectors…are vital for spreading new ideas and practices from one working group to another and between organizations, and for connecting innovative line leaders with one another” (Senge, 2006, p.320). Yukl (2010) advised that this indirect leadership, referred to as “cascading” (Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Bebb, 1987; Lencioni, 2005; Waldman & Yammarino, 1999; Yammarino, 1994), “occurs when the direct influence of the CEO on immediate subordinates is transmitted down the authority hierarchy of an organization” (p. 6). Well established in relevant literature (Hyatt & Belden-Charles, 2011; Kahane, 2007; Scharmer, 2009), this whole - system perspective represents an appropriate use of resources while transmitting influence in this manner throughout the organization can effectively influence “changes in employee attitudes, beliefs, values, or behaviors” (Yukl, 2010, p. 6).

The establishment of a value statement outlining individual responsibilities, core competencies, and performance standards for the RTOC as it currently exists will be key to provide guidance for future internal development and to provide a template for the “clear and compelling vision” (Yukl, 2010, p. 309) necessary to guide future external expansion and development of the RTOC. Senge (2006) told us such, “Visions spread because of a reinforcing process of increasing clarity, enthusiasm, communication and commitment. As people talk, the vision grows clearer. As it gets clearer, enthusiasm for its benefits builds” (p. 211). Since “a single leader is unlikely to have the knowledge needed to develop a vision that will appeal to all the stakeholders whose support is necessary to accomplish major organizational change” (Yukl, 2010, p. 313), it will be necessary for affected stakeholders to jointly develop a universal vision that will compel collaboration and commitment (Baker, 2000; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Senge, 2006).
Organizational commitment remains paramount to the success of this interagency law enforcement initiative, and although the construct is strongly endorsed in relevant literature (Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2004; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Senge, 2006; Yukl, 2010), the gravity of true commitment is effectively captured in this humorous analogy offered by a colleague:

Hoping to stimulate some missing team enthusiasm, following a breakfast of bacon and eggs a coach borrowed a page from Senge (2006) to explain the difference between mere contribution and the commitment his players were lacking. Using the meal as continuum, a comparison of the effort put into its preparation with his clear expectation of the individual team contribution he expected was delivered by the coach when he explained, “That meal you just ate culminated from the efforts of many - some contributed, others were committed. The farmer contributed, the baker contributed, the chef contributed, and the waitress contributed. The chicken also contributed but the pig – he was committed.”

(Anon)

Clear communication protocols

Communication protocols determining how information is to be shared could be developed consensually among stakeholders who remain cognizant that clarity is key to providing clear definitions of:

a. what intelligence and information is to be shared; and

b. subsequent use of all intelligence and information.

Praising the concept of intelligence - led policing (ILP), Baker (2009) explained:

ILP collects raw data, coordinates the flow of accurate information, analyzes, and disseminates intelligence to those who have a need and right to know. Therefore, the
accurate flow of information and channels of communication must remain open to the law enforcement community. (p. 12)

Baker’s overview accurately depicts the current real time intelligence function of the RTOC, just one of the centre’s many operational responsibilities. In relation to this proposed communication recommendation, Baker (2009) elaborated:

Assessment of an agency’s existing organizational structure and its relationship to intelligence infrastructure is required for improved ILP intelligence. Organizational realignment and innovative architectural strategies should remove barriers to gathering intelligence, and encourage intelligence and information reciprocity. (p. 13)

The open channels of communication and information reciprocity cited by Baker are essential elements of the law enforcement collaborative proposed by this study and remain paramount to success of the RTOC.

During a previous examination of communicating change to non-profit organizations researchers determined two communicative dimensions, “communication efficiency and consensus building – which may be used to predict implementers’ choices of approach to their communication with stakeholders” (Lewis, Hamel & Richardson, 2001, p. 6). As implementer of the proposed RTOC, challenges presented by the communication and introduction of change are pertinent to CPS, and were identified in this same study with an emphasized need:

To assess and balance (a) the needs for consensus building and communication efficiency, (b) the quantity of resources they can devote to communication of change and those devoted to the technical and procedural requirements, (c) their own energies and investments in the change and the interests of numerous stakeholder groups, (d) the
organization’s values concerning participation and power, and (e) the importance of the
planned change. (p. 34)

These guidelines highlight interagency communicative clarity while stressing the need for
organizational conviction towards proposed change. Initially essential for CPS and subsequently
for participating stakeholder agencies, these safeguards could enhance participation and
interagency cooperation with open lines of communication that should ensure the necessary
development of common goals and interests among stakeholders.

**Alignment of stakeholder resources**

Clear, compatible policy considerate of the procedures and mandates of all stakeholder
agencies must be established before any alignment of resources will be possible. In order to
realize this alignment, stakeholders will have to engage in meaningful dialogue to access that
“pool of common meaning [in which] the whole organizes the parts” (Bohm, 1965, as cited in
Senge, 2006, p. 223). Such dialogue is necessary to address the individual and organizational
mental models and defensive routines inherent to these groups and, although the power lies in the
resulting synergy, dialogue also contributes to a collective capability for the continual *generative
learning* that will enable CPS and its stakeholders to “address the underlying causes of behavior
at a level at which patterns of behavior *can be changed*” (Senge, 2006, p. 53). As we are told by
Day (2002), patterns of behavior are significant in that “Change happens by altering behavior
patterns and helping people understand how the new behaviors lead to better performance.
Eventually these changes will be absorbed into the underlying norms, beliefs, and mind set” (p.
12).

An alignment of resources cannot be realized without a mutual understanding of one
another’s organizational capacity and capabilities, both attainable through the collective
discipline of dialogue and discussion. It is expected that the resulting commonality would act as vehicle for the advent of three critical dimensions of team learning defined as “the need to think insightfully about complex issues, the need for innovative, coordinated action, and a learning team [that] continually fosters other learning teams through inculcating the practices and skills of team learning more broadly” (Senge, 2006, p. 219).

CPS is a complex organization, and the proposed alignment of stakeholder agencies within a collaborative proposes a multifaceted system that will be virtually unframed or unmapped. Bolman and Deal (2008) define a frame as “a mental model - a set of ideas and assumptions - that you carry in your head to help you understand and negotiate a particular territory” (p. 11) and that “learning multiple perspectives, or frames, is a defence against thrashing around without a clue about what you are doing or why” (p. 21). Since this collaborative proposes a system exacerbated exponentially in its complexity, the framing and reframing techniques provided by Bolman and Deal (2008) may prove invaluable in organizing and structuring the resulting system. Their espoused principles are organized around four frames “rooted in both managerial wisdom and social science knowledge” that include:

a. A structural approach that “focuses on the architecture of organization - the design of units and subunits, rules and roles, goals and policies;

b. The human resource lens [that] emphasizes understanding people, their strengths and foibles, reason and emotion, desires and fears;

c. The political view [that] sees organizations as competitive arenas of scarce resources, competing interests, and struggles for power and advantage; [and]

d. The symbolic frame [that] focuses on issues of meaning and faith [and] puts ritual, ceremony, story, play, and culture at the heart of organizational life” (p. 21).
The framing and reframing of organizations is an accepted problem-solving method well-grounded throughout relative literature (Argyris & Schon, 1974; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg & Martin, 1991; Gallos, 1991) supporting Bolman and Deal’s claims:

Collectively, [frames] make it possible to reframe, looking at the same thing from multiple lenses or points of view. When the world seems hopelessly confusing and nothing is working, reframing is a powerful tool for gaining clarity, regaining balance, generating new options, and finding strategies that make a difference. (2008, p. 22)

Formal agreements in the form of Memorandums of Understanding (MOU)

Formal agreements in the form of Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) could be established with a view to enhancing interagency integration and resource sharing. This could be done in conjunction with reciprocal integrated training initiatives that enhance mutual understanding at both an organizational and individual level.

Since information sharing will be paramount to this initiative, stakeholders will be expected to participate in a steadfast, conscientious manner. Accountability for responsible cooperation (Lencioni, 2005, pp. 61-68) could be implemented in concurrence with the development and implementation of simple guidelines that could be as basic as:

a. *Who* to share the information with;

b. *What* information needs to be shared;

c. *When* must this information be shared;

d. *Where* is it essential for this information to be shared;

e. *How* is this information best shared; and

f. *Why* - because we need to share in order to collaborate effectively.
Describing the peculiarities of organizations, Bolman and Deal (2008) advised that they are complex, surprising, deceptive and ambiguous, explaining, “complexity, unpredictability and deception generate rampant ambiguity, a dense fog that shrouds what happens from day to day” (p. 32). In the policing world it is not difficult to envision the general confusion described by the authors when they elaborated that, “Much of the time, events and processes are so intricate, scattered, and uncoordinated that no one can fully understand - let alone control - the real truth” (p. 33).

The proposed development of a framework to formulate objectives and strategies through formal agreements that recognize organizational learning and accountability should alleviate some potential confusion by providing an effective structure for delegating duties and coordinating multiple interagency efforts. Consummated with the appropriate MOU’s, “Structure needs to be designed with an eye toward desired ends, the nature of the environment, the talents of the workforce, and the available resources (such as time, budget, and other contingencies)” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 59).

**Cultural issues addressed through development of authentic interagency trust**

The current “happenstance” (AB04, p. 23; Senge, 2006, p. 221) upon which the bulk of police interpersonal and interagency cooperation currently relies is a cultural phenomenon that exemplifies the strong leadership necessary for the development of trust, as illustrated by Solomon and Flores’ (2001) observation that, “Authentic trust can never be taken for granted, but must be continually cultivated through commitment and truthfulness … True leadership, whatever else it may be, can be based on nothing less” (p. 15).

In an examination of the concept of trust, this paper has described development of *authentic trust* as paramount to the success of the RTOC initiative, and it is essential that the
people responsible for this development understand the powerful, reciprocal and enduring nature of the trust conceived by Solomon and Flores (2001):

Authentic trust is … fully self-aware, cognizant of its own conditions and limitations, open to new and even unimagined possibilities, based on choice and responsibility, rather than the mechanical operations of predictability, reliance, and rigid rule-following. (p. 59)

Those tasked with cultivation of interagency trust must fully understand the implications, long-term commitment, and continuous effort required to undertake a construct aptly described by Piggot-Irvine (2012) as the “hard earned outcome from effective collaboration” (p. 91). Refuting the notion of trust as a prerequisite for collaboration (Hattori & Lapidus, 2004), Piggot-Irvine qualified existing literary implications with the conclusion that trust is instead the inevitable result of collaboration and a lot of hard work. While much of the current literature infers trust is a requirement for successful collaboration, I concur with Piggot-Irvine’s (2012) alternate view and endorsement of enhanced communication skills that adopt “productive reasoning” (p. 99) in the engagement of “constructive conflict” (p. 96). Defining “dialogue, inquiry, and reflection [as] collaborative norms [with] intended outcomes of respect for diversity of opinion, openness and ultimately trust” (p. 93), the common thread woven throughout Piggot-Irvine’s (2012) hypothesis of collaboration is effective communication that emphasizes patience and proficiency. Proficiency will ensure that it is completed efficiently, patience typifies the approach since “If we do not have time to do something, it is a sign that it doesn’t matter” (Block, 2008, p. 79).

Techniques created by Piggot-Irvine (2012) address defensive routines in collaborative development while effectively building authentic trust, and include “Learning steps to guide a
shift to productive values and strategies” (p. 98), an adaptation of the original work of Argyris (1990). The practical guidelines offered illustrate the extensive collaborative experience of Piggot-Irvine (2012), and I have paraphrased these particular steps towards authentic collaboration as: (a) honest self-examination; (b) identification of defensive strategies; (c) implementation of learned skills and their development in collaborative settings; and (d) ongoing personal reflection.

**Organizational Implications**

Although no organization can continue status quo indefinitely, it is understood that peoples’ inherent need for stability presents a daunting challenge to the introduction of change for both constituents and leaders and, as implied in the following excerpt, the resulting culture of resistance manifests in the defensive behaviors discussed throughout this paper:

> Until advocates of police change recognize the importance of culture, they will continue to be as surprised as they have been for the past 100 years at the profound limitations of reform efforts to yield real and enduring changes. (Crank, 2004, p. 4)

Despite the reality of resistance, leaders should remember that these challenges are not insurmountable and that the prospect of collaboration can be successful. I found the wisdom of Piggot-Irvine (2012) timely and relevant, particularly after a borrowed “range of collaborative categories” (Cardno, 1998, p. 114) was revised into “categories of collaboration” (Piggot-Irvine, 2012, p. 93). I have borrowed from her work to design the framework for an implementation proposal that facilitates stakeholder RTOC adaptation and integration over the next 18 to 24 months.
Implementation Process

Old methods of innovation…R & D, special task forces - aren’t enough any more, because the challenge isn’t just to come up with a better idea. The challenge is to implement it. (McGehee, 2001, p. 50)

I found Piggot-Irvine’s (2012) five “categories of collaboration” (p. 93) a relevant format that I was able to reframe and revise into five steps that form an effective platform for the implementation of collaborative practice within the RTOC and the law enforcement counterparts of CPS. In conjunction with many of the congruent literary principles and relying heavily upon The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership from Kouzes and Posner (2007), the original categories - information, consultation, discussion, involvement, and participation (Piggot-Irvine, 2012), are presented chronologically in their revised form in the following proposal:

Information

CPS leaders could take this opportunity to engage in internal dialogue in the RTOC to clarify roles and values within CPS. Constituent understanding of their role in proposed change “is critical to commitment levels, since people need to believe that they’re dedicating themselves to the creation of a noble and meaningful future that is worthy of their best efforts” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 212). Creating a climate in which constituents accept the challenges of change and are able to act on the values they share will build competence that provides the RTOC with “the ability to deliver on the promise” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 68). Organizational leaders who “personify the shared values” and “teach others to model the values” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 76) will “create a culture in which everyone commits to aligning themselves with shared values” (p. 76).

Consultation
Leaders should seek feedback on the proposed changes from constituents and other relevant sources while always being careful to ask the right questions. Utilizing this feedback to identify personal and systemic shortcomings might provide leaders the opportunity for honest, open dialogue with constituents. Seizing these as an opportunity to “speak from the heart” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 151) and to openly “express their emotions” (p. 148) could build leadership trust within the organization.

**Discussion**

With organizational competency and alignment putting the RTOC in position to “model the way” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 31) it will be incumbent upon CPS leaders to “Be the first to trust [since] building trust is a process that begins when one party is willing to risk being the first to open up, being the first to show vulnerability, and being the first to let go of control” (p. 227). This will mean approaching stakeholders in an honest, forthright manner to inspire dialogue that will establish a mutual understanding and appreciation of stakeholder concerns, capabilities and limitations. Creation of the necessary forums to facilitate incorporation of the communication practices espoused by the literature is paramount. This will provide an opportunity to foster collaboration by promoting a sense of mutual dependence and build trust through honest reflection (Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Lencioni, 2005; Piggot-Irvine, 2012; Senge, 2006; Short, 1998; Yukl, 2010).

**Involvement**

It is advisable for CPS to invite stakeholders to participate in the RTOC with an initial visit to the operations centre. Seeking suggestions and remaining open to the feedback of these external stakeholders will foster collaboration while creating a climate of trust and a sense of interdependency. “By demonstrating openness to others’ influence, you contribute to building
the trust that enables your constituents to be more open to your influence” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 229). By “showing trust to build trust” (p. 247), a genuine offer to share information and resources will go a long way towards the desired development of an authentic reciprocal trust between stakeholders.

**Participation**

Ongoing dialogue with stakeholders will keep collaborative participants engaged and allow for the joint development of a value statement and some common goals and objectives. By remaining objective and optimistic leaders will create “conditions for success” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 290) that will allow all stakeholders to participate fully in the planning, implementation and operation of the collaborative. “By bringing people together, sharing the lessons from success, and getting personally involved, leaders reinforce in others the courage required to get extraordinary things done” (p. 309). Commitment to collaboration may produce successes, and celebrating those victories based upon adherence to key values could bring about a sense of community to the developing collaborative (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Above all else, because AB11 was correct with his assessment that a law enforcement collaborative is “the right thing to do” (p. 18). Since participant’ comments emphasized the common good, this alone could prove incentive enough to entice leaders to work together towards a successful collaborative. This may have been a key issue that potential stakeholders lost sight of with previous failed initiatives, most recently illustrated by the failure of APi3. It will be imperative for leaders tasked with this development and implementation to remember that, “Leadership is not an affair of the head. Leadership is an affair of the heart” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 351).

**Leadership Implications for Organizational Change**
Offering his view of change leadership, Yukl’s (2010) research manifested the sage advice that, “Leading change is one of the most important and difficult leadership responsibilities” (p. 298). Illustrative of an elusiveness presented through the quandary of leadership, Yukl’s comments reiterated this somewhat ominous warning issued in more colorful prose some five centuries earlier:

> And it ought to be remembered that there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things. (Machiavelli, 1469 - 1527)

Though demonstrably difficult, employment of leadership principles, particularly the development of common goals and articulation of a shared vision, is essential to the success of this collaborative effort. As noted by Senge (2006), “If any one idea about leadership has inspired organizations for thousands of years, it’s the capacity to hold a shared picture of the future we seek to create” (p. 9), and leaders unsure of the influence they wield over their organization need only review this pertinent summary from Fairholm and Fairholm (2009):

> Leadership is a culture - building, value - infusing, behavior - changing, trust - causing activity. Culture dictates acceptable behavior and measures its fidelity to group expectations. Establishing shared values is the most crucial culture - setting leadership task. The values thus set become the basis for a corporate mind - set that guides subsequent individual and group trust and interaction. While leaders shape values, they are made manifest in the culture through attitudes fostered and rites, rituals, myths, strategies, and goals assumed. (p. 10)

Leadership is paramount to a successful collaborative effort and it is clear that a commitment to the principles of transformational leadership acknowledged by study participants
will be an essential element of this process. Leadership principles highlighted here have been acknowledged and extracted directly from study data as the express comments of research participants. This demonstrated familiarity with accepted literary leadership principles is significant and infers an obligation for organizational leaders to engage these practices.

**Vision**

“Clarity of vision” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 34) is described as the leadership quality that most distinguishes leaders from other credible people, and as Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2004) explained, “Visionary leaders articulate where a group is going, but not how it will get there - setting people free to innovate, experiment, and take calculated risks” (p. 57). In this manner a much-needed clarity is provided to constituents who are better able to understand what is expected of them in relation to a bigger picture. Emphasized by study participants, recognition and understanding of a bigger picture is imperative to establish a requisite commitment so that “people with a strong sense of personal direction can join together to create a powerful synergy” (Senge, 2006, p. 197). Articulation of a clear and compelling vision creates a foundation for synergy because:

A clear vision of what the organization could accomplish or become helps people understand the purpose, objectives, and priorities of the organization. It gives the work meaning, serves as a source of self-esteem, and fosters a sense of common purpose. (Yukl, 2010, p. 289)

Stakeholder commonality, that common purpose recognized by study participants and acknowledged by this research study, should stimulate the realization that a law enforcement collective represents a “complex whole that is greater than the sum of its parts” (Nobre, 2007)
and allow leaders to decrease interagency competition with established, agreed upon goals. This alignment of efforts will facilitate the creation of a clear vision that will be difficult but possible to accomplish, with the knowledge that, “when peer organizations honestly embrace shared goals and clearly articulate how they will achieve them, collaboration works” (Tierney, 2011, p. 38).

**Implications if Study Recommendations are not Implemented**

Should the collaborative effort of policing remain status quo in the Province of Alberta, police leaders run a serious risk of jeopardizing the public trust upon which police rely. Since the principle responsibility of police is public safety, it could be argued that a failure or refusal by police to incorporate a law enforcement collaborative may jeopardize the safety of the people they serve.

The prevalence of marginally effective or chronically ineffective police technology (CISA; ACIIS; NCDB; APSNET; APi3) has been the result of well - intentioned, misguided politicians intending to provide effective tools to law enforcement (Bell, 2012; Massinon, 2013). Should police leaders not take the opportunity to align organizational efforts, this pattern of government intervention promises to continue with potential shortcomings exacerbated by a troubled economy (Gignac, 2013; Wyatt, 2013). Upon collaborating to decide mutually acceptable technology, “we don’t need to decide what it looks like, just what it does” (AB10, p. 33), unless police are able to present their needs to government as a collaborative, they will be obliged to accept the status quo and to make the most of the next government offering with the knowledge that “bureaucrats can create unreasonable or irrational legislation” (AB12, p. 15).

**Implications for Future Inquiry**
Future inquiry into interagency collaboration among Alberta law enforcement agencies could provide insight into initiatives including this one by addressing the relative success or failures of collaboration. Arguably ineffective in achieving goals (Cross, Dickmann, Newmann-Gonchar & Fagan, 2009), further study of specific collaboration efficiencies and effectiveness may begin to round out what was earlier referred to in this paper as a generalization of collaborative studies and serve to balance the paucity of literature on failed or unsuccessful collaborations (Cross et al, 2009).

Future inquiries of this nature may wish to include or encompass all governing bodies overseeing and administering to police agencies and those individuals and offices of the provincial government pertinent to police operations. Because this could be viewed as potentially sensitive research presumably enveloping different venues perceptually or intellectually removed from one another, alternate action research approaches of *action science* or *appreciative inquiry* may be advised in order to expand research findings. Concentration on how “individuals’ theories in use create organizational defensiveness” (Argyris & Schon, 1996; Senge, 2006) is seen in the first instance as “an important approach to organizational learning” (Coghlan & Brannick, 2010, p. 46). Focusing on “appreciation rather than pathologies and problems”, Cooperrider and Whitney’s (2005) appreciative inquiry “aims at large system change through an appreciative focus on what already works in a system, rather than a focus on what is deficient” (as cited in Coghlan & Brannick, 2010, p. 47). Either of these investigative paradigms have the potential to be effective in generating new knowledge in regard to the further study of collaboration without the risk of offending the sensibilities of study participants. This softer approach is congruent with the community based action research espoused by Stringer (2007) that “seeks to build positive working relationships and productive communicative styles” (p. 20).
with the intention of providing “a climate that enables disparate groups of people to work
harmoniously and productively to achieve a set of goals” (p. 20).

Since a distinct lack of communication surfaced between these disparate governing
bodies and police organizations during this study, it is presumed that future inquiry employing
the suggested techniques may expose the cause of this failure to communicate and introduce
enhanced cooperation between these organizational entities. Rather than the unilateral decision -
making historically employed by government, implementation of communicative techniques
such as the productive dialogue and productive reasoning discussed in Chapter Two will benefit
this and future initiatives.

**Chapter Summary**

In conversation with CPS senior management, it is my understanding that plans to pursue
a provincial law enforcement collaborative under the auspices of the RTOC are to be pursued by
CPS Executive. Although I have seen no formal business plan for such an endeavor, I also
understand that in conversation with the Chief of Police, CPS, many of the leaders from
stakeholder agencies have expressed the desire and intention to actively pursue a collaborative
initiative. The seeds of change appear to have been sown through communication between these
leaders.

The project sponsor, senior officer of the RTOC, has indicated his intention to invite
external leaders to participate in the operations centre with an initial visit to the RTOC, and
subsequent study recommendations will be employed as he sees fit to further the depth of these
stakeholder relationships. Witnessing this developing proposal, it is difficult not to be optimistic
that a collaborative never previously thought possible now has the potential to become reality.
REFERENCES


Bell, R. (2012, August 20). What were they thinking? After years of trumpeting training centre, Tory turnaround leaves us all guessing. *The Calgary Sun*, p. 5.


1322BB68AEA12AC38CF/1?accountid=8056


1322BC77AA514683088/16?accountid=8056


APPENDIX A: CPS BUSINESS PLAN

APPENDIX B: CPS ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

APPENDIX C: RTOC ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

APPENDIX D: TELEPHONE SCRIPT

Hello, my name is John Byers, I am a sworn member of the Calgary Police Service and I am conducting a research project as part of the requirement for my Masters Degree at Royal Roads University. My research project revolves around the Real Time Operations Centre of the Calgary Police Service and examines the question of how law enforcement might effectively collaborate in a manner that meets everyone’s needs. Title of the research paper is “Real Time, Intelligence Lead Operations: Making Collaborative Policing Work”.

You have been chosen to participate because of your experience and specific knowledge of your agency. In an effort to learn the thoughts and opinions of the law enforcement community in relation to this endeavor, as well as any personal opinions you may have on the subject, I will be conducting one-on-one interviews with senior officers from each law enforcement agency in the Province.

I estimate that each digitally recorded interview will take about an hour, you are under no obligation to participate and if you are interested in doing so I will forward the five interview questions to you in advance so that there are no surprises. I will provide you with a written transcript of your interview and an opportunity to review and edit it as you see fit prior to my using it in the study and your express, written consent will be required before any comments are attributed to you. You must be comfortable with your participation and should you change your mind you will be free to withdraw at any time before the end of the research study. Since you and other participants hold prominent positions within your respective organizations, your identity and position will be published, however personal and contact information will be treated as confidential.

Would you be interested in participating in my research project? If so, I will forward a Letter of Invitation with further particulars on it for your review and once I receive an acknowledgement I will contact you to arrange an interview time. Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to speaking with you in the future.
APPENDIX E: LETTER OF INVITATION FOR INTERVIEW

I am conducting research relevant to law enforcement in Alberta and would like to invite you to participate. This thesis study is being conducted as prerequisite to a Master’s Degree in Leadership at Royal Roads University where I am currently enrolled. My name is John Byers, and should you wish to confirm any of the information contained in this letter please feel free to contact Dr. Niels Agger-Gupta, Programme Head, Leadership & Core Faculty-Royal Roads University.

I am a sworn member of the Calgary Police Service (CPS) and my research will examine how we might collectively make collaborative policing work, asking specifically, “How can the Calgary Police Service (CPS) develop an intelligence lead, real time law enforcement collaborative?” This study originates from the current CPS-Real Time Operations Centre (RTOC) and purposes that all law enforcement agencies in the Province be invited to participate as equal partners in a collaborative that utilizes a common centre for the timely sharing of information and intelligence. My research will examine potential human barriers and attempt to identify benefits and shortcomings of the proposed collaborative.

I will be conducting qualitative research that entails thematic analysis of data collected from one-on-one interviews. These interviews will be audio recorded, transcribed and returned to individual participants for contextual review and approval prior to my analysis. Data collected will be coded, formatted, summarized and presented in the body of my Final Report. All research findings will be shared with my sponsoring agency in this Final Report, a copy of which will be made available to each project participant. Comments and quotations will be attributed to specific individuals only where prior, express permission is agreed to by the participant. All documentation will be kept strictly confidential.

During the course of my research all data collected will be retained in a locked filing cabinet within the secure confines of the Calgary Police Service and accessed only by myself. One year after my research has been successfully accepted by Royal Roads University all raw research data and any personal information will be destroyed. If you or any individual withdraws from this research at any time before the study ends, your data and personal information will be removed from the research and destroyed immediately. A copy of the Final Report will be published and archived in the Royal Roads Library.

You have been selected as a prospective research participant because of your position, experience and personal familiarity with your respective agency. You are not compelled to participate and if you choose to do so are free to withdraw at any time before the study ends without prejudice. Similarly, if you choose not to participate your decision will be maintained in confidence.

It is intended that each of the proposed interviews last 30 to 60 minutes depending upon individual response and any necessary clarification. Each will involve five (5) set questions that I have included here for your consideration. Your personal thoughts, opinions, experiences, observations and suggestions are welcomed.
1) What if any benefit(s) do you see to a law-enforcement collaborative such as the one proposed here?
2) What do you see as barriers to the successful establishment of a policing collaborative in the Province?
3) What are your thoughts on the perceived reluctance of police officers to share information and intelligence with their law enforcement counterparts and what, if any, are the cultural issues that need to be addressed before we can realize full interagency information sharing?
4) This study proposes the ongoing, unrestricted sharing of information between law enforcement agencies. Does current policy within your agency endorse or inhibit this type of collaboration and what changes would need to take place in order for your agency to adapt a collaborative model such as the one proposed?
5) What do you think would be the best way to develop and implement a true policing collaborative based upon a central operations centre such as the RTOC?

I would like to thank you in advance for your anticipated consideration. Please contact me if you would like to participate in my research project.

Detective John Byers
Criminal Operations
Calgary Police Service

Sincerely,

John A. Byers
APPENDIX F: RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

My name is John Byers and this research project is part of the requirement for a Masters of Leadership Degree at Royal Roads University. My credentials with Royal Roads University can be established by contacting Dr. Niels Agger-Gupta, Programme Head, Leadership & Core Faculty-Royal Roads University. The title of this project is “Real Time, Intelligence Lead Operations: Making Collaborative Policing Work”.

This document constitutes an agreement to participate in my research project, the objective of which is to examine how to make collaborative policing work and answer the question, “How can the Calgary Police Service (CPS) develop an intelligence lead, real time law enforcement collaborative?” In addition to submitting my Final Report to Royal Roads University in partial fulfillment for a Masters in Leadership Degree, I will be sharing my research findings with the Calgary Police Service, my sponsoring agency, and all research participants. A copy of the Final Report will be published and archived in the Royal Roads Library.

This research will consist of the thematic analysis of data collected through a series of interviews and will be completed before March 15, 2013. The foreseen interview questions refer to the proposed law enforcement collaborative as follows:

1) What if any benefit(s) do you see to a law-enforcement collaborative such as the one proposed here?
2) What do you see as barriers to the successful establishment of a policing collaborative in the Province?
3) What are your thoughts on the perceived reluctance of police officers to share information and intelligence with their law enforcement counterparts and what, if any, are the cultural issues that need to be addressed before we can realize full interagency information sharing?
4) This study proposes the ongoing, unrestricted sharing of information between law enforcement agencies. Does current policy within your agency endorse or inhibit this type of collaboration and what changes would need to take place in order for your agency to adapt a collaborative model such as the one proposed?
5) What do you think would be the best way to develop and implement a true policing collaborative based upon a central operations centre such as the CPS - Real Time Operations Centre?

Expected to last approximately one hour, interviews will be audio-recorded, transcribed and returned to the interviewee in order to check context for accuracy. Data will be analyzed and findings presented in the body of a Final Report. At no time will any specific comments be attributed to any individual unless specific agreement has been obtained beforehand. All documentation will be kept strictly confidential.

During the course of my research all data collected will be retained in a locked filing cabinet within the secure confines of the Calgary Police Service and accessed only by myself. Interview results and any other data collected during this research will be used specifically for this and no
other study and one year after my research has been successfully accepted by Royal Roads University all raw research data and personal information will be destroyed. If you or any individual withdraws from this research before the end of the study, your data and personal information will be removed from the research and destroyed immediately.

You are not compelled to participate in this research project. If you do choose to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time before the study ends without prejudice. Similarly, if you choose not to participate in this research project, this information will also be maintained in confidence.

By signing this letter, you give free and informed consent to participate in this project.

Name: (Please Print): __________________________________________________

Signed: ______________________________________________________________

Date: ________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX G: LETTER OF AGREEMENT

For Transcription Services

In partial fulfillment of the requirement for a Master of Arts in Leadership Degree at Royal Roads University, John Byers will be conducting an inquiry research study to understand the strengths of core leaders at “The Calgary Police Service” and how to support leadership development.

**Transcriptionist Role Description:**
Transcribe and review recorded audio files for the purpose of producing audio data collection into written form. In the course of this activity, you may be privy to confidential inquiry data and confidential business data.

**Confidentiality of Inquiry Data:**
In compliance with the Royal Roads University Research Ethics Policy, under which this inquiry project is being conducted, all personal and business identifiers and any other confidential information generated or accessed by the inquiry team member will only be used in the performance of the functions of this project, and must not be disclosed to anyone other than persons authorized to receive it, both during the inquiry period and beyond it. Recorded information in all formats is covered by this agreement. Personal and business identifiers include participant names, contact information, personally identifying turns of phrase or comments, other personally identifying information, proprietary information, and business operations or strategy information. Personal information will be collected, recorded, corrected, accessed, altered, used, disclosed, retained, secured and destroyed as directed by John Byers, under direction of the Royal Roads Academic Supervisor.

**Statement of Informed Consent and Confidentiality:**
I have read and understand this agreement.

Gayle PHILLIPS _________________________ 2012.10.01
Name (Please Print) Signature Date