

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]



The Role of Leadership in the Integration of Police Organizations

By

SANDRO COLASACCO

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

MASTER OF ARTS

In

LEADERSHIP AND TRAINING

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

.....

Project Sponsor, Marianne Ryan, B.A.,

.....

Faculty Project Supervisor, Pam Aikman, B.A., MSc., MA.,

.....

Committee Chair, Tony Williams, Ph.D.

ROYAL ROADS UNIVERSITY

July, 2005

© Sandro Colasacco, 2005



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

0-494-09424-9

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

ISBN:

Our file *Notre référence*

ISBN:

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

ABSTRACT

Over the past ten years, there has been a growing awareness that there is a need for police forces throughout Canada to break down the walls that prevent them from establishing truly genuine working relationships. In response to the demand from the public, all levels of government and the police community, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) proposed the creation of a number of integrated policing units to deal with different operational necessities. As in any industry, effective leadership dictates the success or failure of a business endeavour. So is this the case for integrated policing units. This report will study the leader's role in facilitating and encouraging the development and continuing commitment to the integration of police resources. The result of this study will be the identification of leadership practices that will assist senior police managers in ensuring that the integrative process maintains and builds upon its current success.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those who supported and encouraged me during this journey over the past two years. I would like to thank my family who gave up the most to allow me to reach the end of my journey. To my wife, Linda, who painstakingly edited my work and who often picked up my part of our family responsibilities so that I could devote that time to my studies. She also provided me the encouragement I needed in those times when my commitment to family, work and school seemed overwhelming. To my son, Greg, and my daughter, Lia, who, over those two years, gave up a considerable amount of their time with Dad.

I would like to express a special thanks to my Project Sponsor, Superintendent Marianne Ryan, who took time from her demanding responsibilities to work with me and to provide me with the guidance and resources that made this all possible.

I would like to thank my Project Supervisor, Pam Aikman, who also took time from her busy schedule to accept e-mails, take evening phone calls, edit my writing and provide me with the encouragement and insight that allowed me to complete this project.

I would like to thank the ten senior police leaders that graciously took the time to allow me to interview them so that their knowledge and experience could become an instrumental part of this project.

Finally, I would like to thank the dedicated staff at Royal Roads University and the members of my cohort who gave me courage throughout this journey. When at times things seemed confusing and overwhelming, I would hear Professor Tony Williams' often said words, "Just trust the system." I'm glad I did.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE: FOCUS AND FRAMING	1
Introduction	1
The Opportunity and its Significance	4
Systems Analysis of the Opportunity.....	7
Organizational Context	8
Organization of the RCMP	8
Strategic Priorities	10
Mission, Vision and Value Statements.....	10
Core Values:.....	11
“E” Division – British Columbia.....	12
Governance and Accountability	12
The Organizational Structure of Integrated Policing Models.....	13
Administration and Management.....	13
Operations	14
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	16
Leadership.....	16
Rationale.....	16
Leadership and the Integrative Process	17
Leadership Styles.....	18
Value Based Leadership.....	18
Contingency Leadership	19
Transactional Leadership	20
The Leader and the Vision	21
Organizational Culture.....	22
Rationale.....	22
Defining Culture	22
The CFSEU Model and Organizational Culture.....	24
Successful Cultural Change	24
Leadership.....	25
Shared Assumptions	25
Group Stability	26
Systems and Systems Thinking.....	27
Rationale.....	27
Success to the Successful.....	27
System Blindness.....	28
System Blindness and Mental Models	30
Differentiation and Dedifferentiation	30

Trust	31
Rationale.....	31
Developing Trust	33
The Inherent Risk in Trust.....	34
Authentic Trust.....	35
Communication.....	37
Rationale.....	37
Honesty and Openness	37
Dialogue vs. Discussion	38
Open and Honest Communication and Teambuilding	40
Collaboration – The “Win-Win” Approach.....	41
CHAPTER THREE: CONDUCT OF RESEARCH REPORT	44
Research Approach	44
Research Methods.....	46
Procedure.....	46
Trustworthiness.....	47
Information Analysis.....	48
Project Participants.....	49
The Research Team	49
The Project Participants	49
Selection of the Interview Participants	50
The Reasons for Choosing This Group.....	50
Ethical Issues	51
Ethical Considerations	51
The Right to Privacy	52
Study Conduct.....	53
Preparation and the Interviews.....	53
The Interview Questions	55
Analysis	55
Trustworthiness.....	56
CHAPTER FOUR: ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	57
Leadership.....	57
Organizational Culture.....	64
Systems and Systems Thinking.....	73
Trust	82
Communication.....	84
Study Conclusions.....	86
Leadership	86
Organizational Culture	88
Systems and Systems Thinking	90
Trust.....	93
Communication	94
Scope and Limitations of the Research	96
CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS	97
Study Recommendations	97
Organizational Implementation	98

Recommendation One.....	98
Recommendation Two.....	99
Recommendation Three	100
Implications for Future Research	100
CHAPTER SIX: LESSONS LEARNED	102
WORKS CITED	104
APPENDIX A: LETTER OF INVITATION	107
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM	109
APPENDIX C: Major Project Interview Questions	111
APPENDIX D: Letter to Participants at the end of the interviews	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Leadership traits required by police leaders in an integrative model	57
Table 2.	Prerequisites required for integration to occur.....	58
Table 3.	Expectations that must continue to exist to remain in the integrated initiative	60
Table 4.	How does a leader nurture the partnerships developed in integrated policing models?	61
Table 5.	Is integrative policing a long term policing model in Canada?.....	61
Table 6.	To what extent does a leader affect organizational culture?.....	64
Table 7.	Can different police organizational cultures come together to create effective integrated units?	66
Table 8.	The use of another organization’s policy to govern an integrated unit	69
Table 9.	Does the potential exist that integrated silos will be created?.....	71
Table 10.	What is more important: the suppression of crime within your own police jurisdiction, or enforcement actions in a larger regional, provincial, or national context?.....	73
Table 11.	What factors contribute to “turf” warfare among police organizations?.....	74
Table 12.	How do you eliminate “turf” warfare from the relationships between police organizations?	76
Table 13.	Is integration beneficial to your organization?	77
Table 14.	Is integration detrimental to your organization?.....	79
Table 15.	For the sake of your organization, would you be prepared to set aside the needs of your organization?	81
Table 16.	Is the erosion of trust among police organizations one of the biggest problems facing police leaders in Canada today?	82
Table 17.	Describe the communication process that is required to create, sustain and enhance the integrative process.....	84
Table 18.	Are collaborative “win-win” solutions possible for all the participants in an integrative partnership?.....	85

CHAPTER ONE:

FOCUS AND FRAMING

Organizations that fail to reach their visions do so because of lack of leadership – at every level. The type of leadership that excels is the type of leadership that understands how hard it is to move people out of their comfort zones; leadership where people have patience and stamina for the long haul. Leaders don't just stay the course – they set it, and reset it. The vision of integrated policing is our generation's challenge. My expectation as we plan for the coming year is that you will embrace the integrated policing vision, sense the urgency and take a leadership role – out front and behind the scenes. (RCMP Commissioner Giuliano Zaccardelli, 2004, p.7)

Introduction

It is the researcher's experience that the law enforcement community is most often comprised of dedicated individuals who are extremely proud of the work they do and extremely loyal to the organizations they represent. Ironically, these factors have contributed to an environment that is often extremely competitive and possessive of the investigative knowledge and intelligence that is gathered. Such a competitive and possessive mind set often contributes to the creation of police organizations that function within what is commonly referred to as "silos." This analogy refers to the fact that police organizations all have similar strategic goals and objectives but pride and a sense of territorialism preclude them from working in unison towards those similar goals and objectives.

In cases where the only alternative is for police forces to work together, the relationship is sometimes strained and not transparent. Unfortunately, this fact has resulted in a number of incidents that could have been prevented had there been cooperative working relationships and regimes in place that allowed for a free flow of investigative knowledge and intelligence. This corporate knowledge is the backbone of any

police organization and the protective sense of entitlement to this information, given past events, is no longer in the public interest.

A case in point is the investigation involving Paul Bernardo (Bernardo), Karla Homolka and the murders of Christine French and Leslie Mahaffy. In his 1996 report, known as the Bernardo Investigation Review – Campbell Inquiry Report (CIR), the Honourable Justice Archie Campbell of the Ontario Supreme Court (Justice Campbell) identified many failings resulting from the poor cooperation between the police forces involved in the investigation. In his report Justice Campbell (1996) commented that,

A case management system is needed that is based on co-operation rather than rivalry, among law enforcement agencies...The Bernardo case shows that motivation, investigative skill, and dedication are not enough. The work of the most dedicated, skilful, and highly motivated investigators and supervisors and forensic scientists can be defeated by the lack of effective case management systems and the lack of systems to ensure communication and co-operation among law enforcement agencies. (p. 2)

So far as Bernardo was concerned, the Metro force [Metropolitan Toronto Police Service] and the GRT [Green River Taskforce] might as well have been operating in different countries. (p. 42)

When Bernardo stopped stalking and raping in Toronto and started stalking and raping in St. Catharines and Burlington he might as well have moved to another country for a fresh start. (p. 43)

Law enforcement agencies and all levels of government are demanding that the “silos” be broken down and that the integration of police services is to be pursued wherever possible. This demand is perpetuated by the following factors:

- The growing influence of organized crime that respects no boundaries; nationally or internationally;
- The growing urban nature of Canadian society resulting in criminals who commit offences in urban regions policed by a multitude of police forces;
- The ever present threat of terrorism;
- The desire of Federal and Provincial governments to remove redundant police services in order to rationalize the cost of delivering those services;

- The recognition by the law enforcement community that the integration of police services will meet all these demands.

In his 2004 Directional Statement, RCMP Commissioner Giuliano Zaccardelli envisioned a policing model for the new millennium that resolved the fragmented and often ineffective approaches to modern criminality. He envisioned a policing model with a shared framework of strategic priorities in which shared resources are directed towards achieving common goals with the highest standards of transparency and accountability. He further stated that this policing model would involve the free flow of intelligence and information across borders and even continents because the traditional approach of restricting access was no longer applicable. In short, he proposed a policing model that no longer operates in silos but that works together in an integrated environment. Most importantly, he stated that “it takes leadership and a sense of urgency” to achieve this vision (p. 7).

The issues identified by Commissioner Zaccardelli (2004) form the foundation for the question this research project intends to answer. **What is the role of the leader in facilitating and encouraging the integration of police organizations?**

Specifically:

- How does a leader facilitate the integration of competing organizational cultures?
- How does a leader overcome the “turf” warfare that often constrains the relationships between different police organizations now expected to work cooperatively?
- How does a leader nurture the partnerships developed as a result of the creation of an integrated policing model?

The role of the leader cannot be understated or taken for granted. Schein (1992) states that, “organizational cultures are created in part by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership is the creation, the management, and sometimes even the destruction of culture” (p. 5). Of greater significance is his comment that “if the group’s

survival is threatened because of elements of its culture have been maladapted, it is ultimately the function of leadership to recognize and do something about the situation. It is in this sense that leadership and culture are conceptually intertwined” (p. 5).

Schein’s (1992) assertions are supported by Justice Campbell (1996) when he stated,

But it is in the spirit of how things can work well when the spirit of co-operation is demonstrated from the top down throughout a police organization. The improvement in the working relationships, when Metro sent Detective Sergeant Boyd and Detective Sergeant Warr to work with the GRT on site in Beamsville, demonstrates that an attitude of professionalism and co-operation from the leadership of a force can overcome the inherent inter-force rivalry and turf wars that are an everyday fact of police life. As noted above, senior officers in positions of authority need more than investigative and administrative skills. Team building and professional skills of the kind demonstrated by Inspector Bevan in the leadership of the Green Ribbon Task Force, professional peace-making skills of the kind demonstrated by Detective Sergeant Boyd and Detective Sergeant Warr in the aftermath of the initial Metro-GRT clashes, and leadership of the kind demonstrated by the Metro force when it sent Boyd and Warr to work together with GRT, are essential to the success of any co-operative police venture. Communication and cooperation between agencies at all levels must be accepted, encouraged, directed and, above all, practiced. If not, every other measure, effort, venture, and joint force operation is doomed to failure. (p. 204)

The Opportunity and its Significance

The researcher found himself in a unique and advantageous situation because, in his organizational role, he was able to observe and study the manner in which various police organizations were integrated into a single entity. The researcher was and continues to be a senior supervisory Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO), at a newly created integrated unit known as the Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit – British Columbia (CFSEU – BC). The mandate of CFSEU – BC is the identification and disruption of organized crime groups in British Columbia. It is comprised of police officers from the Organized Crime Agency of British Columbia (OCABC), the RCMP (both provincial and federal resources) and the police departments within the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD).

CFSEU – BC also has a satellite office in Victoria and it too has a similar police representative structure.

There are five other CFSEUs in Canada located in Toronto, Ottawa, Cornwall, the Golden Horseshoe and Montreal. Calgary and Edmonton have created integrated models referred to as Integrated Response to Organized Crime (IROC) but the organizational structure and management of these units differ somewhat from the CFSEU model. Nevertheless, all these units are faced with the daily challenges associated with the integration of many different law enforcement organizations. These difficulties include such issues as governance, accountability, training, finances, unit composition and the acquisition and deployment of human resources.

The researcher also had the advantage of having access to other leaders who have been involved in the creation and or management of CFSEUs and other integrated units throughout Canada. These individuals were instrumental in identifying and providing insight into the major issues and considerations that have affected the integrative process. This insight was invaluable because the purpose of this research study was not to examine how leaders facilitate the day to day functions of an integrated policing model. Instead, the researcher examined what conditions needed to be established and what relationships needed to be developed before the senior management of partnering police agencies agreed to participate in an integrated policing model. Furthermore, the researcher also examined what continuing conditions and criteria are required to ensure the ongoing commitment of the senior management of the police agencies participating in the integrated policing model. The researcher believes that the long term viability of permanent integrated policing models, such as CFSEU and IROC, are dependent upon on how well relationships are nurtured by the leader developing those partnerships.

These are not trivial considerations because the CIR identified a number of underlying factors that contributed to the poor working relationship between the various police forces involved in the Bernardo investigation. In his report Justice Campbell identified that ego clashes, turf competition and inherent rivalry between police forces were a natural and common occurrence that impeded effective law enforcement. He further identified that no one was in charge, no one was accountable and as a result, no effective co-operation or co-ordination was provided for the work being done. This led Justice Campbell to state that:

As noted above, if there was ever an abject example of how things can go wrong when police forces do not co-operate and no one is in charge or accountable, this is that example. And again, if there was ever an abject example of why it is necessary to develop a co-operative approach among police forces and a system to ensure such co-operation and accountability under a unified leadership structure, this is that example. (p. 203)

An insightful understanding of the past is imperative because “the future depends upon the past” (Bellman, 1990, p. 74). Likewise, by examining what is presently known and by gathering information that resulted in new knowledge, the researcher was able to make recommendations for future courses of action based on those findings (Bellman, 1990).

The opportunity also represented a genuine leadership stretch for the researcher because with the assistance of his Project Sponsor, he interviewed ten senior leaders who outrank him in every case. Subsequently, the researcher needed to conduct his interviews within the parameters of a paramilitary organizational culture while still acquiring the necessary information to conduct meaningful research and analysis. The rapport that the researcher was able to develop with his interview subjects was to a certain extent influenced by this unequal relationship. This was an important consideration because to truly understand people’s perceptions, qualitative research requires getting close to research

participants (Palys, 2003). Consequently, this research project benefited the researcher in the following ways:

- By providing the researcher with valuable exposure to and experience in change leadership that will be utilized during the course of his career.
- By allowing the researcher to develop the competencies of:
 - Systems Theory Thinking and Planning;
 - Organizations and Organizational Change;
 - Research and Inquiry.

Systems Analysis of the Opportunity

Nationally, policing is carried out by many different police forces and they derive their authority and mandates from both federal and provincial legislation. At the federal level, the enforcement of federal statutes is the primary responsibility of the RCMP. These responsibilities are fulfilled by specialized federal sections whose operating budgets are derived entirely from the federal government. At the provincial level, policing is carried out by the RCMP (under contract with some provinces), provincial police forces and municipal police forces. In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, the RCMP only enforces federal statutes. Provincial law enforcement responsibilities are carried out by the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) and the Sûreté de Québec (SQ). Municipal law enforcement is carried out by municipal police forces and in cases where smaller communities cannot afford their own police forces, policing services are provided by the OPP and the SQ.

In the rest of Canada, the RCMP is responsible for fulfilling many different law enforcement mandates. In the three territories, the RCMP is responsible for the federal, provincial and municipal police services. In the remaining eight provinces, the RCMP is also responsible for providing the federal, provincial and most of the municipal police services. There are some communities that have their own municipal police departments

but all in all, the RCMP provides the municipal policing service in one hundred and ninety-nine communities (RCMP Internet Homepage, 2004).

Internationally, the RCMP has Liaison Officers posted in many of the Canadian Embassies around the world. The Liaison Officers are responsible for providing all Canadian law enforcement agencies with assistance in conducting inquiries outside of Canada and with providing Canadian police officers access to their counterparts in foreign law enforcement agencies. In cases where Canadian law enforcement officers must travel to foreign jurisdictions to conduct their investigations, the Liaison Officers provide all the required assistance.

Organizational Context

Organization of the RCMP

The RCMP is organized and derives its authority from the provisions of the RCMP Act, an act of the Parliament of Canada. In accordance with that Act and under the direction of the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada, the RCMP is headed by a Commissioner. The on-strength establishment of the RCMP as of April 4, 2004 was 22,239 police officers and support staff. The actual strength, at that time, was 22,472 and a breakdown of those positions by rank and category is as follows:

- Commissioner – 1;
- Deputy Commissioners – 6;
- Assistant Commissioners – 27;
- Chief Superintendents – 58;
- Superintendents – 139;
- Inspectors – 333;
- Corps Sergeant Major – 1;
- Sergeant Major – 7;

- Staff Sergeant Major – 1;
- Staff Sergeants – 752;
- Sergeants – 1606;
- Corporals – 2,846;
- Constables – 10,028;
- Civilian Members – 2,611;
- Public Servants – 4,052.

The RCMP is comprised of four regions and within those regions there are fifteen divisions, not including headquarters in Ottawa. These divisions are alphabetically designated and roughly approximate the provincial boundaries. The regions and divisions are divided as follows:

- Pacific Region:
 - “E” Division British Columbia;
 - “M” Division Yukon Territories.
- North West Region:
 - “D” Division Manitoba;
 - “F” Division Saskatchewan;
 - “Depot” Division Regina Saskatchewan (the Training Academy);
 - “G” Division Northwest Territories;
 - “V” Division Nunavut;
 - “K” Division Alberta;
- Central Region:
 - “A” Division National Capital Region, Ottawa;
 - “O” Division Ontario;
 - “C” Division Quebec;

- Atlantic Region:
 - “B” Division Newfoundland;
 - “H” Division Nova Scotia;
 - “J” Division New Brunswick;
 - “L” Division Prince Edward Island. (RCMP Internet Homepage, 2004)

Strategic Priorities

The RCMP has five strategic priorities:

- Organized Crime;
- Terrorism;
- Youth;
- International Policing;
- Aboriginal Communities.

It is the first of these strategic priorities, Organized Crime, which dictates the mandate of the CFSEU and IROC units throughout Canada (RCMP Internet Homepage, 2004).

Mission, Vision and Value Statements

In an effort to promote value based leadership that is committed to providing its employees with a healthy workplace, the RCMP is guided by strong and definitive mission, vision and value statements.

- Mission:
 - The RCMP is Canada’s national police service. Proud of its traditions and confident in meeting future challenges, the RCMP commits itself to preserving the peace, upholding the law and providing quality service in partnership with Canada’s communities.”

- Vision:
 - The RCMP will:
 - Be a progressive, proactive and innovative organization;
 - Provide the highest quality service through dynamic leadership, education; and technology in partnership with the diverse communities we serve
 - Be accountable and efficient through shared decision-making;
 - Ensure a healthy work environment that encourages team building, open communication and mutual respect;
 - Promote safe communities;
 - Demonstrate leadership in the pursuit of excellence.

Core Values:

- Recognizing the dedication of all employees, the RCMP will create and maintain an environment of individual safety, well-being and development. The RCMP is guided by:
 - Accountability;
 - Respect;
 - Professionalism;
 - Honesty;
 - Compassion;
 - Integrity;
 - Empowerment;
 - Commitments to our Communities;
 - Commitments to our Employees (RCMP Internet Homepage, 2004).

“E” Division – British Columbia

In British Columbia, “E” Division provides federal, provincial, and municipal policing to the province through 126 detachments, with more than 5,000 police officers. Including other employees such as public service employees and civilian members, there are over 6,000 RCMP employees in BC. This makes “E” Division the largest in Canada, representing approximately one-third of the total RCMP force. The RCMP polices all but twelve municipalities in B.C.. In 1950, when it replaced the now defunct B.C. Provincial Police, the RCMP assumed provincial policing responsibilities as well. “E” Division is also divided into four districts and they consist of:

- The Lower Mainland District;
- The Island District;
- The North District;
- The Southeast District.

Governance and Accountability

According to Gehl (2001), all provinces have legislation that obligates police agencies to assist each other if called upon in emergency situations but there is no legislation dictating how police forces should share information or create joint forces teams to conduct major investigations or respond to multi-jurisdictional crime problems. Guided by the desires and direction of senior RCMP management, any integrated policing model that is created within the RCMP organizational structure will operate under the same premises as any other federal or provincial specialized unit.

Federal policing programs such as the Proceeds of Crime Program and the Drug Enforcement and Organized Crime Program receive their budget and direction from RCMP National Headquarters (NHQ) in Ottawa. To meet the national mandate of federal policing

programs, operational units are located within some or all divisions (depending on the perceived operational requirements). The day to day operational direction of those units is delegated to the Federal Operation Officer within that division. Provincial specialized policing units such as the Major Crime Unit are created in each division in accordance with the agreements between the RCMP and the provincial governments. The day to day operational directions of those units is delegated to the Contract Policing Officer within that division. In either case, these specialized units are responsible for their law enforcement mandates within their divisions. In the event that a criminal or a criminal organization also operates outside the division's jurisdictional boundaries, partnerships are created with other national or international police agencies to facilitate the gathering of evidence within those jurisdictions.

The Organizational Structure of Integrated Policing Models

Administration and Management

The administrative and management functions of the CFSEU models are based on RCMP policy and operational guidelines. IROC, on the other hand, alternates between the policy and operational guidelines of the partnering police agencies - whichever is considered the best policy at the time. Regardless of which policy and procedure is used, the organizational structure of these integrated units is arranged as follows:

- In all but "E" Division:
 - An Executive Steering Committee (ESC) determines the goals and objectives of the integrated policing model and is comprised of the Commanding Officer of the RCMP Division as well as the Chiefs of Police of all the partnering police departments. In the case of IROC, the Deputy Solicitor General for Alberta is also included in the Executive Steering Committee;

- A Joint Management Team (JMT), which is comprised of the senior criminal operations officers of the partnering agencies, ensures compliance with the overall operational philosophy and objectives of the unit. The JMT also monitors the operational progress and results of the unit's operational initiatives.
- In "E" Division, CFSEU adopted the Board of Governance (BOG), from OCABC, as its governing body. The BOG is comprised of:
 - The Commanding Officer of the RCMP "E" Division;
 - The Chief Constable of the Vancouver Police Department;
 - The President of the British Columbia Association of Chiefs of Police; and
 - The President of the British Columbia Association of Municipal Chiefs of Police.
- In all but "E" Division, the Officer in Charge (OIC) of CFSEU is always a senior Commissioned Officer of the RCMP. In the IROC model, the OIC is appointed by the ESC and every two years the position is rotated among the senior Commissioned Officers of the partnering agencies;
- The OIC CFSEU may be supported by two Commissioned Officers; one in charge of Operations and one in charge of Administration and Support. In the case of CFSEU - BC, one is a Commissioned Officer of the RCMP and the other a Commissioned Officer of one of the partnering police forces;
- The management of CFSEU is supported by at least one Senior NCO, at a rank not lower than Sergeant, from any of the partnering agencies.

The OIC IROC does not have the support of any Commissioned Officers.

Operations

Below the administrative and management levels are the operational project teams that conduct the actual investigations. The structure and composition of the investigative operational teams are dependent upon the needs of the different Divisions. A common

structure encompasses a number of operational project teams composed of investigators with expertise in a variety of investigative specializations such as drug investigations, proceeds of crime investigations and serious crime investigations. These operational teams are supported by surveillance teams, technical support teams (interception of private communication, electronic surveillance etc.) and criminal analysis teams, to name a few.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The topics of this literature review are Leadership, Organizational Culture, Systems and System Thinking, Trust and Communication. These topics were chosen because the researcher believes that they are intrinsic to the integrative process. An examination of the literature as it pertains to these topics provides a foundation for the subsequent analysis of the study findings.

Leadership

Rationale

Effective leadership is a multi-faceted concept and the defining factor in both the creation and continued success of any integrated policing model. Leaders have the ability of drawing others to them because they have a vision. They can also communicate an extraordinary commitment that makes people want to enrol in the pursuit of that vision (Bennis, 2000). Kouzes and Posner (2002) state that “leadership is relationship” (p. 20) and in this case, nothing could be more true. Once other police leaders have been engaged in the vision of integrated policing, the ability of the leader to develop and nurture these relationships is paramount to the long term success of the integrated policing model. An examination of leadership is important for the purposes of this Major Project because the researcher does not intend on examining the relationship between leader and follower. Rather, he intends on examining the relationship among leaders.

Leadership and the Integrative Process

The importance of leadership in facilitating and encouraging the creation of integrated policing models cannot be over emphasized. In a report on integrated policing published by the RCMP Strategic Policy and Planning Branch (“Why integrated policing?,” 2004), leadership was identified as one of the complex issues that determines integrative success. The report also questioned who was in the best position to advance this plan (“Why integrated policing?,” 2004). Although the report was correct in stating that leadership is an important issue, it failed to recognize that the important consideration is not just who in the organization is best positioned to advance the concept of integrated policing, but more importantly, what are the leadership skills needed to make such a plan a success. The article stated that “integrated policing begins with communication between partners and stakeholders that can lead to coalitions of trust. Broad consultation with partners and stakeholders is a critical first step in that ongoing process” (“Why integrated policing?,” 2004, p. 13). Trust and communication are very important considerations in developing and sustaining integrated policing models and as such, will be examined in detail later in this study. However, neither trust nor communication, not to mention broad consultation, can be achieved if the person leading that process does not have the abilities to develop these concepts.

It is important to remember that integrated policing units based on the CFESU model are usually headed by a senior Commissioned Officer of the RCMP and governed by RCMP policy and operational guidelines. The IROC model differs only in the requirement that the OIC position is rotated every two years among Commissioned Officers of the partnering police agencies. Consequently, all the senior leaders of the partnering agencies involved in the “broad consultation” know that once they agree to participate, they will lose a certain amount of control over the resources they commit to the integrated unit.

Undoubtedly, these requirements may become contentious issues that may cause discord among the senior leaders involved in the creation of the integrated unit. Couple this with concerns of mistrust and territorial protection and a consensus may never be reached.

Transformational leaders create shared visions, base their leadership on sound values and enable the development of relationships (DePree, 1989; Kouzes & Pozner, 2002; O'Toole, 1995; Yukl, 2002). Therefore, it is imperative that the senior leader entering the integrative process has the correct leadership skills to overcome any obstacles to integration. Effective influencing and understanding spring from healthy relationships among the members of a group. Leaders need to foster environments within which people can develop high quality relationships with each other and the group as a whole (DePree, 1989). Conversely, senior leaders of the partnering police forces must also approach the consultation process with a sincere desire to create a lasting agreement.

Leadership Styles

Value Based Leadership

To prevent or overcome these possibilities, the individual leading the integrative process must be well versed in the principles of value based leadership. Value based leadership is the foundation from which transformational leaders build their success. In keeping with the values of respect and empowerment, the value based leader allows people to do what is required by removing obstacles and enabling them to realize their full potential (DePree, 1989). By exemplifying the values of trust, integrity, respect, inclusion and empowerment, the transformational leader strengthens the existing organizational vision or builds commitment to a new vision (Yukl, 2002).

Contingency Leadership

Like all things in life, leadership is also subject to different opinions and philosophies. A philosophy of leadership that is considered to be contrary to that of value based leadership is the contingency theory of leadership. Yukl (2002) describes the contingency theory of leadership in a matter of fact sort of way. He defines it as an approach whereby a leader applies different solutions to different problematic situations. Yukl outlines a number of different contingency theories all of which utilize a variety of intervening variables to affect behaviour and the outcome of various situations. Yukl sees nothing nefarious in the practice of contingency leadership and theoretically, it appears to be a perfectly reasonable and effective approach to organizational problem solving.

Conversely, O'Toole (1995) takes great exception to the contingency theory of leadership stating that it is not a moral philosophy. He describes those who profess contingency leadership as realists who approach leadership without a value based philosophy. Realists make decisions based on the present circumstances and they utilize an "it all depends" approach to leadership. In other words, regardless of any underlying philosophy, a realist's response to a situation depends on what is most effective at the time. In essence, an organization led by a strong leader who does not practice inclusion limits the capacity of that organization to his or her level of competency (DePree, as cited in O'Toole, 1995). Furthermore, to a realist, there is always a crisis and "the essence of a crisis is the evil and anarchic nature of humans, which must be controlled by a firm commander" (O'Toole, 1995, p. 105). Consequently, O'Toole (1995) argues that contingency leadership intrinsically lends itself to abuse.

Nevertheless, Yukl's (2002) definition and descriptions of the various theories of contingency leadership indicate that they do not intrinsically lend themselves to abuse. Consequently, the underlying principles of contingency leadership and value based

leadership are not mutually exclusive. Many of the applications used in contingency leadership have merit and can be applied within the framework of value based leadership.

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership, on the other hand, is a leadership philosophy that should be avoided at all costs. Unlike transformational leadership that encourages trust, admiration, loyalty and respect in order to motivate individuals to transcend their own self-interests, transactional leadership is too self-serving. Transactional leadership motivates followers by appealing to their self-interests. It involves an exchange process that results in a follower's compliance with the leader's request but it is unlikely to generate enthusiasm and commitment (Yukl, 2002).

The task of creating an integrated policing model must begin with a clear understanding of the final product. It must be lead by a leader who is committed to the concept and who has a vision of how the final product will serve both the police community and the greater community as a whole. The authentic nature of value based leadership will contribute to the removal of any sentiments of mistrust and will go a long way in breaking down the barriers of defensiveness created by territorial concerns. The principles of value based leaderships may not always be consistent with a paramilitary system based on the contingency leadership tradition of command and control. As already stated, the principles of contingency and value based leadership are not mutually exclusive. This is evident in the fact that all the principles of value based leadership are encompassed in the mission, vision and value statements of the RCMP. Even DePree (1989) states that, "participative management is not democratic. Having a say differs from having a vote" (p. 25). The realities of police work dictate that sometimes, someone has to make difficult decisions that others must just follow. Effective leadership consists of knowing when to use which

leadership philosophy. Proficient leaders are flexible and capable of adapting to the circumstances of their present situations.

The Leader and the Vision

Regardless of an individual's leadership philosophy, it is universally accepted that a leader must have a commitment to and a vision for the future of an organization or group. To successfully facilitate and encourage the creation of an integrated policing model, a leader must be committed to the concept. Therefore, it is important that the individual who is chosen to lead the integration process is chosen not only for their leadership skills but also because they truly embrace the task at hand. This component of effective leadership is referred to throughout the literature. Kouzes and Posner (2002) refer to this commitment as "modeling the way." Exemplary leaders know that if they want to gain commitment they must be models of the behaviours they expect from others. People first follow the leader and then the plan. This is an extremely important statement because any long term commitment made by all the organizations in the integrated policing model is dependent on their commitment to the concept.

Having a vision of the future direction of integrated policing is the source of a leader's commitment because by inspiring a shared vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2002), a leader is effectively inspiring commitment from others. More importantly, a leader's enthusiasm for that vision is contagious and a truly visionary leader cannot help but enrol others in the attainment of the vision. In the case of value based leadership, a leader enlists others in a common vision by appealing to their aspirations. A value based leader motivates by forging a unity of purpose and by showing others that the vision embraces the common good (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). In the end, the leader's vision becomes his or her follower's vision because it is built on a foundation of their needs and aspirations. Followers are able to adopt the vision as their own because it is their own (O'Toole, 1995).

Bennis (2000) most effectively defines how leaders embrace others in their vision by defining a concept he refers to as the “management of attention.” He states that in his experiences, he was most effective when he knew what he wanted and he was ineffective when he did not. He therefore concludes that, “the first leadership competency is the management of attention through a set of intentions or vision, not in a mystical or religious sense, but in a sense of outcome, goal or direction” (p. 18).

Organizational Culture

Rationale

Schein (1992) identifies artifacts, espoused values and basic underlying assumptions (mental models) as the three components of organizational culture. These components are unique to every organization because they are developed as a result of shared experiences that ultimately define an organization. An understanding of how the leader affects organizational culture and how the organizational culture affects the leader is important in understanding the dynamics of the integrated policing models because intrinsic to this model is the partnering of a number of these strong organizational cultures.

Defining Culture

The word culture has many meanings and connotations and has been the subject of much debate. Commonly used words relating to culture such as norms, behaviour patterns, rituals and traditions emphasize one of its critical aspects – the idea that certain things in groups are shared or held in common. Culture implies that rituals, climate, values and behaviours bind together into a coherent whole (Schein, 1992). Schein (1992) states that:

The most useful way to think about culture is to view it as the accumulated shared learning of a given group, covering behavioural, emotional and cognitive elements of the group member’s total psychological functioning. For shared learning to occur, there must be a history of shared experience,

which in turn implies some stability of membership in the group. Given such stability and shared history, the human need for parsimony, consistency, and meaning will cause the various shared elements to form into patterns that eventually can be called a culture. (p.10)

O'Toole (1995) supports Schein's definition of culture when he states that:

A culture is a system of beliefs and actions that characterize a particular group. Culture is the unique whole – the shared ideas, customs assumptions, expectations, philosophy, traditions, mores, and values – that determines how a group of people will behave. (p. 72)

Organizational culture is comprised of three underlying components that allow it to be visible to the casual observer. These three components are artifacts, espoused values and basic assumptions (Schein, 1992).

Artifacts include all the phenomena that one sees, hears and feels when encountering a new group. Artifacts would include the visible products of the group such as the architecture of its physical environment, its language, artistic creations, myths, observable rituals and ceremonies, to name a few. The most important point about this level of culture is that it is easily observable but difficult to decipher (Schein, 1992).

Espoused values are values that are embraced by the group but only after they have been tested and proven to be successful. All group learning reflects someone's original values. When a group is first created or when it faces a new task, issue or problem, the first solution proposed to deal with the problem reflects some individual's own assumptions about what is right, what is wrong, what will or will not work. If a solution works and if the group has a shared perception of that success, then the perceived value gradually starts a process of cognitive transformation. First, the solution is transformed into a shared value or belief (espoused value) and ultimately, if it continues to work reliably in solving the group's problems, it is transformed into a shared basic assumption (Schein, 1992). Consequently, those individuals who prevail and who can influence the group to adopt certain approaches to a problem will be identified as the group's leaders or founders (Schein, 1992).

Schein (1992) defines basic assumptions as the essence of culture. Basic assumptions (mental models) are solutions to problems that work repeatedly and come to be taken for granted. In fact, these assumptions become so taken for granted that there is very little variation within a cultural unit. When a group strongly holds a basic assumption, any behaviour that is inconsistent with that assumption is unacceptable and/or inconceivable to the group.

The CFSEU Model and Organizational Culture

The researcher contends that it is the basic assumptions that define organizational culture that make the integrative process a challenging endeavour. Leaders must be cognizant of the fact that within the CFSEU model a number of proud and distinct police organizational cultures have come together to create a new organization that functions under the guidance of the basic assumptions (i.e. policy and procedure) of the RCMP. It is therefore imperative that police leaders are continually aware of these dynamics while engaging in the integrative process especially when making decisions regarding governance and the deployment of human resources. Senge (1990) states that “the problem with mental models lie not in the whether they are right or wrong – by definition, all mental models are simplifications. The problem with mental models arises when the models are tacit – when they exist below the level of awareness” (p. 176). If, in a changing world, the mental models remain unexamined and unchanged, a gap will develop between reality and the mental models leading to increasingly counterproductive actions.

Successful Cultural Change

The components of successful cultural change are effective leadership, shared assumption and group stability.

Leadership

Schein (1992) asserts that leaders impose their own values and assumptions on a group. If the group is successful and the assumptions come to be taken for granted, a culture is developed that defines for later generations what kind of leadership is acceptable. The culture now defines the leadership. But as the group encounters adaptive difficulties, as its environment changes to the point where some of its assumptions are no longer valid, leadership comes into play once more. Leadership now is the ability to step outside the culture that leadership created in order to start evolutionary change processes that are more adaptable. This ability to perceive the limitations of an organization's culture and to develop and evolve that culture is the ultimate challenge of leadership.

Shared Assumptions

Shared assumptions and common cultural values are powerful forces that bind groups together and prevent their disintegration at the slightest challenge. Paradoxically, they are also a prime source of resistance to change (O'Toole, 1995). The researcher believes that in an effort to mitigate this resistance, police leaders must take every opportunity to emphasize and celebrate the commonalities within the corporate cultures of the participating police organizations because "effective change builds on the existing culture. A group will reject a foreign system of values the way a healthy body rejects a virus" (O'Toole, 1995, p. 73),

This phenomenon as described in the literature can be exemplified in police organizations as follows. Physical and legal risks are an inherent aspect of police work. In an effort to effectively assess and respond to these risks, police organizations have developed, through time, various organizational policies and procedures. Regardless of which police organization, the risks they face are, in most cases, the same throughout the law enforcement community. Consequently, the policy and procedure developed to address

these risks are often very similar. The integrative process and police cooperation in general would be better served if police organizations devoted more time recognizing and accepting the similarities in the various policies and procedures rather than debating whose policy and procedure is better.

Initially, there is the potential for the integrative process to fail because, intrinsically, the re-examination of basic assumptions temporarily destabilizes an individual's cognitive and interpersonal world (Schein, 1992). Consequently this re-examination creates large quantities of anxiety because the human mind needs cognitive stability. In essence, shared assumptions can be thought of as both an individual's and group's psychological defence mechanisms that allows that group to function. Recognizing this connection is important when asking individuals to change or re-learn their basic assumptions during the integrative process (Schein, 1992). If the large amount of anxiety is well managed, then the new group will be allowed the opportunity to create its own culture or sub-culture. This may facilitate the success of the integrative process.

Group Stability

Any group with a stable membership and history of shared learning will develop some level of organizational culture. However, a group having a high turnover rate of members, leaders or lacking a history with any kind of challenging events may well not have any shared assumptions (Schein, 1992). The researcher believes that it is therefore important that police leaders facilitate and encourage this process by allowing both the leadership and the membership of integrated units not to change too often. If the turnover rates are well planned and the group composition remains stable, new members will be easily absorbed and socialized by the group ensuring the continued success of the integrative process. The same holds true for the leadership of the integrated units because leaders influence organizational culture. Although they retain the prerogative to make

progressive changes to the nature and mandate of the units they command, it is important that those leaders chosen to head the integrated units are aware of the challenges they may encounter and that they remain committed to the task at hand.

Systems and Systems Thinking

Rationale

Living systems have integrity and to understand challenging organizational issues requires an understanding of the whole system (Senge, 1990). Examining an entire organization does not mean that every organizational issue can be understood because sometimes the issues require that the dynamics of the entire industry must be considered (Senge, 1990). This examination is important because “system thinking shows that small, well-focused actions can sometimes produce significant, enduring improvements, if they’re in the right place. System thinkers refer to this principle as ‘leverage’” (Senge, 1990, p. 64). An understanding of the underlying systemic forces affecting the integration of police organizations may identify the points of leverage that will produce the significant and enduring improvements that will ensure the longevity of integration.

Success to the Successful

The availability and deployment of resources is a never ending challenge within most systems and this includes the integrative process. Senge (1990) describes this systemic archetype as “success to the successful” (p. 385). Characteristic of this archetype is two activities competing for the same limited support and resources. The more successful one activity becomes, the more support it gains, thereby starving the other of those limited resources. An early warning symptom of this archetype is the fact that one of the two interrelated activities, groups, or individuals is doing very well while the other is struggling.

Senge suggests that to deal with this situation, management should look for an overarching way to balance the achievement of both choices. The coupling between the two choices must be broken or weakened so that they no longer compete for the same amount of limited resources. This is extremely desirable in cases where the coupling is inadvertent and creates an unhealthy competition for resources.

System Blindness

As humans, we spend our lives in systems whether in the family, in the classroom, on a team or in an organization. So much happens to us in system life yet system life remains a mystery because there is so much we do not see. Unfortunately, when we do not understand systems, we miss the possibility and the opportunity to create partnerships with one another.

Consequently, we misunderstand one another and in turn, we develop myths and prejudices that we use to justify trying to hurt and destroy one another. Instead of collaborating we become antagonists, a situation that is only detrimental to the overall good of the whole (Oshry, 1995).

Oshry (1995) has dedicated a great deal of time and effort researching why we are sometimes unable to understand the concept of systems and system thinking. He contends that our inability to understand systems is caused by four types of system blindness. Spatial blindness occurs when we see our part of the system but we do not see the whole system. By being spatially blind, we do not see how all the parts influence one another because we do not see how our world impacts others and how their world impacts us. Temporal blindness occurs when we see the present but do not see the past. When we are temporally blind, we do not see the history of the present or know the story of our system that has brought us to that point in time. Relational blindness occurs when we do not see ourselves in

relationships with others. In systems we exist only in relationship to one another and whether we are at the top, in the middle or at the bottom of an organization, we need to interact with each other in order to achieve the organization's goals. Process blindness occurs when we do not see our systems as wholes or as entities in a larger system environment. By being blind to the process, we do not see how the system differentiates in an environment of shared responsibilities and complexity. As a result, leaders fall into "turf warfare," middle managers become alienated from one another and employees coalesce in an environment of shared vulnerability by becoming enmeshed in a "group think" mentality.

Although it is important to overcome all these forms of system blindness, it is process and relational blindness that have the greatest potential of undermining or even preventing the integrative process. Process and relational blindness result in leaders becoming territorial and falling into "turf" battles with one another. Although leaders are collectively responsible for the whole system, they divide responsibilities among themselves (Oshry, 1995). This may be particularly true in law enforcement where the policing responsibilities in large regional districts are divided among a number of different independent police forces. Oshry (1995) tells us that leaders become increasingly responsible for his or her own territory and decreasingly responsible for the territory of others and for the system as a whole. Leaders become more concerned with what is good for their area rather than the needs of the overall system. Consequently, instead of being in partnership with one another, leaders feel they need to protect themselves from one another. These elements comprise the basic pattern that contributes to the creation of a "turf" mentality and the consequential conflicts intrinsic in this mental model.

System Blindness and Mental Models

Unfortunately, there is more to solving the problem of “turf” warfare than just being cognizant of process and relational blindness. The researcher posits that “turf” warfare has become one of the mental models within the police community. Consequently, a failure to appreciate mental models has undermined many efforts to foster systems thinking (Senge, 1990). System thinking is an intrinsic element in the integrative process because the creation of integrated police units has a direct affect upon the manner in which police organizations govern and allocate their human resources. It is for this reason that it was earlier asserted that there needs to be a fundamental change in the assumptions police leaders have regarding their relationship with other police organizations. These assumptions have been shown to create systems that foster non-effective working relationships rooted in competition, territorialism and in some extreme cases obstructive conduct. It is imperative that while police leaders fulfill their responsibilities of ensuring the safety of their communities, they also keep in mind that their organizations are part of a larger system. By doing so, they will contribute to the greater good by avoiding many of the pitfalls identified by Justice Campbell (1996) in the CIR.

Differentiation and Dedifferentiation

Leaders themselves may contribute to the problem of “turf” warfare. Police leaders like many other leaders find themselves in a “top space” of responsibility and complexity. They must deal with many complex, difficult and changing issues that require their constant attention. In order to cope, leaders differentiate and although differentiation is a natural response that should be diligently pursued, it can become a problem (Oshry, 1995). As leaders grow increasingly different from one another, they fall into “turf” battles by becoming increasingly territorial, increasingly responsible for their own differentiations and

decreasingly responsible for the system as a whole. Consequently, leaders fall into relationship problems whereby they do not feel respected for their contributions, do not feel supported and do not trust or feel trusted (Oshry, 1995).

Oshry (1995) states that top groups that have fallen into “turf” warfare do not often recover and do not often find their way back to partnership. Unfortunately, in most cases, the leaders involved in this situation take this system breakdown personally and do not recognize it as a failure of differentiation. In doing so, they overlook the processes that would prevent process and relational blindness and that would prevent differentiation from transforming into an underlying problem. Leaders can avoid “turf” battles through dedifferentiation and integration. Dedifferentiation does not come naturally but with some effort, it makes or breaks a partnership. Dedifferentiation maintains and strengthens commonality when leaders:

- Come to an agreement on a common vision for their system;
- Regularly share information with one another regarding the events, issues, difficulties and choices in their respective areas of responsibility;
- Create mutual coaching relationships so that as a coach to others, leaders become fully committed to the success of others as well as themselves;
- Create regular opportunities to walk in someone else’s shoes to interchange the experiences and issues being dealt with by other leaders;
- Create joint task forces by finding opportunities to partner with one another when new issues arise that fall outside a leader’s area of responsibility. (Oshry, 1995)

Trust

Rationale

Trust is essential to all organizations and it is determined by the reliability or constancy of leadership. In a study, people indicated they would much rather follow

individuals they could count on, even if they disagree with their positions, than people they agree with but shift positions frequently (Bennis, 2000). The organizational structures of integrated policing models such as CFSEU and IROC include executive steering committees and joint management teams comprised of senior managers from all the partnering agencies. If integrated policing models are to successfully stand the test of time, it is imperative that these senior managers collaborate willingly and freely in an environment based on collegiality and trust.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) describe a research study in which several groups of business executives in a role-playing exercise were given identical factual information about a difficult policy decision and then asked to solve the problem based on the information they were given. In an effort to test the role of trust in the process, half the group were briefed to expect trusting behaviour from the other senior executives and the other half were briefed to expect untrusting behaviour. After thirty minutes of discussion, the participants were asked to complete a questionnaire as were those who observed the discussions. The responses were quite consistent. The group members who were told to expect trusting relationships reported their discussions and decisions to be significantly more positive than did the members who were told to expect untrusting relationships. In the high-trust group:

- Members were more open about feelings;
- Members experienced greater clarity about the group's problems and goals;
- Members searched for alternative courses of action;
- Members reported greater levels of mutual influence on outcomes, satisfaction with the meetings, motivation to implement decisions and closeness as a management team as a result of the meeting. (Kouzes & Posner, 2002)

In the group whose participants were told to expect untrusting behaviour, any attempt to be open and honest were ignored or distorted. In fact, distrust was so strong that

members viewed such conduct as a clever attempt to deceive them and generally reacted by sabotaging the process (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Developing Trust

In a study conducted by the Conference Board of Canada (2002) on cultivating customer loyalty, the researchers examined the practices of a number of organizations. They found that given the increasing levels of integration in those organizations, there clearly was a need to focus on developing and nurturing levels of trust. Consequently, the level of trust dictated the balance and degree of integration in accordance with the strength of those relationships. All the organizations that were studied learned that similar to individuals who do not trust, they too found themselves isolated and alone (Conference Board of Canada, 2002). These same lessons can be translated to the integrative process. Police organizations that do not focus on developing and nurturing trusting relationships will continue to operate in independent silos isolated from those organizations that are working collaboratively to integrate their resources with other police agencies. If this holds true for all police organizations, in general, then the integrative process will not succeed or sustain itself once initiated.

Ostensibly, trust is the lubrication that makes it possible for organizations to work. Trust implies accountability, predictability and reliability – it is the glue that maintains organizational integrity (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Ironically, as important a characteristic that it is, even Bennis and Nanus (1985) agree that “trust is hard to describe, let alone define” (p. 41). Examined purely as a theory, scholars concur that there is little agreement on the meaning of trust (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003). The study and construct of trust are very confusing (Hwang & Burgers, as cited in Atkinson & Butcher, 2003) but it has been argued that the role and degree of trust required differs from relationship to relationship

and often takes different forms in different types of relationships (Parkhe, as cited in Atkinson & Butcher, 2003).

It is imperative that trust becomes an intrinsic element in the integrative process because police leaders that make a long term commitment to the integrated policing model must be prepared to give up a large portion of their control over the resources they commit to that initiative. To successfully solicit this type of commitment, police leaders must trust the individuals and police organizations to who they delegate this authority. You cannot make people trust change and trust the system; to do so you have to create a system that is trustworthy (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Trust is at the heart of collaboration. It is the central issue in relationships within and outside an organization and without it, you cannot lead (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). In almost every study conducted by Kouzes and Posner (2002), honesty was selected more often than any other leadership characteristic. It emerged as the single most important ingredient because before anyone willingly follows, or for that matter collaborates, they want to know that the person they are dealing with is truthful, ethical and principled. Consequently, low trust spoils communication because “if you are fundamentally duplicitous, you can’t solve the low trust problem; you can’t talk yourself out of problems you behave yourself into” (Covey, 1991, p. 171).

The Inherent Risk in Trust

Subsequently, for the purposes of this research study, to trust means “to place oneself in a position of personal risk based on expectations that the trustee will behave in a way that results in harm to the trustor” (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003, p. 289). This definition of trust was derived from an examination of the concepts of vulnerability, uncertainty and risk (Myerson et al., 1996; Newell & Sewell, as cited in Atkinson & Butcher, 2003).

However, as they pertain to managerial relationships, risk is central to the definition of

these three concepts. The distinction between vulnerability and risk is subtle and hard to delineate because to be vulnerable one must place oneself in a position of risk. Uncertainty is intrinsic to risk because if a situation is one hundred percent predictable then an individual cannot be at risk. Therefore, in deference to the above stated definition, to trust is not simply taking a risk but it is to take it willingly (Mayer et al., as cited in Atkinson & Butcher, 2003).

Authentic Trust

Solomon and Flores (2001) support the notion that risk is inherent in trusting relationships because they assert that authentic trust does not necessitate the exclusion of distrust. In fact, they posit that authentic trust embraces the possibilities of distrust and betrayal as an essential part of trust. Building trust means coming to terms with the possibility of breach and betrayal. Ironically, the existence and importance of trust becomes most apparent in the event of a breakdown or betrayal of trust. Unfortunately, when the difficult task of rebuilding trust begins, those involved often tend to give up too easily. This tendency sometimes leads to the worst of these situations – cordial hypocrisy. This is the tendency for people in some organizations to be polite in the name of harmony when cynicism and distrust are active poisons, eating away at the organizational relationships. Loyalty, fear, or the need to pretend that trust exists is often the root of cordial hypocrisy. In these types of organizational relationships, discussions and meetings do not become forums that allow for the opportunity to creatively address problems, face criticism and build trust and solidarity. Authentic trust is something that must be learned.

Trust is not always a good thing. Trust can be foolish, naïve, gullible, and blind. And trust ought never to be taken for granted. That is why we insist that the issue is building trust – that is, creating trust, maintaining trust, restoring trust once it has been lost or betrayed. We want to suggest that this requires a radical revision of the conception of trust. Our thesis, to put it simply, is that trusting is something that we individually do; it is something

we make, we create, we build, we maintain, we sustain with our promises, our commitments, our emotions, and our sense of our own integrity. Trust is not contrary to what recent authors have written, a medium, an atmosphere, a “lubricant,” social “glue,” a lucky break for one society or another, or some mysterious social “stuff.” Trust is an option, a choice. It is an active part of our lives, not something that has to be taken for granted. It involves skills and commitment, not just good luck or mutual understanding. (pp. 5-6)

Anyone who has experienced the emotional turmoil and frustrations of “office politics” knows full well how distrust limits one’s ability to act, to speak and to engage in their work. The freedom provided by trust is the freedom to engage in projects that one could not or would not undertake on one’s own, the freedom to engage strangers, the freedom to think for oneself and the freedom to speak up with one’s ideas. Trust includes the consequences of being questioned or criticized but it also includes the right to be recognized and rewarded (Solomon & Flores, 2001).

Only with a firm understanding of the inherent risks and rewards involved in trusting relationships can police leaders develop these relationships. Rather than allowing themselves to become influenced by the negative effects of differentiation (Oshry, 1995) police leaders must work concertedly towards maintaining and developing trusting relationships because they must be cognizant of the fact that all police leaders are subjected to the same risks and vulnerabilities. Individuals commonly feel isolated when grappling with the emotions generated by complex issues and difficult decisions. When they realize they are part of a larger group tackling the same issues and being affected in the same way, the feeling of isolation gives way to a feeling of normalcy that allows for the creation of trusting relationships. Trusting relationships make collaboration possible and collaboration will contribute to the success of the integrative process.

Communication

Rationale

Authentic communication is an important leadership skill because honest and open communication is the cornerstone of any meaningful relationship built on trust and mutual respect. Good communication is the pre-requisite for teaching, learning, bridging gaps, building trust and sharing vision (DePree, 1989). To inspire others to commit themselves to an integrated policing model, honest communication is not just a pre-requisite, it is a must.

Honesty and Openness

In most vital organizations, there is a common bond of interdependence, mutual interest and interlocking contributions. Open communication shared accurately and freely is an intrinsic element of good leadership because it ensures this bond is maintained and strengthened (DePree, 1989). Cooperative goals can be achieved when organizational norms of reciprocity encourage participants to share information, listen to each other's ideas, exchange resources and respond to each other's requests for positive interdependence. People will collaborate when they can actively contribute to the goal of making a whole from their separate pieces (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

To inspire others to commit themselves to an integrated policing model, honest communication is not just a pre-requisite, it is a must. Bennis and Nanus (1985) describe the relationship between communication and integration when they state that,

Survival in this seeming madness calls for great flexibility and awareness on the part of leaders and followers alike. Our large objectives, peace and prosperity, must pivot on increased communication and broadened belief systems. We must fix our horizons not the mandates of atrophying institutions but on the successes of burgeoning new enterprises. It is to the trends we should all look as we shape the future and we shape ourselves.
(p. 13)

Communication creates meaning for people and is the only way any group, small or large, can become aligned behind the goals of an organization. Getting the message across is absolutely essential because it is what the creative process is all about (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Communication is also a prerequisite to problem solving but the difficulty with communication is translating what is said into what is meant and translating what is meant into what is said. To do so effectively, individuals must learn to not only say what they mean but to also listen to what others are saying so as to understand what they mean (Covey, 1991). Leaders communicate in many ways and in fact, it is hard for them not to communicate because they are closely watched, referred to and emulated regardless of whatever they say, do not say, do or do not do. The most universal approach to communication is the simple dialogue (Nanus, 1992). Only through sincere, genuine and accurate two way empathic dialogue may those involved thoroughly understand what is happening and why, how they benefit and what their responsibilities and opportunities are because of it (Covey, 1991).

Dialogue vs. Discussion

Senge (1990) studied the theory and method of dialogue as developed by the leading quantum theorist David Bohm. Bohm (1965, as cited in Senge, 1990) asserted that only through dialogue does a group become open to the flow of greater intelligence. This assertion provided a distinct contribution to the insights of team learning because it sees thought as largely a collective phenomenon that cannot just be improved individually (Senge, 1990). Accordingly, there are two types of discourse – dialogue and discussion. The word discussion has the same root as percussion and concussion. Like a ping pong game, where a ball is hit back and forth between two individuals, the goal of a discussion is to win. During a discussion a group analyzes and dissects a subject of interest from many points of

view but like the ping pong game, the ultimate purpose is for one individual to win by having his or her view accepted by the rest of the group. An individual may occasionally accept part of another person's view in order to strengthen his or her own argument but fundamentally, that individual wants to prevail. This purpose is not compatible with the attainment of coherence and truth (Bohm, as cited by Senge, 1990). Often, the participants are so ego-invested in advancing their own ideas that they listen not with the intent to understand but with the intent to respond (Covey, 1991).

By contrast, the word dialogue comes from the Greek word *dialogos* which is comprised of *dias* meaning through and *logos* meaning the word or more broadly, the meaning. Dialogue allows a group to access a larger pool of common meaning which cannot be accessed individually. The purpose of dialogue is to go beyond anyone individual's understanding. No one is trying to win in dialogue. If it is done correctly, everyone wins because dialogue allows the group to explore complex difficult issues from many points of view. Consequently, insights are gained that can not be achieved outside the context of a group effort (Bohm, as cited in Senge, 1990).

Bohm (1965, as cited in Senge, 1990) identified three basic conditions that are necessary for dialogue:

- All participants must suspend their assumptions – to literally hold them in the forefront so that the individual can be aware of them and they can be observed and questioned. If an individual “digs in their heels” and becomes intransigent, the flow of dialogue is blocked;
- All participants must regard one another as colleagues. Seeing each other as colleagues is critical to establishing a positive tone so as to offset the vulnerabilities that dialogue brings;
- There must be a skilled facilitator who holds the context of the dialogue because in the absence of a skilled facilitator, there is a continual pull towards discussion and away from dialogue (Bohm, as cited in Senge, 1990).

During the integrative process, it is important that police leaders foster their relationships through dialogue. By reaching an informed consensus on common issues, all those involved will feel respected, supported and accept ownership of any proposed solutions or courses of action. The researcher believes that dialogue encourages the dedifferentiation proposed in effective system thinking and is especially important for the leaders of the smaller police organizations that, in many cases, already feel overwhelmed by their larger and more powerful police counterparts.

Open and Honest Communication and Teambuilding

Lencioni (2002) asserts that there are five dysfunctions of a team that prevent that team from achieving excellence. These dysfunctions are:

- An absence of trust;
- Fear of Conflict;
- Lack of commitment;
- Avoidance of accountability; and
- An inattention to the results (the identified goals or objectives).

Lencioni arranges these dysfunctions in a pyramid with an absence of trust at the base and an inattention to the results at the pinnacle. Of those, a lack of open and honest communication directly affects the dysfunctions of an absence of trust and a fear of conflict.

Lencioni (2002) states that trust is the foundation of real teamwork and dysfunction occurs when there is a failure on the part of team members to understand and open up to one another. He contends that by being open, team members expose themselves to a certain amount of vulnerability. The exposure of one's vulnerability is considered to be a critical part of building a team because it facilitates the creation of trust. Subsequently, if

team members do not trust one another they will not engage in open, constructive, ideological conflict and the team will preserve a sense of artificial harmony.

Collaboration – The “Win-Win” Approach

Senge (1990) supports Lencioni’s (2002) contention that open and honest communication, held within the context of a dialogue, does not eliminate or prevent conflict from emerging within a team or partnership. On the contrary, great teams are not characterized by an absence of conflict. In fact, one of the most reliable indicators of a team continually learning is the visible conflict of ideas. In great teams conflict becomes productive. A healthy organization, whether a marriage, family, or a business is not one with an absence of problems, but one that is actively and effectively addressing or healing those problems (Peck, 1993). The appropriate and proportional response to situations of conflict, by employing good communication skills, contributes greatly to the manner in which police organizations perceive each other’s motives. It also contributes directly to the creation of trust and the longer term sustainability of the integrative process among those organizations.

Conflict is simply the condition in which people’s concerns (the things they care about) appear to be incompatible. Conflict is therefore a fact of daily life that is often mistakenly equated with fighting, arguing, blaming, name-calling and so on. This makes conflict seem like a dangerous and destructive thing but once you recognize that conflict is simply a condition in which people’s concerns are incompatible, you realize that fighting is only one way of dealing with it. This approach allows for the recognition that there are choices by which the conflict process can be controlled and managed constructively (Thomas, 2002).

Assertiveness and cooperativeness are the basic dimensions for describing the available choices in conflict situations. Assertiveness is the degree in which individuals attempt to satisfy their own concerns. Cooperativeness is the degree in which an individual attempts to satisfy the other person's concerns. Within the parameters of these two dimensions are a number of possible responses to conflict situations. A competitive response is assertive and uncooperative because an individual is only concerned with maximizing satisfaction at the expense of the other person. Collaboration is both assertive and cooperative and is considered the optimal win-win situation because the solution completely satisfies the concerns of both parties. Compromise is considered as an intermediate response that is both assertive and cooperative. It is an intermediate response because the acceptable settlement only partially satisfies both parties' concerns. Avoidance is both unassertive and uncooperative because conflict is side stepped without any person's concerns being addressed. Finally, accommodation is unassertive and cooperative because an individual attempts to satisfy the concerns of the other person at their own expense (Thomas, 2002).

When choosing among the conflict modes, two important dynamics come into play. These dynamics involve forces and tradeoffs you must deal with to steer conflict in different directions. They are known as "creating value" and "claiming value" (Lax & Sebenius, as cited in Thomas, 2002). "Creating value" involves deciding how much joint satisfaction an individual is attempting to attain. More value is gained as an individual moves along the scale from avoidance to accommodation to collaboration. Creating value requires commitment because one must invest more time and energy into the conflict issue (Thomas, 2002). "Claiming value" involves deciding how much satisfaction an individual attempts to claim for themselves. Greater value is claimed as an individual moves along the scale from accommodation to compromise to competition. By definition, claiming value is a

competitive activity occurring at the expense of the other person. Consequently, the more value that is claimed, the greater the resistance one can expect and the greater the strain on any working relationship. In other words, the decision to claim more value involves deciding how much to risk the other party's cooperation and goodwill while satisfying one's personal concerns (Thomas, 2002).

Thomas (2002) does state that there is no single best way to handle conflict. He does not assert one conflict handling mode over the others but he contends that each of the five conflict handling modes has its own costs and benefits. Each can be highly effective when used in the right circumstances and applied skilfully. The researcher contends that the creation of integrated police units does not preclude a leader from asserting the needs of his or her organization but to ensure the initial and continued success of the integrative process, it is imperative that all the police leaders involved try as often as possible to collaborate. Collaboration will go a long way in breaking down the "silos" that encourage uncooperative working relationships and discourage integration. It is the optimal win-win situation that creates trust, eliminates resistance and allows for agreements to be reached without any lingering resentment, suspicion or doubt.

CHAPTER THREE: CONDUCT OF RESEARCH REPORT

The following chapter describes the manner in which this research report examines the research question:

What is the role of the leader in facilitating and encouraging the integration of police organizations?

The following areas are reviewed in that examination:

- Research Approach;
- Research Methods;
- Project Participants;
- Ethical Issues;
- Study Conduct;
- Analysis.

Research Approach

The framework for the research methodology used in this Major Project was based on the principles of participatory action based research. Intrinsic to those principles is the tradition of qualitative research. Specifically, the researcher relied upon the qualitative research philosophy of phenomenologism (Palys, 2003). In an effort to ensure the rigour of the study, the researcher relied upon the Literature Reviews and personal interviews taken from research participants. This research approach allowed for the triangulation of the research data that, in turn, strengthened the trustworthiness of the research results and the subsequent recommendations. Triangulation was an important research concept because it allowed for differing research perspectives to be considered. These differing perspectives

increased the study's rigour and trustworthiness because the use of more than one research method assisted in identifying converging or diverging themes in the collected data.

Action based research is premised on the assumption that the recording of events and the formulation of explanations by uninvolved researchers is inadequate (Stringer, 1999). Central to this assumption is the contention that action based research is a collaborative approach that involves the consensual participation of the individuals who will ultimately benefit from the results of the research (Stringer, 1999). The action based research routine – look, think and act – starts simply and builds greater detail into procedures as the complexity of activities increase. Firstly, the researcher gathers information and by relying on that information, the researcher describes the situation at hand. Secondly, the researcher analyzes the information with the intention of interpreting and/or explaining what may be happening. Lastly, the researcher prepares an action plan that is implemented and subsequently evaluated.

Ostensibly, it is simple to understand why qualitative research fits so well into the principles of action based research. Qualitative research asserts that adequacy in the social sciences requires the acceptance of human-centred methodology because the social sciences are attempting to understand human behaviour (Palys, 2003). Phenomenologists within this philosophy of research maintain that to understand human behaviour researchers must accept that humans are cognitive beings who actively perceive and make sense of the world around them. Consequently, these individuals have the capacity to abstract from their experiences and ascribe meaning to their behaviour and that of the world around them. More importantly, these individuals are directly affected by those meanings. To that end, qualitative researchers believe that if you want to understand people's perceptions then the researcher must get close to those individuals (Palys, 2003). Therefore, by having interviewed the senior leaders of the police organizations involved in the integrative

process, this key research method was instrumental in gathering the data necessary to complete this Major Project.

Research Methods

Procedure

This was a qualitative research study because qualitative research procedures were used to collect the research data (Creswell, 2003). The research data was collected from three sources:

- Interviews with senior police leaders who were or are still involved in the integrative process;
- The recommendations put forth by Justice Campbell in the CIR; and
- The review of literature related to the topics of leadership, organizational culture, systems thinking, trust and communication.

During the data collection phase and most specifically during the interviewing of the project participants, the following common characteristics of qualitative research were relied upon in this research study:

- Qualitative research takes place in natural settings. The qualitative researcher goes to the site of the participant to conduct the research;
- Qualitative research uses multiple methods that are interactive and humanistic. Qualitative researchers look for the involvement of their participants in data collection and seek to build a rapport and credibility with the individuals involved;
- Qualitative research is emergent rather than tightly prefigured;
- Qualitative research is fundamentally interpretive. In other words, the researcher makes an interpretation of the data;
- Qualitative research views social phenomena holistically. This is why qualitative research studies appear as broad, panoramic views and not micro-analyses;

- Qualitative research is introspective and reflexive because the qualitative researcher reflects on who he or she is and how his or her personal biography shapes the study;
- Qualitative research uses complex reasoning that is multi-faceted, iterative and simultaneous;
- Qualitative research adopts and uses one or more strategies of inquiry as a guide for the procedures in qualitative study. (Rossman & Rallis, as cited in Creswell, 2003)

Trustworthiness

In qualitative studies, validity does not carry the same connotations as it does in quantitative research nor is it a companion of reliability. Reliability plays a minor role in qualitative inquiry while on the other hand, validity is seen as a strength of qualitative research (Creswell, 2003). Validity or trustworthiness, as it is also referred to, is used to determine whether the findings are accurate from the standpoint of the researcher, the participant, or the readers of an account (Creswell & Miller, as cited in Creswell, 2003). There are eight primary strategies available to check the accuracy of research findings. Of those strategies, this research study relied upon the following as evidence of the trustworthiness of the qualitative research:

- The triangulation of different data sources of information by examining evidence from those sources to build a coherent justification for themes;
- The use of member-checking to determine the accuracy of the qualitative findings. Member-checking is a method whereby the final report or specific descriptions or themes are brought back to the participants to determine if the participants feel they are accurate;
- The use of rich description to convey the findings;
- The clarification of any bias that the researcher brings to the study. This self-reflection creates an open and honest narrative for the reader;

- The presentation of any negative or discrepant information that runs counter to the themes. (Creswell, 2003)

Information Analysis

Data analysis involves making sense out of the text and image data. It involves preparing the data for analysis, conducting different analysis, understanding the data, representing the data and making an interpretation of the larger meaning of the data (Cresswell, 2003). The broad steps involved in the analysis of data are as follows:

- Organize and prepare the data for analysis;
 - For the purposes of this research study, this involved the transcribing of audio taped interviews, the review of the transcriptions to ensure their accuracy, the completion of field notes and the arranging of data into different types depending on the sources of the information.
- Read through all the data;
 - This allowed the researcher to obtain a general sense of the information and to reflect on its overall meaning. To that end, the data was read multiple times by the researcher.
- Conduct a detailed analysis utilizing a coding process.
 - Coding was an important step in the data analysis. It involved the organization of the material into categories and the labelling those categories with a term, often based on the actual language of the participant (an in vivo term).
- Use the coding to generate a small number of themes or categories;
 - These themes appeared consistently as major findings during the analysis of the data and are listed under separate headings in the findings section of the study. The themes display the multiple perspectives of the individuals who were interviewed and are supported by their quotations and specific evidence.

- Advance how the description and themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative.
 - This research study employed the most popular approaches of using narrative passages and visuals such as tables to convey the findings of the analysis.
- A final step in data analysis involves making an interpretation of the meaning of the data.
 - This interpretation of the data was used to formulate the study's findings, the study's recommendations, the lessons learned and to suggest further research questions. These results are in keeping with Creswell's (2003) contention that qualitative research can take many forms, be adaptive and be flexible to convey personal, research-based and action meanings.

Project Participants

The Research Team

The action-based research team consisted of the Major Project researcher supported by his Major Project Sponsor and Major Project supervisor.

The Project Participants

The nature of this research study dictated that the project participants were to be senior executive leaders from police organizations involved in the integrative process. These senior leaders consisted of individuals from the rank of Inspector to that of Chief Constable and all were responsible for creating, leading and/or being part of management teams within the different integrated units. The project participants included senior leaders from across Canada to allow the research results to reflect a national perspective.

Inclusiveness is an intrinsic element in action-based research because it seeks to involve all the relevant stakeholders in the process of working towards an effective solution

for the problems that concern them (Stringer, 1999). This active participation is an important element in creating a sense of ownership that will motivate people to invest their time and energy in the research process. Therefore, researchers need to ensure that all the stakeholders participate in defining and exploring the problem or issue under investigation. Although it is not possible for everyone to become involved, it is important that all the stakeholder groups feel that someone is speaking for their interests and is in a position to inform them of what is going on (Stringer, 1999). Consequently, the researcher felt it was imperative that the police community outside the RCMP be directly involved in this research process.

Selection of the Interview Participants

With the assistance of Supt. Ryan, the ten interview participants were chosen equally between the RCMP and non-RCMP municipal police forces. The individuals who were interviewed comprised a homogeneous group. All were police officers, all were male, all were at the senior executive level of their organizations and all were or continue to be involved in the integrative process. In cases where a sample is completely homogenous, issues of sampling are unimportant and any sample will do (Palys, 2003). This sample was chosen with the assistance of Supt. Ryan because she had the direct knowledge of which individuals met the criteria for selection. As well, once the “critical reference group” was identified, she had the informal patterns of influence that allowed access to the significant “opinion leaders” or “gatekeepers” within that group (Stringer, 1999).

The Reasons for Choosing This Group

As already asserted in this project proposal, police leaders who commit their resources to the integrative process give up a large portion of their control over those

resources. Short of cancelling their commitments and recalling their seconded police personnel, these senior police leaders turn over the day to day operation of their resources to leaders and managers who are most often from other police organizations. Consequently, for the purposes of this Major Project, it was imperative that these senior police leaders were interviewed because they are the ones most directly affected by the integrative process.

The researcher contends that for the integrative process to succeed, these senior leaders must first be convinced that there is value to their organizations for agreeing to that participation and subsequently, they must continue to observe and perceive that their commitment is not detrimental to their organization's long term strategic goals and short term tactical objectives. In fact, it would be beneficial if the basic framework of the strategic goals and tactical objectives of the integrated units were congruent with those of the partnering agencies. The research data collected by interviewing and surveying these senior police leaders identified themes and sub-themes that indicated that the integrative process is alive and well and destined to continue to flourish in the future. Subsequently, the recommendations reached as a result of this Major Project may assist in allowing the integrative process to build on its current success.

Ethical Issues

Ethical Considerations

During the course of the data collection, the project researcher was not faced with any ethical dilemmas or considerations. The researcher was cognizant of Palys' (2003) assertion that "the role of the researcher is to treat research participants with care" (p. 102). During the research gathering phase of the Major Project, the researcher ensured that his research methodology was not contrary to any of the ethical requirements of Royal Roads

University (RRU). These requirements were documented in the researcher's Ethical Review Application and no research was conducted prior to the approval of this application by RRU.

Furthermore, as a member of the RCMP, the researcher was also bound by a code of conduct which ensured his ethical behaviour. The RCMP has well defined mission, vision and value statements. Incorporated in the seven core values that make up that value statement are the values of respect, professionalism, honesty and integrity (RCMP Website, n.d.). The researcher is not only bound by these values but he also attempts to incorporate them in his day to day conduct. Both Palys (2003) and Glesne (1999) refer to past research studies which involved unethical and exploitive conduct. Although the RCMP does not have an ethics committee that reviewed the content of this Major Project, the researcher, nevertheless, ensured that its content was based on facts that will stand the test of ardent scrutiny and review. The researcher was very aware that any unethical conduct on his part would affect the credibility of his Major Project.

No matter how qualitative researchers view their roles, they develop relationships with their research participants. The relationships in qualitative research are generally asymmetrical with power disproportionately located on the side of the researcher (Glesne, 1999). As previously mentioned, this was not an ethical concern in this project because in every case, the researcher interviewed senior leaders who outranked him. Ironically, power was disproportionately located on the side of the research participant and not the researcher.

The Right to Privacy

The right to privacy is a major consideration in qualitative research. As Glesne (1999) states, "participants have a right to expect that when they give you permission to observe or interview, you will protect their confidences and preserve their anonymity"

(p. 122). This was an important assurance because the researcher did not want the participants to be concerned that any of their comments would, in some way, adversely affect them. The utmost care was taken to ensure that the participant's privacy was not compromised and their participation required their informed and documented consent. By ensuring their privacy, the researcher also ensured his ability to collect meaningful and probative data. To eliminate any privacy concerns, the researcher assured the participants that he would not identify anyone involved. As well, the Major Project was written in a manner that ensures that any criticism or accolades cannot be attributed to any person or event. Furthermore, no references were made to geographical locations in the event that a participant could be identified in that manner.

As already noted in the *Research Methods* section of this proposal, the participants' anonymity was ensured by allotting each participant an alphanumeric code between P1 and P10. In managing the research data, the researcher created a separate "identity file" that further protected the participants' identities. This file, along with the files containing the Letters of Invitation and the Participant Consent Forms, were kept separately and securely in a location inaccessible by the public. The transcriptions of the interviews, the field notes and the digital recordings were also stored in a secure location.

Study Conduct

Preparation and the Interviews

Prior to any contact with the researcher, Supt. Ryan forwarded e-mail correspondence to the previously chosen list of participants inquiring if they would be interested in participating in this research study. All ten individuals that were contacted agreed to participate and based on these confirmations, the researcher made initial contact

with the participants. As a precursor to the collection of the research data, the researcher sent e-mail correspondence to the participants that included:

- A Letter of Invitation outlining the purpose and scope of the research study (attached as Appendix “A”);
- A Consent Form explaining and ensuring their privacy and rights during the conduct of the research study (attached as Appendix “B”);
- A list of the interview questions for their review prior to the interview (attached as Appendix “C”).

Subsequent to this correspondence, the researcher made telephone contact with either the participants themselves or their executive assistants to arrange an interview time.

In all but two cases, the researcher attended the participants’ offices and conducted the interviews there. In the other two cases, the interviews were conducted over the phone because of the distance involved in meeting the participants in person. All the participants signed the Consent Form prior to being interviewed. The participants that were interviewed by phone faxed their signed Consent Forms to the researcher. The interviews ranged in length from one to one and a half hours. The researcher had initially intended on conducting the distant interviews by video conferencing but this method was abandoned when it was discovered that there were too many technical difficulties involved in recording the interview. In every case, the interviews were digitally recorded and those recordings were transcribed, in secure locations, by three support staff members at CFSEU-BC, each of whom have security clearances allowing them access to most if not all documentation and information within the unit. Upon receiving the transcribed interviews, the researcher reviewed them against the digital recordings and if necessary, made any corrections to the transcripts.

As well as digitally recording the interviews, the researcher took field notes in the event that there were any difficulties associated to the recordings. This proved to be

beneficial on one occasion. During the interview of P6, the digital recorder turned itself off before the completion of the interview. This occurred towards the end of the interview and the researcher was able to complete the interview by taking detailed field notes.

The Interview Questions

The interview consisted of a total of twenty-one questions. Twenty of those questions were divided between the five categories of Leadership, Organizational Culture, Systems Thinking, Trust and Communication. The twenty first and final question was a “wrap-up” question which asked the participant to describe his greatest leadership challenge during the integrative process. The interview questions were prepared by the researcher based on the project research question and the results of the literature review. In short, the participants were asked questions:

- To explore their understanding and personal philosophies regarding the topics examined during the literature review; and
- To ascertain what elements or requirements they felt were necessary, in the integrative process, to secure their participation and sustained support.

In the true essence of phenomenology, the researcher asked questions based on the participants’ experiences and reflections of the integrative process (Creswell, 2003). Even though all the participants were asked a similar series of interview questions, the questions were comprised of unstructured, open ended questions that allowed the researcher probative flexibility when conducting the interviews (Creswell, 2003).

Analysis

Once the transcribed interviews were verified for their accuracy and any necessary corrections were made, the researcher reviewed the transcripts to identify theme phrases within the categories of Leadership, Organizational Culture, Systems Thinking, Trust and

Communication. These theme phrases were highlighted and notations were hand written on the left side of the transcripts. Other comments and thoughtful notes were made within the body of the transcripts. Upon completing this process, the researcher reviewed the transcripts again and listed common themes identified within those categories. The number of participants who identified these themes were counted and recorded. A common theme was identified only when three or more project participants made the same reference. The researcher decided that one reference was the opinion of one person, two references may have only been a coincidence but three references could safely be considered as the common identification of a theme. The results were tallied theme by theme, category by category and reported in table format as research findings. In support of and/or to assist in the clarification of each theme, the researcher quoted relevant phrases from the interviews.

Trustworthiness

To validate the researcher's findings, the transcriptions, including the highlighted themes and researcher's hand written notes, were converted into Adobe documents and e-mailed to the participants for their review. This exercise fulfilled the two requirements of providing the participants with a copy of the transcription of their interview as well as validating the researcher's findings. Accompanying the Adobe document was a letter (attached as Appendix "D") requesting the participants to review the transcription and validate the researcher's interpretation of the theme phrases. All the transcripts were returned by the participants as validated and any corrections and or clarifications were noted and amended within the transcripts.

CHAPTER FOUR:

ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Leadership

Table 1. Leadership traits required by police leaders in an integrative model

Leadership Traits	Responses
Openness	4 of the 10 identify this trait
Honesty	4 of the 10 identify this trait
Personable	4 of the 10 identify this trait
Good Communicator	4 of the 10 identify this trait
Has integrity	4 of the 10 identify this trait

The research participants identify five leadership traits that they believe are important to the integrative process. For the most part, these traits speak for themselves but the participants did make some interesting comments that merit notation.

It is not uncommon to hear the terms open and honest spoken in the same sentence. One senior leader best describes the value of openness and honesty when he states that, "...to have the traits of being honest and open, show that there is no hidden agendas..." (P2). Another participant describes a personal experience that reinforces the need for honesty when creating integrated units:

We talked about it earlier, and that was honesty. I mean, if you're not going to be ethical people and be honest with each other, none of this is going to work. And when, at the outset, I talked to you about a fellow who came to me with this integration opportunity? He wasn't being honest with me. And that person, I have since found out, has done this to others. Not in our organization, in another organization and he's getting a bit of a reputation as a fibber and as a manipulator and nobody's willing to deal with him anymore. And even his own people are getting kind of, oh geez, let's find a job for him

somewhere else so he doesn't [redacted] destroy any other relationships. So if there's no honesty, none of this is going to work. (P9)

Being personable, being a good communicator and having integrity are also identified as important and valuable traits. There are no lengthy comments regarding these traits that are worthy of quotation. They are described in one or two words but suffice it to say that the participants feel it is important for a leader to be a person of integrity who can communicate his or her message in a friendly manner.

Table 2. Prerequisites required for integration to occur

Prerequisites	Responses
A need or common purpose for the integration	10 of the 10 identify this need
Clear objectives or priorities of the integration	10 of the 10 identify this need
Political/Government support	4 of the 10 identify this need
Sub-theme	
No integration for the sake of integration	6 of the 10 identify this position

All the participants state that as a prerequisite to integration there must be a common need or purpose and clearly defined goals and objectives. P1 is very succinct when he states that:

So, right at the outset there should be a common goal or purpose of the integration. What's the, what are you, what are you trying to achieve in the end? So I think you go from there, from your goals and what it is you're trying to achieve and you build, you build on the integration from there, because depending on what those goals are, you'll have different, different skill sets that you'll need from different organizations. There are different levels of participation. Different degrees of participation.

This assertion is also supported by another participant who states that:

So I think you need to know exactly where the integration's going. And I think that not enough times here, recently, that all of the cards have been on the table? So I think that in order to sustain a positive integration relationship between the different departments, we have to have a common goal in relation to the integration. All of the participants have to value the

relationship, you know, the integration has to be best to better, the policing model. (P6)

Furthermore, four of the participants identify the need for some form of political support whether it is from their Police Board, City Counsel, Mayor or provincial government.

According to one participant, one of his biggest challenges is getting this support:

And I guess that was the challenge I had, was to say yeah we have something really is good and it ain't broke. It was - are we really taking a risk by moving to this bigger picture? Then of course having to convince the Police Board and, and Counsel that there is a greater good. That we need to look beyond the boundaries of our community. That if you want to be really good at what we do and effective - we really need. So, I guess you know the greatest challenge was breaking down the silo concept with, with Police Board Counsel and starting to get them to think beyond the boundaries of our community. And I'd have to say at this point we got total buy in. (P8)

To another senior leader, political support precludes all other prerequisites:

Well, first of all the prerequisites are, at least in my environment, is support from our Police Board. Without the support from the Police Board, we may as well just pack our tent and forget about the whole thing. Now, what I need them to do is to be supportive of the process. First of all, be supportive of the concept, be supportive of any process we might enter into and then, on our behalf, on the department's behalf, go to City Council and convince them, help convince them that it is in their best benefit not to protect their fiefdom. Or get away from this parochial idea that you have to be able to control your police agency. (P9)

An interesting sub-theme also emerges that requires some consideration. A majority of the participants indicate that integration is not required for all aspects of law enforcement. The credibility and support for integration will be adversely affected if integration is pursued solely for the sake of integration and especially if career advancement is seen as the motivation to do so. This was quite evident in the cynical nature of these two participant comments:

You know, I recently had a conversation with a member of the [REDACTED], a senior member of the [REDACTED] about an integration opportunity. What he considered to be an integration opportunity. So he said, well you send me a couple of bodies and we'll put them in here. I said, of course this is a

provincial policing programme, so those will be fully seconded members and he said, oh no. No, no, we've got all our positions filled, we just want more. Well, hold it. It's a provincial policing programme, but, yeah we're going to call it integrated. You know, I mean he obviously had a job jar with a list of things he had to check off. Well, his understanding of integration was, send me your people, they'll work for me and I'll be able to report to somebody up the line that I've ticked the box. I'm part of an integrated unit. (P9)

So I think you've got to make sure that it's not integration for integration sake? That it's got to be with purpose, and as I said to you earlier, we have to make sure that for the global good of policing, that this is a good idea. This isn't an integration to make somebody in politics, or political office or political position or somebody's promotional plan. You know? Or resume building, you know? It has to be with purpose, and for the most part, I think we're on line with an identified community issue that requires an integrated response. And that's where you get buy-in from the communities is from the community police side. (P6)

Table 3. Expectations that must continue to exist to remain in the integrated initiative

Expectations that Must Continue	Responses
Goals are being met / There is value and benefit to the partners	10 of the 10 identify this expectation

Every participant states that their continued participation in an integrative initiative is incumbent on that initiative's ability to achieve the goals and objectives set out at its inception. By doing so, the initiative would be considered a value added endeavour for the participating organizations. As one participant states:

I think as with any integration it is a continuation of what were the elements or what were the things that brought you together to begin with, what are the common objectives and goals that would cause the different agencies to come together to work in an integrated manner. So then you have to sort of continually recognize that there is value resulting from working in an integrated manner that, there is value, and to also recognize that you have one another's contributions and everyone wants to feel that they are contributing that the outcome that are coming from this are contributing to their organizational objects and goals and you have to look for that and making sure that you doing that and its not one agency hijacking or, and sort of driving more benefit because at the end there is an accountability attached to these, so you need to ensure that you are looking at what the outcomes are and you need to monitor that as you go along. (P2)

Table 4. How does a leader nurture the partnerships developed in integrated policing models?

Nurturing the Partnerships	Responses
Continuous communication / dialogue with partners	4 of the 10 participants identify this theme

The participants have a variety of different responses, all of which are valid methods for nurturing partnerships and relationships. However, of those suggestions, the need to continually communicate or dialogue with the other partners of the integrative initiatives is the only response that was identified as a common theme. As one participant states:

I would think you would need to have, well as we do, we need to determine through a process of validation in terms of: outputs, feedback, are we achieving what we have set out to achieve, constant dialogue, ongoing dialogue with the partnering agencies to determine what's working, what's not working. (P8)

Two other participants succinctly state that, "I think part of it is communication again and that is that the valuing the relationship..." (P2); "... and so you nurture it by meeting and talking to your partners" (P7). The last of the four participants assert that the communication must also comprise a reporting component:

Okay. So once again, communication? And continuous reporting. And you know, and this has to be decided at, at the JMT level, for instance. One of the difficulties with managers is that, you know, they have to be able to justify what their people are doing. So we, we also, we report, you know, quarterly at the JMT, yearly at the Executive Steering Committee, we also send out a monthly report on what we're doing. And this is for personal management only, the monthly report. (P3)

Table 5. Is integrative policing a long term policing model in Canada?

Factors Driving Integration and Benefits of Integration	Responses
Globalization of crime issues	3 of the 10 identify this factor
Leveraging of stressed resources	6 of the 10 identify this factor
Sub-theme	
Regionalization/One Provincial Policing Model	4 of the 10 identify this sub-theme

Nine of the ten participants identify integrative policing as a long term policing model in Canada. They believe that integrated policing is the manner in which policing will be structured in the future because of the factors and benefits identified in the top part of the above table.

Three of the participants identify the globalization of criminality as a contributing factor in the integration of police organizations. These crime issues do not only pertain to the fact that criminals move freely across domestic and international borders but with the assistance of technology such as the Internet, they also move freely across different dimensions. As one senior leader states:

It's I think what drives, and one of the big things that drives integrated policing is just the globalization issues that we all, that we face. Globalization of crime issues. You know we, we've come to realize that that, you know, crime does extend beyond all of our boundaries and, you know, there's a lot of things driving that. (P1)

On a similar note, another participant states:

The changing face of crime, I mean we have heard this for years about globalization, cross jurisdictional issues, the fact that technology, internet and those things, the ability to travel, the more international nature of a lot of things have necessitated that we work together. Criminals cross borders, and cross mandates as well, more and more then before. We have seen that with organized crime and the motor cycle gangs for an instance now looking at getting involved in white collar crimes, stock manipulation, they are not just into extortions or into drug trafficking, there is that whole crossing over into different mandates, cross jurisdictional issues and the fact that it all links together, especially when you talk about organized crime. The fact that a lot of the street level criminality is linked back to whether it is purchasing drugs which sort of goes that full circle where the proceeds end up back with the organized criminals. (P2)

The leveraging of scarce resources is another factor driving the integration of police resources. This leveraging includes all aspects of resources such as human, financial and material. One of the participants combines both the themes of globalization and the leveraging of resources when he states:

Another aspect is that the investigations are very often cross-border and cross-frontier. So not one organization can do it on their own. You need to partner with other organizations to do. The investigational boundaries are not only geographical or physical, they're also judicial in the sense that criminals don't necessarily fall into just one type of crime. There's, there's crimes that are not in the Code that would be, for example, tax laws. So you couldn't exclude your tax partners within your investigation because I mean, they're involved as well. Instead of doing everything doubled, well you just do it one-shot deal and everybody is able to pool into the same investigation to facilitate everything.... But in essence, that is, I can give you other examples of why, but the integrative policing is a long-term model that will be there, and it's just bound to grow. You can multiply your impact and your exposure to the different criminal organizations by pooling your resources within different integrated teams... (P5)

However, an interesting sub-theme emerges during the course of this discussion. Of the nine who respond that the integrative process is the policing model of the future, four state that it is only a precursor to the regionalization of policing in the greater Vancouver area. They perceive integration as part of the natural evolution and as one senior leader states: "Well, I mean it's probably the first step of regionalization to tell you the truth. I mean, you can integrate to a point where what's left not to integrate arguably, right?" (P7). On an even grander scale, two of the participants place integration and regionalization within a larger context:

Well I think an integration model, right now is appropriate. I'm not convinced it's here forever, and I'll tell you why. I think that to be effective, we need more of a consistent approach, and that's probably here in the province, is probably a provincial policing model. Right now I can see how integration is quite effective in dealing with Lower Mainland issues. Specifically, not so much in the patrol function, but the specialized units within the Lower Mainland and province, where there aren't enough specialty resources to go around, so you amalgamate and integrate other like-minded agencies for a consistent approach. The issue where it becomes, I think, a solid unit is where you have crimes being committed out of jurisdiction. (P6)

It's a passing police, I hope it's a passing policing model. I want to get out of this, first of all, yeah, I want to get past integration. I want to get into regionalization and I want to get rid of three levels of policing. You've got municipal, provincial and federal policing. And we may not ever be able to get rid of some of the federal level of policing. But I really wish that we were all wearing the same uniform. Again, I don't care what colour it is and I don't care what you call it, and I wish we could get away from this municipal,

provincial, federal distinction. Policing is policing. There's no mystery to this. We're all doing essentially the same job, we just do it in different areas, wearing different uniforms. And the problem with that is, it creates barriers to effective and efficient and economical service to the public. So I'm very hopeful that this is just one model that we have to get over. So that we can go to regionalization. So that we can get over that model and get towards policing. I don't care, let's call it the Canadian Police Department. But let's put a Royal in front of it to make a lot of people happy. I couldn't care less. (P9)

Organizational Culture

Table 6. To what extent does a leader affect organizational culture?

Manner in which the leader affects culture	Responses
Having a vision	4 of the 10 identify this leadership influence
Nurturing/supporting the organizational values	3 of the 10 identify this leadership influence
Modeling the way	3 of the 10 identify this leadership influence

All the participants agree that leaders affect the culture of an organization. An analysis of their varied responses identifies three ways in which a leader influences organizational culture.

A leader's vision has an instrumental affect on the culture of an organization. As one participant states:

By having a strong vision of how the organization should be. Whether that vision is focused on a past history, as we see in the R.C.M.P. right now, that vision of how the organization should look like, really defines how the organization does look like and will look like. So if the leader, and the leaders don't have a vision of the culture as it could be, then it will be just about anything and everything. So I think, you know, in that sense, it is very great. (P5)

Another participant states that important to the visioning process is also the creation of values by which members of the organization can live by:

Now, for this particular department, what was important that didn't exist since I came. We've created a new vision, a new mission, a new set of principals and core values and these were determined by the organization and

input by the organization from all levels. It took a lot of time to develop that, but what ended up happening is they articulated their core values, what was important for this organization, for this community. (P8)

A leader nurturing and supporting those very same values also affects the culture of an organization. As one senior leader states:

That you nurture the values of that organization that you want, and that is those individuals who demonstrate those values are recognized and rewarded, that you recognize and reward that type or ayou want from an organization and that you deal with those or issues and individuals who are contrary to the values you want to see in an organization. I think culture flows from the values of an organization you know, if it is sort of the unofficial organizational values are that you have a bunch of individuals working there and it is all about what's in it for me then that's one aspect, but if you have an organization it is very much how the individuals contribute to the overall organizational objects. I think you have to work on those things. (P2)

Leaders will also affect organizational culture when they lead by example. One leader couples both the concepts of supporting an organization's core values and leading by example when he states:

I think, that as we said earlier, and I do believe this, is that leadership is an activity, it's not a position. So that top-end leaders lead the way in relation to most business policing, the military, leadership that we grasp onto. Here in policing I think it's different to a certain extent, because we have different expectations. We have community concerns. We have the sustainability of our rank and file, we have consistent leadership led by example, and whether it's your core values which you adhere to, which are extremely important, but you've got to enhance the culture by living up to those standards. (P6)

Another supports this comment when he states:

So how do you influence that process, and I think that by recognizing what the organizational values really are and focusing on that, and recognition. I suppose the other side of that is also, it's almost a cliché the fact that the leader has to emulate exactly what the behaviour is you want, you can't be saying one thing and, or demanding one thing of employees and then not doing the same thing yourself. Clearly there has to be, the leaders behaviour has to emulate what the behaviour you want in the organization and probably more than anything else that's key. (P2)

Table 7. Can different police organizational cultures come together to create effective integrated units?

How the integration of different organizational cultures can be achieved	Responses
By supporting the process at the senior management level	4 of the 10 participants identify this requirement
Allowing for the creation of a new sub-culture/identity	3 of the 10 participants identify this requirement

All the senior leaders agree that different police organizational cultures can come together to create effective integrated units but some also add the qualifier that this process is not achieved without its difficulties or challenges. Many hold out the existing integrated units as an example of how this process can be successfully achieved. The participants have many different points of view on how this integration can be attained and an analysis of those views identifies two common themes.

According to two of the participants, the recent attention and efforts devoted to integration is nothing more than the formalization, by senior leaders, of an informal practice commonly used by good police investigators to get their job done. According to these leaders, the “rank and file” quickly set aside their organizational cultures in an effort to achieve success in their investigations. One participant states that this process can be facilitated and supported by senior management:

Leaders do affect it, but much, much of in and around, the issues around integration are achieved right at the ground level. I mean, policemen working the streets see the need to work with other policemen across the boundaries. That, that’s never been an issue. And as a matter of fact, there, there’s always been a lot, as much integration going on as, as kind of, I guess the, the system would permit. You know I think it would probably be fair to say that, that some of the impotence to integration in the past have been structurally between organizations. And so at the lower level, there was always a willingness of, of police investigators to work with whoever they needed to work with to get a job done. It was probably the, the barriers were structures that said you know, there’s boundaries. Where you can go and where you can’t go and what hoops you have to jump through to do that. So, so I think that the process of integration is, is a natural, investigative response. You

know, you take you take the investigation wherever it leads you to, and of course it'll lead you across boundaries. So what we're trying to do now with the integrated policing process is make our structures keep up to that. Up at the, you know, the mid and upper level management levels. (P1)

The formalization of those structures can be facilitated with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the roles and responsibilities of the agencies involved in an integrated unit. Gehl (2001) succinctly describes a MOU as "the document signed by participating agencies to describe and to agree to how a multi-agency team will be formed, how it will be tasked, how it will be funded and who it will report to" (p. 59). As one experienced leader states:

I think part of that is clearly the way that the structure is laid out to begin with regardless of whose in charge, if you have a MOU that says that certain policies and guidelines will be used and that agreement is clear at the outset and it has to be clear, you can't be kind of wishy washy about you know about those issues, whose going to pay for what, whose policies and guidelines are you going to follow, what are sort of the decision making steps, who has the authority, those kind of things have to be very clear and once that's sort of laid out and everyone is in agreement then there is no arguments, its where there is ambiguity that you can run into real issues as to what is the best way, so if you do the initial ground work well then you will overcome a lot of those differences at the end and I see clearly at the working level those things don't preoccupy the employees as there are else where they want to get the job done and there is that common desire I guess. (P2)

In reaching those agreements, senior leaders must maintain an interest based philosophy. By operating at a higher level and focusing on the different organizational interests, a senior leader can facilitate the bringing of those interests together.

It is sort of like if you have taken the interest based negotiation course you know, really focusing on not being territorial or positional but focused on what the difference organizational interests are and bringing that together. So, I think that is probably one of the bigger ones is, focusing on a leader that has to be at that high level, focusing on what are the interests on different organizations in being involved in an integration effort and by staying at that higher level in recognizing as well that there are differences in everyone's interests maybe in some respects a little bit different but they all recognize the value of the integration effort. I think that's probably the things a leader can do. (P2)

Other participants believe that integrative leaders must go beyond a formal arrangement and encourage the creation of new subcultures within the integrated units. As the two following comments indicate:

Well yeah, and I've been involved in two or three now and we've never had that problem. And I think it comes down to creating the separate culture. Right off the bat. Like we don't, we're not asking the City Police to become part of the R.C.M.P. culture. We're not asking the R.C.M.P. to become part of the City Police culture. We're asking that they become part of the unit culture. And I think that's the trick...I think you're facilitating it and in, and this effort towards creating a separate police culture, a patchless organization I think is how you facilitate that as a leader. And you hammer that home with your mid-level supervisors and ensure that they, they're on top of those types of things. (P4)

It's the difference that makes the strength of the team. You need to have those different organizational cultures. And how that can be achieved? Is that once you've got the different cultures coming together? You're really creating a new culture by amalgamating the different sets of values and the different management styles, the different mentality, the background...And eventually, you know, little by little, it's like you have the colour red and you have the colour yellow and you know, you take a little bit of red and a little bit of yellow, you put them together and you're going to have orange now. But not everything's going to be tainted orange. You're still going to have the red and you're still going to have the yellow, but eventually as you create more integration and more teams and the orange returns in the red and returns in the yellow, then that pure red and that pure yellow, you know, from the first bit of integration, are never as purely red and as purely yellow as they were initially, right? And little by little, everybody's going to become coloured, you know with just about the same thing. (P5)

Furthermore, one of the leaders combines the two premises of supporting integration and allowing for the development of a unit identity when he states:

I think not getting in their way is one thing. I think the agencies, for example, OCA and CFSEU, they developed their own identity. These are a particular type of people that go to an agency like this and our job is to make sure that they're supported and not encumbered with road blocks that prevent their success. I don't know if it's, you know, we don't need to micro-manage it. That's what we trust, the management that's in place in these units. (P10)

Table 8. The use of another organization's policy to govern an integrated unit

Use of another organization's policy	Responses
Yes	10 of the 10 participants

The participants found no difficulty in participating in an integrated unit that was governed by the policy of another police agency. Of course, there are considerations such as how closely the policy aligns itself to one's own organizational policy and whether or not it is moral, legal and ethical. One leader summed it up when he states: "The policies and guidelines should not differ a whole bunch because we still are governed by the legal process" (P3). Two other leaders support this comment when they state:

The bottom line is that, you know, we're all doing the same business. Our procedures and policies may be worded differently, but they're roughly the same. (P10)

I'm certainly not apposed to change and embracing a new policy. Our policies over all don't change and overall policies stay fairly the same or very compatible amongst different police agencies. What often does differ, may be procedural. But when you look at policy, policy is pretty much the same and pretty much standard. It's the procedures of how we implement or go about dealing with the policy that sometimes needs tweaking and working out. (P8)

However, while on one hand all the senior leaders agree that they are comfortable with using another organization's policy, the researcher could not help but detect a certain amount of resentment on the part of the municipal leaders when it comes to this topic. Although it may be a contentious issue, failing to document it as part of the research findings would be to ignore the researcher's responsibility as a researcher. The researcher finds that while the integration of municipal units with other municipal units result in the merging of the different policies to create a unified policy for the governance of that integrated initiative, all integrated initiatives involving the RCMP utilize RCMP policy and procedure. As one senior leader cynically states:

The legal argument is because you are going through the police services agreement, you're attaching thirty percent federal funding and consequently you must follow R.C.M.P. policy. I understand that, but I do know that that's caused grief....And most of these mergers with R.C.M.P., that's often-times a big sticking point. Is policy. Which policy will be followed? I think there's been some good faith on the part of the R.C.M.P., frankly, to build MOUs that, because they're constrained. So build MOUs that say that, but accept best practice policy also. And that the wording is something along the lines of, generally follow R.C.M.P. policy, but the R.C.M.P. understand there's other good policies out there that can be followed also, sort of thing. It's a bit of a weasel word, a clause the MOUs use nowadays. (P7)

Another leader states:

Well I would suggest that that's not true, collaborative integration. That's a secondment. You know, if we want to send a member to the Mounties and they're going to be, for all intense and purposes, a Mountie in a seconded unit, we can do that and we do do that. But if we're talking about a truly collaborative unit, then there needs to be the opportunity to say no, we don't agree with those policies and we're going to develop an MOU that is a hybrid. That if they're show-stoppers for us, then there needs to be room to compromise. And we may say no, you know, we think your policies around these particular issues are perfectly fine and we're happy to let our members work within that. The point is, whether there is an opportunity to say, no those are unacceptable to us and we're going to have to talk about that. We're going to have to develop an MOU that meets our needs. That's truly about integration...We may look and probably, in most cases, we will and for various reasons it might be better to adopt one group's policies...There needs to be the opportunity for us to say, you know what we don't think your policy around 'X', 'Y', 'Z' issue is very good. We train our members this way and we think that this is the best, most effective, most ethical way to do that particular operation. And so when it comes to an MOU around the business rules for a collaborative unit, we want to look at that and we want to be able to say, that's not acceptable to us. If you want our participation, this is what we need. There has to be that willingness to compromise. If there's not, it's not a true, then the spirit of good will that I talked about really isn't there. Unless there's such a compelling reason that we're provided with, why it won't work. (P10)

In regards to the procedural aspect of the policy itself, one leader states:

I am comfortable with it because generally I find that most of our policies are designed to protect the organization. So I know our employers are not in jeopardy and that's comfortable. I'm happy with that. Does that lead to a good end product? Sometimes yes and sometimes no. Like I said, sometimes it's important to abandon some things to really, you know, to step over barriers and hurdles and do something different. So, but we've got people working with the R.C.M.P. right now and the [REDACTED]. It's all R.C.M.P. policy. Very happy with that. We roll along like a big, bureaucratic machine, but nobody's going to get hurt unless

you fall in front of the big, bureaucratic machine. And [redacted] lives there to make sure that nobody gets, plucks them back, you know, and make sure that nobody goes under the wheels. And you know, I make mock of it a bit, but it's a big, bureaucratic machine being run out of Ottawa. Okay. I understand that. We all get it. Okay? We're going to rumble along. But if I want things to be really effective and really creative, then we have to kind of jump off the machine and run in a different direction sometimes. (P9)

Surprisingly, this comment is supported by one RCMP participant when he states:

And you have to be cautious on how you apply R.C.M.P. policies to members of other organizations. Because as I said, it'll be the third time now. A lot of what we do doesn't make sense. You know? For instance, major operations? We have such strong, central control now. And it makes it very difficult for anything to get done, especially, you know, for [redacted] investigators that are attached now or, you know they're in, they're used to deciding what to do, get a quick nod from the boss and boom, they go. And here, you know, our approval process sometimes takes weeks. (P3)

Table 9. Does the potential exist that integrated silos will be created?

Are integrated silos being created	Responses
A strong possibility/concern	7 of the 10 participants identify possibility
Is occurring now	2 of the 10 participants state it is occurring
Not a concern/problem	1 of the 10 participants state this is not a problem

Most of the leaders believe that this possibility exists. One of the participants makes the following obvious observation:

Is that a danger? I suppose that something you always have to pay attention to in its group mentality I suppose if you will, or human nature or group human nature or something you tend to feel some inclusion and some sense of belonging to a particular group and so there is another group over there and you feel that I guess an attachment or something, and camaraderie or what ever with your group. (P2)

Overall, there is a sense that integration is part of an evolutionary process that will ultimately resolve itself. As one leader states:

But that it may just be the evolution of integration towards the larger integration as a whole, down the road. You know, you're talking about a fairly massive undertaking. And to think we're going to pull it off in a couple of years is unrealistic. You're looking at a generational change, almost. And I think this is how we do it, you know? Slowly. (P4)

Another leader points out:

But at least you have people from all the different agencies in each one of those things, right? You've got R.C.M.P. and Vancouver Police and Delta in IGTF and you've also got them in CFSEU, and whatever. So I mean, there are those connections there that hopefully will mitigate that potential. Yeah, I suppose it is, especially when you've got a lot of people working on these things that have got big egos and they're high-flying A-driven type personalities and so, you know, a little bit of competition is not unhealthy. (P10)

Ultimately, none of the leaders have a conclusive answer, which is exemplified in the following comment:

Oh that's an issue that we talk about a lot, actually. I think you'll find a couple of Chiefs, you'll probably be interviewing them, or Deputies, are strong on that view. That that's exactly what may be happening. How do you get around that? I don't really know. You know, we talked about that in some sort of, you know, the structure may evolve into one huge integrated support services division, or something, right? With all these specialty squads with various police departments and agencies involved, existing and then providing service out to these detachments, departments, whatever. Right? I don't know. But right now, you are arguably building silos. You've got IGTF, you've got CFSEU, you've got IHIT, right? They're integrated, but they are stand-alone systems. I think they're still working on how the reporting JMT structure's going to work and if it all runs through the Regional Operations Officers Committee, I think is what they're talking about, then that's one way to make sure that they're all talking to each other and what have you, but I think that's a problem. But I don't know how you ever get around that. Even in one big police department, you have to, by virtue of just the amount of work, break things up into sizeable, sizes that you can deal with. Right? (P7)

This is definitely an area that requires more research. The following profound observation indicates that integration may be replacing geographically based silos with mandate based silos: "So, but structurally, that's a fair comment to say that the result may be a different type of isolated units than we have, it's not geographic basis right now, it's mandate-based, right?" (P7).

Systems and Systems Thinking

Table 10. What is more important: the suppression of crime within your own police jurisdiction, or enforcement actions in a larger regional, provincial, or national context?

What is more important, local, regional, provincial or national crime issues?	Responses
Local with the “bigger picture” in mind	9 of the 10 participants

Nearly all the participants respond that local crime issues are in large part their primary concern, especially considering the fact that many of the leaders must report their organization’s performance to local mayors, city councils and police boards. However, as already noted, they are also aware that they are not isolated from the changing nature of criminal activity. As one leader states:

If I answer it this way I think you have to have that balance and everyone has to understand what kind off their individual mandates are a what role they play in a particular area and there are going to be street level policemen in police departments who sort of look at crime reduction strategies in there area but they can’t do that to the exclusion they don’t exist in isolation or in a bubble they have to recognize that the crime that happens in their neighbour-hoods that they are policing spills over to other areas and there is spill over into their areas and this is part of a bigger picture. But they still have to deal with those issues at that level in the neighbourhoods and trying to come with strategies that deal with issues in those particular neighbourhoods and in those communities so from one stand point you have to pay attention to those issues and again it is that part of understanding what the broader environ-ment is. Clearly there has to be efforts at a higher level and this is what maybe the Federal Policing responsibilities come into it where the Federal mandates tend to have language such as, will target at national, international and cross jurisdictional levels at high levels across the jurisdiction, versus being focused in areas and so at a certain level there has to be attention being paid to those larger national, provincial responsibilities and there is a role for every level of policing to play into that and but there is also responsibilities elsewhere. (P2)

Another participant supports this viewpoint when he states:

You cannot, I don’t think we, one is the same as the other and if you don’t look at the bigger picture? You’re not going to be able to resolve, at least in the organized crime context? You’re not going to be able to resolve local problems. I mean, local problems are always going to be there. The localized

murders and domestics and that type of thing. But you know, like the Commissioner says, “the ounce came from a kilo and the kilo came from a hundred kilos.” You know, coming into the country somehow. So you have to look at both a local level of enforcement and you also have to look at a much larger picture, which I hope we’re trying to do. (P3)

There is one interesting finding that must be noted. Although the RCMP is a national police force influenced to a very great extent by policy centres at National Headquarters in Ottawa, four of the five RCMP participants, nevertheless, also identified the need to address local issues first within the context of a broader regional, provincial and national perspective.

Table 11. What factors contribute to “turf” warfare among police organizations?

“Turf Warfare”	Responses
Reverse “Turf” Warfare	3 of the 10 participants identify this concept

The participants indicate that a certain level of “turf” warfare existed in the past but many indicate that “turf” warfare is not an issue they are faced with in their daily challenges as senior police executives. They suggest some reason why “turf” warfare could exist but from those reasons no prevailing theme emerges. Ironically, a unique theme does emerge that one of the participants labels as reverse “turf” warfare. When asked the question regarding factors contributing to “turf” warfare among police organizations, the participant makes the following surprising observation:

I guess you can have kind of a reverse turf war where someone claims that someone should be coming in and doing, doing work. But, I haven’t really, you know we, we don’t see much of that here in recent years (i.e. referring to turf warfare). I’m just trying to think, as we’re talking about it now. It’s really very much the latter here, which I guess is, is probably better. We’ve got a situation where other agencies are claiming certain activities should be the responsibility of the provincial force, as opposed to their responsibility. So you know, maybe that’s a good thing. (P1)

It appears that this is a situation whereby certain police agencies are requesting that other police forces, specifically those mandated with provincial and federal responsibilities, come into their communities to deal with policing issues that are considered the responsibilities of provincial or federal police forces. The most obvious of these issues is the ever increasing drug problem. One participant feels that the federal response to drug enforcement does not reflect the needs of his community and in fact, is contributing to rising crime rates that are attributed to substance abuse. He states that:

The federal mandate in relation to drug interdiction, I think, is quite abysmal. As a result of, for example, just by way of example to clarify it, the federal stand on the marihuana issue here in the province is bloody awful, and it has been bloody awful for ten years. Albeit we've been screaming from the municipal side that we're being inundated by marihuana grow operations, and that these marihuana grow operations are sustaining other kinds of crime in our community. Alright? So I think that there has to be a clarification of mandate in relation to what are the federal pressures or what are deemed to be the federal pressures in relation to certain kinds of crime. Drugs being one of them. And if you looked at our communities, I would say that a disproportionate amount of crimes committed as a result of drug use, drug abuse and those kinds of ancillary crimes that are associated to it. Right? So here in the municipalities, we don't get any federal funding to enhance our drug programmes or our drug enforcement. That's all given to the federal government, to the R.C.M.P. , to the province; municipalities see nothing...So I think there's a major issue there and I think, if you look at the drug problem here in the Lower Mainland for example, I think there are some, the lines of enforcement are somewhat blurred in relation to responsibilities, albeit I think it is getting better. (P6)

The following comment succinctly summarizes both the view most participants have on the question of "turf" warfare and the issue of "reverse" turf warfare:

I actually don't perceive that that is a huge problem? I've read lots about it and that kind of thing. I don't actually, of course it occurs from time to time, and we're all looking to make ourselves look good. As far as arguing over turf, if anybody's ever heard me speak at, you know, the B.C. Chief Conference, I'm the one that's constantly pushing the R.C.M.P. and Police Services to say, to agree to taking on responsibilities that I believe ought to be a provincial policing responsibility and stop dumping them on the poor municipalities that are not resourced to the level that we should be dealing with these things. So you know, I'm not looking to have more turf. I'm looking for there to be some rationalization around what the responsibilities of a municipal police

department. What the responsibilities of the provincial police are? What are the federal responsibilities? (P10)

Table 12. How do you eliminate “turf” warfare from the relationships between police organizations?

How to eliminate turf warfare	Responses
Open Communication/dialogue	6 of the 10 participants identify this method

A majority of leaders identify open communication as a way of eliminating any “turf” warfare that may exist or develop among police organizations. As one leader describes it:

And the best way to do that is the leaders, and we were at one time, I think, probably the worst for it. Not getting out to, like Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, to you know, the ██████████ Association of the Chiefs of Police, out into the community. I know ██████████ was a master at this. Getting out and, and talking to people and being at the same functions as the other Chiefs and this type of thing. And it broke down a lot of barriers there. And you know, a credit to him, because it’s a hard thing to do, you know. (P3)

One other leader describes this communication as being communication that brings understanding and clarity to the issues at hand:

A clear understanding of roles again, many of those things I have talked about before. If you lay it out properly and the other thing is that, and again as we sort of move along this more and more with integrated efforts and those sorts of things, the more that we have those there is a level of comfort that comes along with that and that uncertainty is reduced and the anxiety the feelings or the motives aren’t questioned as much, suddenly you start seeing that we do have common interests and objectives and the motives are to get the job done, versus motives of taking over or those sorts of issues sort of fell by the wayside. So that trust gets built up by having been involved in a number of integrated efforts to begin with and people actually really coming out where individual agencies benefiting and nobody is seen as a loser it really is a win-win. So those things come over time and I say a lot of it has to do with building up that trust over time but also the other is reliant upon that initial efforts in how that integrated effort is commenced and the negotiation that takes place, the agreements become into place and everything else and so its outlined whose responsible for what and again focusing on outcomes. (P2)

Table 13. Is integration beneficial to your organization?

Benefits of Integration	Responses
Allows for the leveraging of resources	9 of the 10 participants identify this benefit
Allows for developmental opportunities	5 of the 10 participants identify this benefit
Allows for those involved in the integrated units to return to their home agencies to mentor and pass on their training to the others	4 of the 10 participants identify this benefit

Nine of the ten participants state that integration is beneficial to their organizations.

The participants identify the leveraging of resources as the primary benefit of integration.

As this leader states:

Because, you know, I don't know if I mentioned that, but flowing from the intelligence gathering, we kind of matched our investigational capacity against the intelligence that we're having, so we kind of investigate more of these groups than other groups. And we separated that so we don't cross, we sometimes cross investigational boundaries, but we commonly agree who has the lead, depending on the nature of the file. And right now? We have fifteen people in fifteen regional squads with the [redacted] that are contributing to the biker, or fighting effort, that we have in [redacted], which is really organized crime. But all it costs us is those fifteen resources to be part of a group of hundreds of policemen fighting this initiative. So how is it beneficial? Is that we can participate in such a large initiative and by having a minimal amount of resources, that if we tried to do it on our own, it would be impossible to tackle. (P5)

The leveraging of resources is especially important in the present police environment as noted by one of the participants.

You know I think all police organizations are struggling with the increased crime rates, regardless of what Stats Canada would tell you, but everyone is just busier and busier. I mean there's all the other factors as well, you know, the disclosure issues, all those factors that, that make us busier than we were. You know, the, a few years ago the increased onus of getting cases through court and so on. Anyway, all that's created a resource crunch in police agencies and everyone's struggling to try to, you know do as good a job as they can. (P1)

This contention is further reinforced by another participant who believes in the:

Gestalt idea that “the whole is greater than the sum of the parts” it truly is when you get into that and again all various agencies and communities don’t exist in isolation, they don’t live in a bubble so its very, very important to recognize that and that there is that interdependence and cross over that occurs all the time so that’s where “interdependence makes it stronger” I guess if you will. (P2)

The participants also state that integrative units provided valuable developmental opportunities for their members. As one leader states:

For the organization itself, it is very beneficial because it also gives our people opportunity to work in an integrated model outside our jurisdiction so it’s developmental. For them it adds a great deal of experience, opportunity to see how other people operate work, give them exposure to other policies and issues. And in a small organization like ours, it’s just. It’s just that whole career development. It gives them that additional exposure that they wouldn’t ordinarily have. So it’s great both ways, and it creates a good incentive for others coming up along the way. Saying oh, you know, I can have an opportunity to do, to work in part of this or be part of that. (P8)

Further to that comment, another participant states:

Tremendously beneficial in terms of the training opportunities, the developmental opportunities, the broader horizon opportunities. We have people come back from integrated units that are absolutely light years ahead of their colleagues, with similar service. So yeah, just fabulous. And who really benefits is the customer. Because they get a much higher level of police service overall than they would have got otherwise. (P9)

Finally, the participants state that those members of their organizations that acquire and develop these new skills are returning to share and mentor those skills and experiences with others.

Well yes, of course, ‘cause they’re coming back with a whole new range, if they come back, they’re coming back with a whole new range of experience and training that they can bring back to our organization and be able to share that knowledge. So definitely there is added value there. Just the fact that we’re being able to provide an opportunity like that for our people to do something very different like that, that’s a great opportunity. And that lends to the health of the organization that they, you know, that there are increased opportunities to do different things. (P10)

Table 14. Is integration detrimental to your organization?

Detriments of Integration	Responses
Providing resources to integrated units results in pressures on core policing mandates	6 of the 10 identify this as a leadership challenge
The organization's best people are committed to integrated units at the detriment of the home agency	4 of the 10 identify this as a pressure

Nine of the ten participants identify that although integration is beneficial to their organizations, there are two detrimental costs to their involvement. These two detrimental concerns go hand in hand. A majority of the participants state that supplying the integrated units with members of their police forces or units places pressure upon their ability to fulfill the core mandates of those units or police agencies. This pressure is a direct result of the fact that no new positions are created when new integrated units are created. Human resources assigned to those integrated units must be re-deployed from existing human resource positions. As one leader very adeptly states:

The only detrimental ones really are that there is so much crime and criminality and there is so much, I guess when you break up units to create integrated units you can take away from the kind of core activities in one sense and core is probably not the right word but a bite of the critical mass to allow sort of the primary units to focus on what they need to focus on what they need to focus on. There is definitely a benefit but the down side is that those units out of necessity are becoming smaller and they are perhaps a little less effective in doing in what, if you look at things like mandated activities, like what is there day to day mandates, it becomes very grey because you can't break it down that way because it goes back to the idea of what level you are working at, if you are in a detachment you need people in uniform on the street doing their thing you can't take them all and put them in integrated units you still need to do day to day work. (P2)

This is supported by another leader who states:

Yeah, I do think there are as well. And I think that you've got to be careful with the number of integrated approaches that you bring forward. Notwithstanding they may be viable, but for some of the smaller departments, and some of the larger departments because it's not on a per capita basis, we can't afford to carve off thirty percent of our resources in house to go on the integrated model, 'cause usually that means they leave the department for

extended periods of time. And as I said earlier to you, we have a responsibility to our front line personnel. Our patrol people. That their adequately resourced and there are a number of issues on the table right now that we're not involved in, because we can't afford it. It's not that we don't think they're good ideas, but it's unrealistic to think that we're going to go below minimums in patrol to facilitate an integrated model regarding a specific crime problem, because our first responsibility is to our communities. So I think it's a great idea, however I do think there are some pitfalls in relation to the realistic expectations. And one of the areas, I think that needs to be examined, is to front-end load some of those funding positions, so that we can hire back those positions prior to giving the bodies up, so that we don't go down in relation to our front-line service. There are a number of other funding arrangements around that, but we need to be realistic in our approach. (P6)

This pressure is exacerbated by the fact that in most cases, the police organizations are sending their most capable and experienced members to the integrated units. This sincere commitment results in the loss of expertise and leadership which, consequently, affects the fulfillment of core policing mandates. As these leaders state:

Right now there's a detriment to the organization that we've, through a number of integrated units, we've sent some very, very talented people, a lot of them, like forty, fifty really high fliers out of this organization over the past, about six months, and we've got such a junior police department, that we could really use those forty or fifty very high fliers back here to teach these kids how to be police officers. So we're struggling, trying to develop young police officers, primarily in the operations division, because we've lost these very senior, not very senior, but more senior, highly intuitive, highly educated people to these integrated units. So, the outset of that? It makes us look good. Better when they come back. So it's a balancing act all the way through this. (P9)

Yeah, absolutely. I mean, there's a price to pay because, for example, because we're committed not to just saying, oh well, we'll get rid of some deadwood. I mean, we send some of our absolute best people to these integrated units. So at least in the short term there is a real loss. When we've got to give up, you know, guys like [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to IGTF, you know, those are big shoes to fill... Now if this were seven or eight years ago, we were in a different place in our demographics, and we had lots of experienced, senior investigators, it wouldn't be as much pain. We could afford to give it up. We had a little more depth. We don't have as much depth right now. Everybody's in the same boat. You know, the retirement, you know, the baby boomers retiring. (P10)

Table 15. For the sake of your organization, would you be prepared to set aside the needs of your organization?

Set aside organizational needs for the sake of integration	Responses
Yes – a commitment is a commitment except under exigent/extraordinary circumstances	6 of the 10 participants take this position
No – has to be a benefit for the organization	4 of the 10 participants take this position

This question nearly split the participants in half. The majority take the position that once a commitment to integration is made then for the integrative process to succeed it requires the stability of that commitment. These senior leaders state they would only withdraw from the commitment under extraordinary circumstances. They would rather find other ways of accommodating their organizational needs. This position is best articulated by one of the participants when he states:

Well I think you have to. If the latter part was long-term, then you'd have to review your participation. But you can't do these integrated units, and every time you have a conflict with some specific issue in [redacted], is strategic, tactical, whatever, it is resourcing, you yank all your people back. It won't work, right? So I mean that's a level of good faith that has to exist on all of the people who are supporting these integrated units. Now there has to be some give and take...There's always that pressure on us and everybody else, to deal with their own operational needs first, right? But we would call out people and whatever, supposed to bring somebody back from (indiscernible) or whatever it's called, things like that. (P7)

Another senior leader states that he would not commit resources to an integrated initiative unless he felt he could spare those resources but once he makes that commitment then he feels that:

I mean it would have to be, I would have to say it would have to be some extraordinary circumstances. And really dire circumstances, or such a critical issue that emerged within the community that would necessitate pulling them. Now if I absolutely felt that it had to be done. I guess I would. But not unless it was really, really, major. No, my idea is when we make the commitment to an integrated. I mean for that integrated team to work, they have to have stability. And they have to have you know I guess stability is the right word. For them to be affective they can't have resources sort of just coming and

going just at the whim of the Chief you know or the Management. I mean you got to. And I don't know about a case where we've had to do that yet so. But like I say it would have to be pretty critical to pull back on the resources. And I guess if, I'm fifteen resources short right now within the department. And I still have no intent of pulling back because it's causing. We'll workout other ways. We'll bring back people on overtime or whatever it takes. But to pull back somebody just because we're facing a bit of a challenge, I don't believe in that. (P8)

Conversely, nearly half the participants state that they would not continue to commit their organizations to an integrated partnership unless there is a direct and ongoing benefit for their organizations. One of the participants sets the mood when he states:

It makes no sense to me, as I said to you earlier, to take bodies out of the castle when you're under attack. (P6)

One other participant makes the following statement in regards to this question:

And so I have a responsibility to, let's say, a police board and citizens of my community. So, am I able to show value added for the resources I'm expending, human or financial in an integrated unit. If the answer is yes, they stay. If it's not either 'A', you make a representation to see if the integrated unit will provide more value for your particular circumstances. And this is a continuous balancing act on these, in these types of units. Or, if it is not, then you may have to reconsider your position. And [REDACTED], we get back to integration for the sake of integration. Integration which is value added. (P3)

Trust

Table 16. Is the erosion of trust among police organizations one of the biggest problems facing police leaders in Canada today?

Is trust eroding among police organizations	Responses
No	10 of the 10 participants states that trust is not eroding

All the participants emphatically respond that trust among police organizations is not eroding. In fact, they indicate that trusting relationships are strengthening as more police organizations become involved in integrative initiatives. The trust among senior police executives is also strengthening due in a large part to their involvement in:

- Municipal, Provincial and National Associations of Chiefs of Police;
- Provincial Operational Councils;
- Joint Management Teams; and
- Jointly created National and Provincial Criminal Threat Assessments.

One participant sums it up well when he states:

No I would actually say it's improving for a lot of different reasons. It's not perfect by any stretch right yet but efforts such as, and I have just talked about it a second ago, the fact that we now do a Provincial Threat Assessment where every Police Agency in the Province contributes to a Provincial Threat Assessment and because you have contributed you have to have that trust that I am sharing tactical information, I am sharing information about my files about our investigation with everyone and it all gets rolled up into one document, into one threat assessment. There have been, we are into the third year of doing that, and it continues to improve. The Provincial Threat Assessment we have this year is far superior to the one two years ago and it gets continually better and why its getting better is because that trust is there that we can share that information and then once you have it then you can do something about it collectively. The fact that we have in [REDACTED] an Ops Council that involves the criminal operations of the RCMP, representation from Municipal Police Chiefs in the [REDACTED] as well as [REDACTED] and an advisory capacity from both the Provincial and Federal Crown sitting around the table talking about what the broader priorities are, the organized crime priorities are and then deciding who is going to take on those priorities jointly is huge as far as getting that trust relationship because you are now involved in Senior Managers making decisions about what the Provincial priorities are going to be. That is one example, I think the trust in setting up integrated units where you have a cross section, you have managers or leaders from different police agencies running different integrated units is a demonstration of trust from all sides. And recognition that others are quite capable of running that type of thing. I actually see that the trust is getting better, certainly things such as information sharing going on one records management system, there has to be a certain element of trust along with that and that has not necessary been an easy process, not just in [REDACTED] but in other areas where there has been concerns about what information would go in there and the fact that other police agencies can actually look into all your investigative files and read everything that has been going on. Those things all work to develop that trust so I think it certainly is an issue and probably that lack of trust or that suspicion or the feeling of being threatened I have talked about before have all been inhibitors or barriers to effective policing in Canada, those things are starting to break down, its certainly not perfect yet and there is a ways to go yet but it is getting better. (P2)

Communication

Table 17. Describe the communication process that is required to create, sustain and enhance the integrative process

Characteristics	Responses
Ongoing/regular communications	7 of the 10 identify this characteristic
Honest communication	5 of the 10 identify this characteristic
Open communication	5 of the 10 identify this characteristic

The majority of the participants identify ongoing and regular communication as an important process for creating, sustaining, and enhancing the integrative process. Half of the participants also identify honest and open communication as other important aspects of that process. In fact, all three of these concepts are often referred to at the same time. As one participant states:

Integration is the direction we want to go, it is necessary, it has been supported and its, if your leaders are silent in communicating then I won't say its doomed for failure but it certainly doesn't have the same chance of success versus where the leaders are right up front and saying this is the direction we need to go, this is the benefits of what we are doing and the leaders standing side by side versus individually so clearly that communication has to be right from the top jointly and there is that type of broad support right from the very top, that is the type of thing that it has to start with , again as those who are sort of negotiating with honest and open communication back and forth and I think ongoing as well as to what the objectives are, where we are going, how what the stages are progressing towards objectives you can't have camps within an incubated unit not communicating with the rest that's again is sort of the leader that integrated unit has to take that role and make sure that no own is excluded and that all are considered part of the unit. (P2)

Accordingly:

Well, you know again to, I think that you need to have systems and structures surrounding, personal interaction. You know, whether it be in the start-up phase through brain storming as an open, honest communication...They just wanted to be at the table, having some input and having some general understanding of where we were at and we resolved more problems internally through that process than we did service their issues. So it is a very good way of doing business. (P4)

One leader even considers achieving a good communication process as one of his many challenges:

But the same thing that would apply to a relationship, I believe, applies to integrated process. You know, in the integration policing, for the communication aspect of it. You just need to put people together and they have to talk to each other and explain their points of view. This is my biggest learning achievement of the last year and a half, is the fact that dialogue is the essence of everything that you do in partnership. Whether it's with the partners within or the partners that are the leaders of the other organization that you have to consult with. So you have to establish many communication forms at the various levels, whether it's direct communications to written communications to informal, to you know, your network of people. (P5)

Table 18. Are collaborative “win-win” solutions possible for all the participants in an integrative partnership?

Factors	Responses
Openness	4 of the 10 participants identify this characteristic
Honesty	3 of the 10 participants identify this characteristic

All of the participants state that “win-win” solutions are possible for the participants of a collaborative partnership. An analysis of their responses identifies two factors that the leaders feel are required to achieve a “win-win” situation.

Openness and honesty are once again identified as important factors in promoting successful solutions within integrated partnerships. One leader speaks of openness, honesty, strength and interdependence all in one comment:

I guess it's the same thing is the fact that you have a leader who is open and honest and focus on sort of the collective benefits and objects of an organization that that individual honours and respects and recognizes the contributions from every different agency that out of necessity there is this interdependence and there is strength in pulling together and high lights those, I think those are the sorts of things that we really do get the “win-win.” (P2)

Another leader places a great emphasis on dialogue as part of open communication:

Like, you know, this is what I firmly believe, that you have to create forms to be able to talk. Whether it's having formal meetings, you know, being set up;

by forcing the dialogue. You know, any problem that people come to me with today, the first question I ask myself is...there an opportunity somewhere here to either talk with the other person, to talk with someone. You know? Like dialogue, to me, has become the basis and I mean I've learned that because of my exposure within partnerships. So to me it's, you know, communication is the essence. And that's one of the conditions that must exist. You need to create that condition of open communication channels and dialogue. (P5)

Yet a third participant epitomizes the importance of open and honest communication when he states:

I think again, it was, it's an open, honest approach. Here's our problem, we're not shucking and jiving. We weren't trying to tell them we're trying to get out from under this...Open, honest communication. It was, I think we established some credibility for open, honest communication by the time those issues had arisen, and that we weren't, that we were going to work towards meeting our goals in the best way possible and you know, all those things that we've talked about so much over time, were critical to that...Absolutely. And if you're not? You're dead. Because they're not going to work with you. They're not going to trust you. You'll see it in the room. They won't, oh I'll get back to you on that or I'll have to have a look at that and we'll get; you know, we'll see how that develops or, you know, you can see it all the time. But to me, that's a product of trust. Because if I'm sitting here telling you that this is the problem, I mean, some of the solutions are obvious. But people won't commit, because they're not sure you're really giving them the whole story, right? (P4)

Study Conclusions

Leadership

The participants identify traits consistent with those of value based leadership. It is not surprising that the participants identified these traits as important leadership traits. Openness, honesty, interpersonal skills, communication skills and integrity are all leadership traits that are highly respected and considered to be the foundation of value based leadership. Kouzes and Posner (2002) state that since the early 1980s when they first started conducting studies on leadership, honesty is consistently at the top of the list of leadership characteristics considered the most important in the leader-constituent relationship. According to O'Toole (1995), the common theme that characterizes value based leaders is that they are inclusive leaders of leaders.

Inclusive leaders enable others to lead by sharing information, by fostering a sense of community, and by creating a consistent system of rewards, structures, process and communication. They are committed to the principle of opportunity, giving all followers the chance to make a contribution to the organization. The values-based leadership they all practice is based on an inspiring vision. And each is dedicated to institutionalizing continuous change, renewal, innovation, and learning. And the bottom line in what they do is adherence to the moral principle of respect for people. (p. 70)

In a more practical sense, the participants are very definite about the prerequisites required to enter into a collaborative partnership and their continuing expectations from that integrated partnership. They are unanimous in stating that:

- There needs to be a common purpose for the integration;
- The integrated initiative requires clearly stated objectives; and
- An evaluation system is to be incorporated into the initiative to regularly assess whether or not those objectives are being met.

A small number of the participants also believe that the integrated partnership must be nurtured through continuous communication and dialogue among the partnering agencies. Most of the leaders are prepared to view integrated partnerships as long term commitments but eventually those partnerships had to add value to their organizational objectives. As well, a majority of the leaders are very wary of integration for the sake of integration. They are not prepared to support partnerships that are obviously self-serving to those making the proposals.

It is encouraging to find that the participants do not consider integrative policing a “passing fad” or “flavour of the day.” Because of factors such as the globalization of criminal activity and the benefits of resource leveraging, the participants feel that integrated policing is a long term policing model in Canada. However, some of the participants believe that integration is only a precursor to the regionalization of policing service in the greater Vancouver area. The integration of municipal resources within federal policing responsibilities is seen as a long term solution. However, they felt that the regionalization of

the other policing functions would better serve the communities within the greater Vancouver area.

Organizational Culture

All the participants agree that the leader has a profound influence and effect on an organization's culture. The participants identify three ways in which a leader affects organizational culture:

- By having a vision;
- By nurturing or supporting the organizational values; and
- By modeling the way.

These findings are consistent with the literature on the topic. According to Schein (1992), a leader's vision defines an organization's purpose which, in turn, contributes to the development of that organization's espoused values. By nurturing and supporting an organization's values, a leader ensures that those values become the common assumptions or mental models of the organization. Modeling the way is also extremely important because, "exemplary leaders know that if they want to gain commitment and achieve the highest standards, they must be models of the behaviour they expect of others" (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 14).

The participants also believe that different police organizational cultures can come together to create effective integrated units. They state that important and intrinsic to that process is the support of senior management. Some of the leaders also believe that supporting the creation of unit subcultures is an acceptable and contributing factor to the effective integration of police cultures. Schein (1992), states that the forces creating functional subcultures are derived from the technological and occupational culture of that function. In other words, IHIT's mandate is homicide investigations, CFSEU-BC's mandate

is the disruption of organized crime and IMPACT's mandate is the prevention and investigation of car thefts. Each unit will develop its own sub-culture and as newcomers arrive to those units, they will be socialized into the sub-culture. They will, nevertheless, bring with them assumptions derived from their home police cultures. Therefore, the sub-culture of each functional unit will include a blending of the founder assumptions and the assumptions associated with that functional or occupational group (Schein, 1992). In essence, the process of developing a subculture is consistent with P5's metaphorical analogy of two different colours being blended together to create a new colour that is "tainted" by both.

All the leaders state that they are willing to be involved in integrated partnerships using another police organization's policy but they do question why RCMP policy has to be consistently used in integrated initiatives involving the RCMP. The participants agree that the policies of the different police forces are more similar than dissimilar and based on that fact, some of the municipal leaders state that they would like an opportunity to utilize policy other than RCMP policy in integrated units. This desire could be facilitated by either merging different policies to create policy that specifically met the needs of the integrated unit or by simply using the policy of another police agency. Furthermore, some of the participants also state that the procedural aspect of RCMP policy is a concern to them. It is their opinion that RCMP policy is sometimes too restrictive and bureaucratic to allow for the quick and innovative responses required in integrated investigations.

A majority of the leaders also believe that there is a definite possibility that integrated silos are being created. They are concerned that while effective, efficient and "patchless" integrated units are being created, they too are developing into silos of their own. P7 made an observation that is worthy of further examination when he states that structurally, integration may be creating silos that are no longer geographically based but

mandate based instead. The possibility of this occurring is supported by Schein (1992) who states:

In fact, as we will see, with time any social unit will produce subunits that will produce subcultures as a normal process of evolution. Some of these subcultures will typically be in conflict with each other, as in the case with higher management and unionized labour groups. Yet in spite of such conflict one will find that organizations have common assumptions that come into play when crisis occurs or when a common enemy is found. (pp. 14-15)

It is argued by some leaders that seamless database systems that facilitate the collection, analysis and dissemination of information and intelligence will prevent or at least mitigate integrated units from creating silos of their own. However, the researcher believes that while the creation of common database systems is a monumental step forward, it does not replace the cooperative sharing of information between two investigators sitting at the same table. This belief is supported by the fact that in nearly every case where an active investigation is stored on a database system, access to that investigation is protected until such time as the investigation is concluded. When the investigation is made accessible to other investigators, the facts are historical in nature and although valuable to future investigations, the information is of no value to an investigation that is being conducted at the same time. The concern that integrated silos are being created is definitely an area that will require further research in the future to ascertain, if in fact, the participants' concerns are well founded.

Systems and Systems Thinking

Nine of the ten participants state that although they are cognizant of the multi-jurisdictional nature of criminal activity, they have to address the needs of their communities first. They are, nevertheless, prepared to allocate resources to integrated units outside their jurisdictions because they know that law enforcement efforts in a larger context has an overall positive affect in reducing crime within their communities. This

finding is encouraging because it indicates that these senior leaders are not subject to spatial and process blindness (Oshry, 1995). By not being spatially blind, the leaders are aware that there are many parts in a system that influence and impact all the other parts of that system. By not suffering from process blindness, the leaders are aware that their own systems are only part of a larger system (Oshry, 1995). The understanding of systems is instrumental in removing some of the barriers that contribute to “turf” issues within relationships.

In fact, the participants indicate that “turf” warfare is not an issue they faced as part of their daily challenges as senior police executives. A particularly interesting research finding is the concept of “reverse” turf warfare. It appears that as police resources and funding become strained, some police organizations are now demanding a greater role from the police agencies with provincial and federal responsibilities to fulfill those mandates within their communities. This expectation is contrary to the concept of protecting “turf” at all costs.

Nine of the ten participants state that integration is beneficial to their organizations because it allows for:

- The leveraging of resources;
- Development opportunities for those individuals sent to the integrated units; and
- The training and mentoring of other police officers when those individuals returned to their home agencies with their new knowledge and experience.

However, the senior leaders also identify two detrimental effects of the integrative process. First, no new positions are allocated when new integrated units are created. Therefore by becoming involved in integrated initiatives, senior police leaders are faced with removing resources in other areas to meet their commitment to the integrated process elsewhere. This results in pressure being placed on the core policing mandates of those police agencies. Secondly, this pressure is exacerbated because, motivated by a sincere

commitment to the integrative process, the police agencies are sending their most capable and experienced investigators to the integrated units. This leads to a loss of experience and leadership at a time when all police forces are faced with the retirement of a large number of experienced senior police officers and the need to train a large number of inexperienced junior police officers.

Senge (1990) describes this systemic archetype as “success to the successful” (p. 385). Characteristic of this archetype is two activities competing for the same limited support and resources. The more successful one activity becomes, the more support it gains, thereby starving the other of those limited resources. It is evident from the participants’ comments that the “success for the successful” archetype exists in regards to their need to fulfill core policing mandates and their need to resource integrated units. It appears that integration is succeeding at the cost of core policing mandates.

The concern over resource allocation is evident when the participants are asked if they are prepared to set aside their organizational needs for the sake of the integrative process. While six of the participants state they are prepared to do so, four state that they are not. Resource considerations are identified as the reason why the four participants are not prepared to set aside the needs of their organizations for the needs of the integrative process. This situation can be easily alleviated if the creation of new integrative initiatives is combined with the funding that allows for the creation of new positions and the backfilling of positions vacated as individuals are transferred into the integrated units. Subsequently, this would also allow for the competition between the integrated units and core policing mandates to be uncoupled (Senge, 1990).

Trust

All the participants emphatically respond that trust among police organizations is not eroding but in fact, trusting relationships are strengthening. The fact that police organizations are becoming increasingly involved in integrative initiatives has contributed greatly to this situation but more importantly, trust is strengthening because senior police leaders are allowing for dedifferentiation (Oshry, 1995). Dedifferentiation is being facilitated by senior police leader participation in organizations and joint ventures such as:

- Municipal, Provincial and National Associations of Chiefs of Police;
- Provincial Operations Councils;
- Joint Management Teams; and
- Jointly created National and Provincial Criminal Threat Assessments.

In doing so, the open communication intrinsic in these relationships allows dedifferentiation to strengthen the commonality among the leaders because, as Oshry (1995) states, they are:

- Agreeing on a common vision for their system;
- Sharing information with one another regarding events, issues, difficulties and choices in their respective areas of responsibility;
- Creating mutual coaching relationships so that all the leaders become fully committed to the success of others as well as themselves;
- Creating regular opportunities to walk in someone else's shoes; and
- Creating joint task forces by finding opportunities to partner with one another when new issues arise and fall outside their area of responsibility.

Furthermore, during the course of these open and honest discussions and activities, they are allowing themselves to be placed in a vulnerable position. Both Atkinson & Butcher (2003) and Solomon and Flores (2001) contend that intrinsic in building trusting

relationships is the possibility of breach and betrayal. This contention is supported by P2 when he states:

No I would actually say it's improving for a lot of different reasons. It's not perfect by any stretch right yet but efforts such as, and I have just talked about it a second ago, the fact that we now do a Provincial Threat Assessment where every Police Agency in the Province contributes to a Provincial Threat Assessment and because you have contributed you have to have that trust that I am sharing tactical information, I am sharing information about my files about our investigation with everyone and it all gets rolled up into one document, into one threat assessment.

The success of differentiation and the strengthening of trust is quite evident in the following statement:

Is that I ponder quite a bit about what we're doing here. From a strategic perspective because I believe in our police department and I, I think we're doing a good job and I'm proud of them. So I'm very mindful of strategy, as how can we reach out and do our job and not to the point where we are so merged with everybody else and we lose our identity? Right? This is a real issue for us. And I've also, on a parallel to that, I mean I have at times asked myself, you know, can I trust these folks who are telling me what they're telling me? But I've, you know, I've done that leap of faith myself, and I haven't been disappointed, right? They've been little hiccups. But again, I went back to it and said you've got to get around those. You've got to determine, is that, like is that the true intent or belief of the organization or is that an anomaly, because we all, we're two people and not everybody, not every [REDACTED] person does what I want them to do or professes the values that I would happen to profess, right? You know, we've had that discussion. There's no doubt about it, and the municipal Chief seems to be blunt with you about trust, but I don't think it's a huge issue. It might be sort of an underlying area there. It's not so much a lack of trust, there's always that. Your antennae are up, Right? Like, what's the true agenda? Right? And I don't want to sound paranoid but there are some Chiefs who have that concern, I think. You know, we've had that discussion to some extent and my sense of it is the people that I deal with - I believe what they tell me. (P7)

Communication

The participants identify regular communication as an important aspect of the integrative process. Not surprisingly, they state that the ability to communicate effectively and the ability to collaborate were based upon the values of honesty and openness. Open and honest communication is the cornerstone of any meaningful relationship built on trust

and mutual respect (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Open and honest communication is a reoccurring theme throughout the research because people respond to individuals whom they perceive are interacting with them in an authentic manner.

Lencioni (2002) asserts that there are five dysfunctions of a team that prevent that team from achieving excellence. Of those, a lack of open and honest communication directly affects the dysfunctions of an absence of trust and a fear of conflict. Lencioni states that trust is the foundation of real teamwork and dysfunction occurs when there is a failure on the part of team members to understand and open up to one another. He contends that by being open, team members expose themselves to a certain amount of vulnerability. The exposure of one's vulnerability is considered to be a critical part of building a team because it facilitates the creation of trust. Subsequently, if team members do not trust one another they will not engage in open, constructive, ideological conflict and the team will preserve a sense of artificial harmony. Solomon and Flores (2002) refer to this artificial harmony as cordial hypocrisy and it is considered a very counterproductive way to avoid constructive conflict. Artificial harmony or cordial hypocrisy stagnate a team because a well functioning team is built on trust which is achieved because its members are prepared to voice their opinions and honest concerns (Lencioni, 2002).

Senge (1990) asserts that "system thinking shows that small, well focused actions can sometimes produce significant, enduring improvements, if they're in the right place. System thinkers refer to this principle as 'leverage'" (pp. 64-65). The researcher believes that the study findings indicate that the "leverage" to creating, sustaining and nurturing the integrative process is open and honest communication. It is the foundation upon which all else is built and achieved.

Scope and Limitations of the Research

The following are limitations that may affect the application of the research findings:

1. The researcher is a Non-Commissioned Officer who interviewed senior Commissioned Officers who outranked him in every case and in some cases outranked him to a great extent. This discrepancy, within the context of a para-military structure, may have affected the manner and extent to which the participants responded to the interview questions. That is not to say that the questions were not answered truthfully but there may have been instances when all the facts and issues were not shared with the researcher in the same manner that one would have when in conversation with a peer or colleague of equal stature.
2. The researcher is a Non-Commissioned Officer in the RCMP who interviewed senior Commissioned Officers of a number of different municipal police forces. This fact may have influenced how candid one or more of these participants answered questions that could have been construed as a negative comments towards the RCMP. There were some instances when the participants apologized to the researcher prior to making such a comment or observation.
3. Conversely, the researcher may have tempered the documentation of certain observations so as not to embarrass or appear overly critical of his police organization.
4. All the research participants were male. No senior female leaders were interviewed that may or may not have brought a different perspective to the issues.
5. The research participants did not represent every region of Canada.

CHAPTER FIVE:

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

The following chapter describes the implications of this research. It provides study recommendations, suggestions regarding how these recommendations can be implemented and possibilities for future research arising from this study. These recommendations are derived from an analysis of the results of the participant interviews. They are directly related to the research question examining the role of leadership in the integration of police organizations. The purpose of these recommendations is to strengthen the integrative process by providing leaders with the knowledge, skills and abilities to fulfill this role.

Study Recommendations

The following are recommendations that stem from the research conclusions:

1. RCMP Centralized Training and the Canadian Police College should consider developing a course on integration for all police leaders involved in creating and managing integrated initiatives. It would be beneficial if the course includes practical considerations as well as scholarly literature on the basic principles of value-based leadership, transformational leadership, organizational culture, systems thinking, trust and communication.
2. The RCMP should give consideration to creating an Integrated Policing Policy Centre to provide operational and administrative direction to all integrated initiatives involving the RCMP. This may also include integrated initiatives not utilizing RCMP policy and operational guidelines.

3. Each new integrated initiative should be assured appropriate funding at the outset so that new positions are created and funded.

Organizational Implementation

The implementation of change within a large organization often has many systemic implications. Depending on the extent of that change, implementation would require the involvement and endorsement of different levels of the organization's leadership. In some cases implementation may also affect and require the involvement of other organizations apart from the organization implementing the change. If any of the researcher's recommendations are accepted and implemented, the changes would require the endorsement and support of senior levels of management within the RCMP as well as several provincial governments and the federal government.

Recommendation One

- RCMP Centralized Training and the Canadian Police College should consider developing a course on integration for all police leaders involved in creating and managing integrated initiatives. It would be beneficial if the course should include practical considerations as well as scholarly literature on the basic principles of value-based leadership, transformational leadership, organizational culture, systems and systems thinking, trust and communication.

After its feasibility has been examined, the implementation of this recommendation would require the creation of a new course by the RCMP Learning and Development Branch, Centralized Training and the Canadian Police College. Subject matter experts would need to be identified and with their assistance a course outline developed and used to create the various teaching units in the course. Such a course would be instrumental in providing police leaders and future police leaders of integrated units a foundation in both

the best practices of integration and the academic literature necessary to assist them in their roles and responsibilities.

Recommendation Two

- The RCMP should give consideration to creating an Integrated Policing Policy Centre to provide operational and administrative direction to all integrated initiatives involving the RCMP. This may also include integrated initiatives not utilizing RCMP policy and operational guidelines.

To create a new Policy Centre, this recommendation would require a business case to secure the approval of the RCMP Senior Executive Committee as well as securing funding at both the RCMP and Federal government levels. There would be many advantages to creating such a policy centre. The Policy Centre would strive in becoming a centre of excellence that would provide operational and administrative assistance and guidance during the creation of new integrated initiatives. As well, the Policy Centre would provide ongoing support to those integrated initiatives already in existence. Along with identifying best practices, the Policy Centre would also:

- Develop new policy when and where applicable;
- Review present policy to examine how it can be improved in order to support integrative initiatives;
- Examine the procedural aspect of policy to identify if there are ways to streamline the process when it comes to integrated units;
- Examine the feasibility of using policy other than RCMP policy in integrated initiatives involving the RCMP;
- Examine other integrated models around the world to identify new best practices outside the experience of the RCMP;
- Reach out to develop new integrative partnerships both nationally and internationally;

- Organize workshops and training sessions for everyone involved in integrated units;
- Develop systems that would allow for the sharing of information between integrated units. This information sharing would be at the investigator level and beyond that provided by common databases and information systems.

Recommendation Three

- Each new integrated initiative should be assured appropriate funding at the outset so that new positions are created and funded.

Of the three recommendations, the implementation of this recommendation would be the most beneficial for the integrative process as well as the police community as a whole. Apart from the support required by senior management within the RCMP and the municipal police forces, this recommendation would also require the support of both the Provincial and Federal governments because they would ultimately approve the increase in police budgets that would allow for the implementation of this recommendation. The creation of new positions would eliminate one of the detrimental affects of integration that was identified by the research participants. With adequate funding in place, participants would be able to backfill positions vacated to meet their commitments to integrated initiatives. As a result, none of the integrated partners would experience a deterioration of their core policing mandates.

Implications for Future Research

As a result of the research findings and conclusions, two potential topics were identified for future research:

1. Further research is required to ascertain whether or not “geographical silos” are being replaced by “mandate silos” as a result of the integrative process. A majority of

the senior leaders believe that there is a strong possibility that integrated silos are being created. This research will assist in the evolutionary development of integrated initiatives and relationships.

2. Some of the leaders state that integration should only be a precursor to the regionalization of policing within British Columbia. They believe that regionalization would allow for effective and efficient service delivery because it would address the concerns that the present policing model has resulted in the creation of “silos” and redundancies. The researcher contends that regionalization will not necessarily ensure internal integration because experience has shown that this is an issue that most large organizations struggle with on a continual basis. To that end, it would be beneficial to study existing regionalized police forces to ascertain if regionalization has resulted in internal integration and an improvement in police services.

CHAPTER SIX: LESSONS LEARNED

There were four lessons learned by the researcher during the data collection phase of this Major Project:

1. It is important to take into consideration the busy work schedules of those individuals that will be interviewed. The researcher found that he was able to dictate the pace of his Major Project until he was required to rely upon other people's schedules to complete his tasks. A researcher must ensure that ample time is allotted for this stage of the project because it is unlikely that interviews will be scheduled as quickly as a researcher anticipates or needs.
2. It is important to take into consideration the length of time that is required to transcribe the recorded interviews. As a general rule, a one to one and one half hour recording will take a transcriber a full eight hour day to transcribe. Depending on how many hours of interviewing a researcher conducts, he or she must allow for approximately one day of transcribing for each hour of recording.
3. A researcher should consider the use of a lapel microphone or some other type of microphone to improve the sound quality of the recording especially in the event that one of the participants is soft spoken. This was the case for only one of the participants in this project and it took the transcriber two and one half days to complete that interview.
4. Rather than completing his highlighting and coding electronically, the researcher found it easier to print a copy of the transcribed interviews and then note the themes

in the margins and highlight key phrases with a highlighting marker. To facilitate the validation process, the researcher had those documents converted into “Adobe” documents so that they could be e-mailed to the participants for their review. Most if not all computers are equipped with Adobe Reader software and this method proved to be successful.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, S., & Butcher, D. (2003). Trust in managerial relationships. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18*(4), 282-304.
- Bellman, G. M. (1990). *The consultant's calling: Bringing who you are to what you do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bennis, W. (2000). *Managing the dream: Reflections on leadership and change*. Cambridge: Perseus Publishing.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge* (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Campbell, A. (1996). *The Campbell Inquiry Report: Bernardo investigative review*. Toronto: Government of Ontario.
- Conference Board of Canada, 2002. *The evolution of customer loyalty. Bringing the customer inside*. Ottawa, Canada.
- Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle centred leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gehl, A. R. (2001). The dynamics of police cooperation in multi-agency investigations. finding common ground. Doctoral dissertation, Royal Roads University.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Oshry, B. (1995). *Seeing systems: Unlocking the mysteries of organizational life*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading change: The argument for value based leadership*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Palys, T. (2003). *Research decisions: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives* (3rd ed.). Canada: Thomas Nelson.
- Peck, M. S. (1993). *A world waiting to be born: Civility rediscovered*. New York: Bantam Book.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police Homepage. (2004). Retrieved May 27, 2004 from http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/bc/home/index_e.htm
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Solomon, R. C., & Flores, F. (2001). *Building trust in business, politics, relationships and life*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stringer, E. T. (1999). *Action research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Thomas, K. W. (2002). *Introduction to conflict management: Improving performance using the TKI*. Palo Alto: CPP, Inc.
- Why integrated policing? (2004). *RCMP Gazette*, 66(1), 12-13.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Zaccardelli, G. (2004). Commissioner's directional statement 2004/2005. *The Quarterly*, 69(1), 6-8.

APPENDIX A:
LETTER OF INVITATION

Address Block

Date

Dear -----;

Re: Research of the Role of Leadership in the Integration of Police Organizations

I am writing this letter to formally invite you to be an interview participant on the research question:

What is the role of the leader in facilitating and encouraging the integration of police organizations?

This research project will be the basis of a thesis submitted as partial completion of my Masters of Arts in Leadership and Training at Royal Roads University in Victoria, British Columbia. This research project is being sponsored by Superintendent Marianne Ryan in her capacity as the Acting Chief of the Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit – British Columbia. The completion of this thesis is scheduled for July 31, 2005.

This research project will explore the role of leadership in facilitating and sustaining integrative policing partnerships in Canada by examining the collective experience of ten senior police leaders. As leaders involved in the integrative process, you have been specifically selected to represent a national and cross-section of police organizations in Canada.

As a result of my consultation with Superintendent Marianne Ryan, I believe that you will be able to make a valuable contribution to this research by sharing your experiences and perspectives on the issue of creating and sustaining integrative, collaborative partnerships among police organizations.

If you agree to participate, I will make arrangements to either attend your jurisdiction to interview you or to make the appropriate arrangements to interview you via video conferencing. I anticipate that interview will take approximately one and a half (1½) hours of your time. Participation in this research is completely voluntary and confidential. You may choose not to participate or withdraw at any point during the research. Not only am I required to protect your confidentiality as a result of ethical guidelines set out by Royal Roads University but I am also required to ensure your confidentiality by ethical standards set out by the research community as a whole.

You will be asked to sign a consent form prior to being interviewed. With your permission I will be asking to audio record the interview or video/audio record the video conference. If you do not wish to have the interview recorded, I will be taking notes during the course of the interview. The audio recorded portion of the interview, or the notes, will be

confidentially transcribed and I will forward the transcript to you for review prior to my conducting any analysis of the contents of the interview. In reviewing the transcript, you may, at your discretion, remove any portion of the interview that you wish.

After review of the transcripts, I will analyze the contents and extract any issues and themes relevant to the role of leadership in facilitating and encouraging the integration of police organizations. Once this is done, I will be asking you to review my findings to provide verification that the issues and themes identified are, in fact, an accurate representation of our interview.

Once you have agreed to participate, I will forward you a copy of the interview questions. If there is any question or questions that you do not wish to discuss, for any reason, you may decline the question in advance and it will not form part of the interview and data analysis process.

I appreciate your consideration for participation in this research project. If you have any questions, or require any additional information, please feel free to contact me directly. I can be reached at work (604) xxx-xxxx from 07:00 to 17:00 hours, PST, Tuesday to Friday or at home (604) xxx-xxxx, evening and weekends. I can also be reached by cell phone (604) xxx-xxxx at any time. My email addresses are xx@xxxx and xx@xxx (primary contact).

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours truly,

Sandro Colasacco

APPENDIX B:

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

The Role of Leadership in Facilitating and Encouraging the Integration of Police Resources

This project is a twelve (12) month qualitative study exploring the role of leadership in creating, encouraging and sustaining integrative, collaborative relationships among police organizations. Participants are chosen from a national and organizational cross-section of policing on the basis of their relevant experience in the integrative process. This is a scholarly inquiry for the purpose of contributing knowledge to the role of leadership in advancing the integrative policing models in Canada. The research findings will be presented in a major project thesis report. The research is being sponsored by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Please read the following carefully and sign if you give your consent to participate in this research study, which will follow the method described below:

- You will be interviewed in a personal interview that will take approximately ninety (90) minutes in duration. All interviews will be recorded through written notes and audio (and possibly video) recording. All audio recordings will be transcribed by a qualified research transcriptionist.
- You have the right to ask that the audio/video recording be turned off at any time during the interview, or to delete the any or all the transcripts at a later date, without being asked for your reasons.
- All interview data and conversations will be kept entirely confidential by the researcher. You will be identified through the research notes and interview by a pseudonym. All identifying characteristics linking you to the research data will be removed from the final report.
- All data will be stored in a secure location, inaccessible from the general public. All notes, tapes, transcripts and documents containing your real name will be destroyed at the conclusion of the research project.
- You will be offered the opportunity to review and verify the transcript created as a result of the recording of your interview. You will also have the opportunity to review and verify the issues and themes derived from the data.

- No deception will ever be used at any time during this study, and the researcher will endeavour to ensure that no harm of any kind will come to you as a result of your participation in this research study. There will be no monetary compensation to you for participating in this study. However, a copy of the major project thesis report will be made available to you.
- At the conclusion of this research study, the final major project thesis report will be housed at Royal Roads University and will be available upon request.

Your signature indicates that you understand to your satisfaction the nature of your participation in this research study and that you agree to participate. In no way does this waive your legal rights at any time in this study.

Participant

Date

Witness

Date

Please feel free to contact the researcher at any time if you require any further information regarding any matters in this research study.

Sergeant Sandro Colasacco
address xxxxxx
E-mail: xx@xx or xx@xx
Office Tel. (604) xxx-xxxx or Home Tel. (604) xxx-xxxx

This study has been designed to comply with the ethical guidelines for research regulated by Royal Roads University, Victoria, British Columbia. If you have any questions regarding the ethical procedures governing this research, you may contact Dr. Wendy Rowe, Faculty Coordinator, Major Projects Royal Roads University. E-mail at xx@xxx or telephone (604) xxx-xxxx.

A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

APPENDIX C:

MAJOR PROJECT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Leadership:

1. What leadership traits are required by a senior police leader to effectively create and nurture integrative relationships (collaborative partnerships)?
2. What are the prerequisites required for you to lead your organization into an integrative, collaborative partnership with one or more police agencies?
3. Once in this relationship, what expectations must continue to exist for you to continue to participate in the integrative process?
4. How does a leader nurture the partnerships developed as a result of the creation of an integrated policing model?
5. Do you consider integrative policing to be a long term policing model in Canada or just another passing policing model? Why or why not?

Organizational Culture:

1. To what extent do you believe that leaders affect the organizational culture of an organization?
 - a. How do they influence this process?
2. Do you believe that different police organizational cultures can come together to create effective integrative units?
 - a. If yes, explain how this can be achieved?
 - b. If no, explain why not?
3. How does a leader facilitate the integration of competing organizational cultures?
4. How comfortable are you with integrative partnerships whereby the policy and operational guidelines being used to govern the unit is not the policy and operational guidelines of your police organization? Please explain why or why not?
5. Do you believe that there is the danger that integrated silos will be created whereby the new integrated units will revert to the old habits of not sharing information or working cooperatively? Why or why not?

Systems Thinking:

1. What is more important to you, the suppression of crime within your own geographical police jurisdiction or enforcement actions in a larger regional, provincial or national context? Why?
2. What do you believe are the factors that contribute to the “turf” warfare that is common amongst police organizations?
3. How can “turf” warfare be eliminated from the relationship between most police organizations?
4. Is the integrative process beneficial to your organization?
 - a. Why and how?
5. Is the integrative process detrimental to your organization?

- a. Why and how?
6. For the sake of the integrative process, would you be prepared to set aside the needs of your organization if circumstances required such a concession on your part?
Please include in your response considerations such as:
 - a. The retention of your resources within integrative units when they would be better deployed elsewhere in your organization.
 - b. The retention of your resources within integrative units when the strategic and tactical objectives are not consistent with the strategic and tactical objectives of your organization.

Trust:

1. Do you agree or disagree with the statement that the erosion of trust among police organizations is one of the biggest problems facing police leaders in Canada today?
 - a. Why do you agree or disagree with this statement?
2. If you agree with this statement, how does a leader overcome the ongoing erosion of trust often underlying the relationships between different police organizations now expected to work cooperatively?

Communication:

1. How would you describe the communication process that is required to create, sustain and enhance the integrative process?
2. Do you believe that collaborative solutions are possible – that is situations that are “win-win” for all the participants?
 - a. If so, what conditions must exist for this to occur?
 - b. If not, why do you not believe that collaborative solutions are possible?

What, in your experience, has been your greatest leadership challenge during the integrative process?

APPENDIX D:

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEWS

Date

Dear -----

I have now finished my research interviews and I have completed my review of our interview. I am sending the interview as an attachment to this message.

After having your interview transcribed, I highlighted some areas of text and made hand written notes in the left margin and in some cases, within the document itself. I had this document converted into an Adobe document and I am sending the transcribed interview to you for your review.

If you could look through the interview and confirm that my interpretation of the themes is in agreement with you your own, this will serve to validate my findings. If you think that I have misinterpreted any of your comments, or if you would like to enlarge upon or clarify some area, please feel free to send me your comments. If all is in order, then please send me a quick message indicating that as well so that I may retain it for my records.

As previously noted in the ethics consent form that we signed, you are free to delete any portion of this interview without question. If you do chose to delete any portion of the interview, please indicate in your e-mail message which portion you would like to delete.

If you have any questions or concerns, do not hesitate to phone me. Thank you again for your assistance and contribution to this research project. It would not have been possible without you. I look forward to you hearing from you soon.

Sandro Colasacco
(604) xxx-xxxx (Work)
(604) xxx-xxxx (Cell)
(604) xxx-xxxx (Home)
email: xx@xxx