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Abstract

Community safety partnerships are becoming an important part of policing and crime prevention in Canada. These types of partnerships have long existed. However, with recent pressures on police services to respond to more complex social issues, alongside scrutiny of policing budgets, increasing attention is being paid to partnership creation. Much has been written about community safety partnerships. This literature, however, largely ignores the transactional phase of partnership-making. This phase is important for understanding how community safety partnerships emerge, develop and sustain themselves. Furthermore, little is written on the Canadian context, despite significant differences in Canadian police organizations and communities compared to the United Kingdom and the United States. The current study seeks to examine the community safety partnership making process through an event perspective. Findings from this study have implications for theories of partnerships, as well as practical implications for partnership making and the organizational structure of policing in Canada.
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Chapter 1.

Introduction

Over the past decade in Canada, increasing attention has been devoted to community safety partnerships (CSPs). In fact, a number of high profile initiatives have garnered widespread attention and have been adopted in various jurisdictions across the country. These initiatives have attempted to offer a holistic approach to addressing numerous social and criminal issues including domestic violence, drug use and poverty, while reducing reactive policing measures. At the same time, a lot of attention has been paid to the political and policy implications of these initiatives (Public Safety Canada, 2013; Public Safety Canada, 2015; Public Safety Canada, 2007). However, there has been little research into how CSPs are created or how they operate. This study seeks to fill the existing gap in our understanding of CSPs by examining the micro-level interactions of partnership making.

CSPs\(^1\) became a popular way of addressing community safety issues in Canada as a result of a number of factors. Several commentators have pointed out the increasing costs of policing, particularly to municipalities, despite significant declines in crime rates (Lepreucht, 2014; Di Mateo, 2014). Furthermore, policing agencies in Canada are experiencing increasing demands on their resources as social service budgets and other government supports are cut or scaled back. Calls for service to address mental health-related incidents, addictions, poverty, homelessness etc. have also contributed to steadily increasing policing costs (Coleman & Cotton, 2010). At the same time, the police in Canada are often ill-prepared to deal appropriately with these types of incidents, lacking the expertise or training required (Council of Canadian Academies, 2014). They also typically lack the resources to be proactive in responding to social issues, given that much of their resources are devoted to reactive policing including responding to calls for service, completing investigations and providing other support services (Bayley, 1996). Furthermore, some critics have argued that reactive

---

1 CSPs are defined here as the geographically constrained cooperation of several organizations (including the police), addressing local safety issues as defined by local experts and those affected. This definition will be further interrogated in Chapter Two.
policing is the least appropriate response to these types of social issues with much more effective solutions available to communities.

In response, police agencies are increasingly entering into partnerships with local community and social service agencies to meet demands related to social and health issues. These agencies can sometimes provide complimentary expertise and skills to reduce and prevent crime as well as respond to community needs (Council of Canadian Academies, 2014). However, these partnerships can themselves result in various problems since there is no uniformity in how they are structured, and little consistency in how they operate or are managed including who should be in charge (Rosenbaum, 2002). It is perhaps not surprising then, that many police services can provide a list of so-called “partners,” but few are able to provide evidence of genuine collaboration among those involved (Gorisi, 2001).

The literature on the issue of community safety partnerships in policing focuses on two main themes: i) the consequences of neoliberal downloading of responsibility onto the local level, and ii) practical questions related to the factors that contribute to the success or failure of these partnerships. While both of these themes are important, neither focuses specifically on the processes required to develop, implement, or maintain such partnerships. It is critical for both practitioners and academics to understand these processes, however, because of the potential they have for achieving common goals and outcomes related to community safety. The processes underlying CSPs can also provide community-level actors (individuals, groups, community organizations, etc.) important opportunities for enhancing democratic participation and engagement in activities that can enhance the safety and well-being of their communities.

While many observers note the potential benefits of CSPs, critics point to the lack of representation and participation by certain groups in the population (Backstrand, 2006). These critics argue that while police and community partnerships appear to offer opportunities for greater democratic decision-making, in the end, they can actually result

---

2 Community agencies have emerged and reflect the people in communities and their interests. Social service agencies providing various services to local communities. Social service agencies in effect have their own mandate and agendas and are often in competition with the police over resources and clients (Lowndes & Skelcher, 1998). However, both agencies partner with the police.
in less democracy as decision-making becomes increasingly centralized and responsibility for non-crime social issues gets shifted onto community partners (Crawford 1997; Edwards & Benyon, 2000).

The literature based on an administrative approach to community safety partnerships rarely includes discussions of the power dynamics at play or the pitfalls of the partnership process. Instead, they explain the need to address diversity, establish trust, and consider group operations and style (McCarthy & O’Neill, 2014). They also fail to discuss the assumptions built into partnership creation such as the possibilities and benefits of merging expertise and their potential for success based on the fact that they focus on the social causes of crime and disorder (Jacobs, 2010).

A more nuanced explanation that addresses the process of partnering, and the role and agency of the actors involved would address these shortcomings. The purpose of this study is to understand what brings community safety partners together, in time and space, to engage in partnership making; what happens during the partnership making process; and what these partnerships mean for communities and policing in the 21st century.

It has been long argued that to truly understand and explain social phenomena, an integrated theoretical approach is necessary (Ritzer, 1990). However, several attempts at achieving integration focus on assimilating theories. Doing so, often fails to acknowledge the incompatible assumptions upon which these theories are built. Additionally, these attempts often over emphasize one theoretical concept while claiming a balanced approach (Munch & Smelser, 1987). Ritzer (1990) argues that integration should focus on theoretical levels (e.g. macro vs micro), rather than attempting to assimilate theories that differ in their basic assumptions or emphasizing one theoretical level above another. He goes on to explain that doing so would involve a conceptual framework along a micro-macro continuum (Ritzer, 1990). I would argue that a particular, overarching perspective is necessary when combining theoretical positions and attempting to account for social phenomena in an integrated way.

In this study, I offer a holistic theory of community safety partnerships through an event perspective. Event models have become increasingly popular in several areas, particularly criminology, as they allow the researcher to describe and explain social
phenomena within a particular space and time (Hodgkinson, 2011; Ganpat et al. 2013; Gilmour, 2014; Parker, 2017; Hopkins & Chivers, 2017). For example, Sacco and Kennedy (2010) explain crime as an event through three stages: precursors, transactions, and aftermath. The precursors of the event include the structural and social factors that exist prior to the crime that influence who comes together in space and time. The transaction includes the exchanges or interactions between the actors, or the situational context, during the commission of the crime. Finally, the aftermath refers to events that occur after the crime has been committed, including the impact or consequences of the crime for those involved, the involvement of the criminal justice system, and the impact of the crime on the broader community (Sacco & Kennedy, 2010).

In the case of CSPs, the event perspective allows for a multi-level engagement with what has largely been a macro-theoretical, political economy approach to explaining partnerships. As discussed, theoretical explanations of CSPs focus almost exclusively on the precursors – the impact of top down policies such as neoliberal attempts to download responsibility onto communities. However, by examining the transactions of these partnerships and their aftermath, the meso and micro levels of theoretical explanation can be elicited. Including a focus on these levels of analysis is important because it will allow us to better understand how social actors react to or resist external forces and pressure including policing policies and practices.

Micro-sociological theories such as Collin’s (2008) situational analysis attempt to understand ground level interactions. Collins (2008) argues that situations are a series of conditions and turning points upon which actors can change and alter their behaviour in response to the presented context. He points out that the researcher must not only place these interactions at the centre of the analysis, but also compare and contrast these interactions across different kinds of situational contexts. However, social constructionists suggest that these observed interactions are not to be taken as objective reality (Best, 2008). Rather, they claim that all knowledge is subjective. Thus, the meanings of these interactions are created and recreated based on the constructed realities of those involved and the new realities they construct together.

A more nuanced understanding of the process level explanations for CSPs in the Canadian context would benefit from the incorporation of these two theoretical
approaches: situational analysis under a social constructionist perspective. Doing so utilizes Ritzer’s (1990) proposal for a macro-micro continuum. Thus, in Chapter Two, I review the macro-level explanations of CSPs that are currently dominant in the literature. Though I have spoken about them briefly here, I expand on the two major research themes, political economy and neoliberalism, as well as administrative criminology and evaluation research. I conclude this discussion by acknowledging the gaps in the macro level of analysis and the need for the proposed integrated approach.

In Chapter Three, I outline the methodology of how to research the questions that emerge from the current macro-theoretical approach and the specific steps I took to do so. I offer my ontological and epistemological assumptions, explaining how these guide a largely situated and context specific analysis with comparisons across case studies and across several locations.

In Chapter Four, I provide a detailed summary of the extensive qualitative findings from the research undertaken for this study. I do so by using a themed analysis, so that the learnings from the data are organized and presented in a systematic way. I offer no explanation for these themes in the findings chapter, in order to provide an objective as possible analysis of the experiences and meaning making of the participants. However, in the following chapter (Chapter Five), I resume using an event model framework to discuss how the themes outlined in the findings chapter fit into a macro-micro continuum that better addresses the transactions event.

In the final chapter, I consider the aftermath of the partnership making event and the future of CSPs in Canada. I offer some conclusions regarding the understanding of CSPs within the event model and discuss the implications for policy. I also discuss some limitations of the current study and future directions for research in this area with a specific focus on guidance for practitioners.
Chapter 2.

Literature Review

Introduction

Public policing in Canada has garnered a great deal of attention over the past decade. This is based on two main concerns. First, the cost of policing has been growing steadily since the 1950s. This concern has been heightened during a period of fiscal restraint (e.g., 2008) and a downloading of social service issues onto police (e.g., mental health). Second, the public police are dealing with a number of issues related to legitimacy, responsivity and accountability. In Canada specifically, this relates to issues such as carding and street checks (Morrow & White, 2015) that have called into question the objectivity and racial neutrality of the police. Additionally, there is a larger narrative of anxiety around police use of (deadly) force across North America (CBC News, 2015; Wright et al., 2014 Canadian Press, 2013; Morales, 2013). These issues are creating demands for greater public oversight and accountability of, while potentially resulting in calls for less reliance on, the police.

In Canada, these concerns were highlighted under the “Economics of Policing” initiative that emphasized New Public Management measures focusing on efficiency and effectiveness (Butterfield et al. 2004; Public Safety Canada, 2013). These measures included changes to governance, with increasing attention being placed on police partnerships with community agencies. Public Safety Canada informally mandated these collaborations in the outcomes of their economics of policing conferences and in the funding structures they were supporting (Public Safety Canada, 2013). However, these initiatives neither acknowledge the number of partnerships that already existed between the police and community agencies, nor did they outline what these partnerships should look like or how they would be funded.

______________________________

3 The public police are publicly funded by different levels of government. They differ from the private police, who are usually funded privately for purposes of security. While the public police are the focus of this dissertation, it is important to note that private policing in Canada is expanding exponentially and their relationships with community agencies should be explored in future research (Rigakos, 2002; Sarre, 2005)
If we understand partnership making as an event, as outlined in Chapter One, then the literature on community partnerships offers a lot of guidance on the precursors to partnership making, but not the transaction or the aftermath. Two schools of thought exist within this macro-level theorizing. One school takes an administrative approach by examining the potential of partnerships for increasing police efficiency and effectiveness, noting benefits and lack of uptake with the community policing model (Fielding & Innes, 2006). This part of the research will sometimes provide case studies of successful police partnerships or offer learnings from the business literature on factors leading to success, but it does not examine these on the micro-scale or critically question structures of power and control. However, this body of literature does mention some of the themes of a transaction like trust building and how partners meet and work together but fails to provide any specifics on how to achieve these goals.

The other school of thought proceeds from a political economy approach and critiques the creation of partnerships for downloading responsibility for crime and community safety from the government and social services onto the community and the poor and marginalized (Goddard, 2012). Partnerships in this context are seen as a way of responsibilizing communities for their safety problems while reducing the role of the state in this area. However, governments and policies are not authoritarian and do not simply dictate social behaviour. They provide opportunities for local citizens to act and react. Thus, while this school of thought may be able to explain why some actors come together in time and space to form partnerships, it offers little understanding of the transactional phases of partnership making and how actors actively engage and navigate these relationships.

Some researchers claim that multi-service collaboration promises to challenge the status quo by reassigning funding to systemic prevention (Huddart, 2010). However, the literature in this area does not outline specifically how this occurs. Furthermore, there is no thorough examination of the transaction that could illuminate the micro-sociological processes at play and create a more holistic understanding of partnership making.

The following literature review provides an overview of the current state of CSPs in Canada, as well as a review of Canadian and international research that sets the stage for interrogating the transactions and aftermath of the partnership making event.
Community safety partnerships in Canada

Research on community safety partnerships (CSPs) in Canada dates back to the late 1980s. The first significant multi-agency community-safety partnerships were developed at the Montreal (1989) and Paris (1991) Conference of Mayors and by the Horner Committee in Canada in 1993 (EFUS, 1991; Vanderschueren, 1998; Hodgkinson & Farrell, 2018). These developments led to an important commitment to violence reduction and crime prevention in numerous developed countries. In Canada, the city of Montreal and the Waterloo Regional Municipality were among the first cities to establish multi-sectoral (although not specifically policing) strategies. Furthermore, the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention, through the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC), funded partnership projects as well (Public Safety Canada, 2007). In 2006, fourteen cities across Canada came together under the Institute for the Prevention of Crime (IPC) at the University of Ottawa to create the Municipal Network for the Crime Prevention (IPC 2007). Here, municipal leaders discussed the current state of crime prevention and compared this with their own municipal strategies to identify areas for change and improvement (IPC, 2008). The Municipal Network then developed guidelines to improve safety and prevent crime. The principles underlying these guidelines included the proper and effective use of knowledge and data, public engagement, sustainable funding, prioritizing local level issues, and establishing responsibility centres at the municipal, provincial, and federal government levels (IPC, 2009). In recent years, the Canadian Municipal Network for the Prevention of Crime (CMNCP) has taken these efforts further to gain municipal commitments to investing in crime prevention and emphasizing the importance of multi-sectoral collaborations (CMNCP, 2016).

In policing, the Hub and Centre of Responsibility (COR) models emerged at the same time as the Municipal Network was growing and guiding crime prevention (McFee & Taylor, 2014). The Hub and COR were a result of initiatives promoted by Dale McFee who at the time was the Chief of Police for Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. In 2010, McFee went to Glasgow, Scotland to learn about their multi-sectoral strategy, particularly their

---

4 While NCPC has provided some seed funding for partnerships, their funding model does not support the kinds of community safety partnerships described herein. Furthermore, their funding is often short term, unidimensional and does not offer a sustainable source for long term initiatives.
violence reduction unit (McFee & Taylor, 2014). The Scottish Violence Reduction Unit focused primarily on risk factors, bringing together developmental criminology, multi-sectoral partnerships, and implementation and evaluation strategies that are very closely aligned with the guidelines for violence prevention adopted by the European Forum for Urban Safety, WHO, and Habitat (Carnochan & McCluskey, 2011; WHO 2016).

At the time, Saskatchewan had a growing youth population, and alcohol and drug-related social issues, both of which contributed to high crime rates. In order to deal with these issues more effectively, McFee set up the Hub and the COR in Prince Albert, Canada. The Hub is a community safety model, rather than a policing model. Front line workers from several social service agencies meet twice a week for 1.5 hours to discuss issues in the community (McFee & Taylor, 2014). The COR is made up of stakeholders from police and other participating agencies to help research local problems, liaise with resource providers, and organize community solutions (SASKBPRC, 2016).

The police involvement in the Prince Albert Hub and COR initiative differed greatly from the traditional expectations of the police response to crime (Reiner, 2010), because they were now a partner in evidence-based crime prevention strategies (Sherman et al. 1997) and providing sustainable funding (Waller, 2013). However, unlike the Glasgow model, the Hub, developed in Saskatchewan was not based on diagnosis. Rather, it was designed to shift police case work to those who were more equipped to deal with specific social and health-related issues. Redirection happened at the peril of the social services that had to respond to police caseloads without any financial support - a finding quite similar to the UK experience with police partnerships. This issue will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

Though the Hub is described as following WHO and Habitat strategies, in practice it focuses mainly on tertiary prevention, as its main focus is diversion. As an accepted policing model, its current structure differs from the evidence-based primary and secondary prevention strategies already used in several Canadian cities. Alternatively, the COR portion of the initiative is much closer to the original Glasgow

5 Tertiary prevention is a type of crime prevention after a crime has occurred to prevent similar future crimes (Sutton et al. 2013).
collaborative and multi-sectoral prevention strategy based on WHO and Habitat guidelines since it focuses on developing collaborative prevention strategies.

The creation of the Hub and COR, and the CMNCP have encouraged efforts in Canada to create a guiding ontology related to community safety and well-being, while encouraging thinking about issues of collaboration at a practitioner level, potential shared outcomes that could be generated and ways of moving forward on community safety issues in a consistent way (Nilson, 2018). While these attempts are impressive, they do not address a number of important issues related to partnerships and multi-sector collaborations including engaging with meaning making by the different groups involved. Nor do they examine the micro-situational interactions that underpin these partnerships and how these might contribute to or hinder success. Here, I attempt to set the stage for the need to do just that, by breaking down current conceptions of CSPs, their theoretical underpinnings and the sociological and criminological concepts that could move these ideas forward.

**Defining community safety partnerships**

Attempting to define CSPs is a difficult task. In the community safety partnership\(^6\) literature, there are numerous terms for similar, but distinct, concepts. These terms include public safety, crime prevention, multi-agency collaboration and integral security. Their meanings often differ based on the local context in which they are defined (Edward & Hughes, 2012). For example, the UN-Habitat defines partnerships as the collaboration between municipal authorities, the private sector, the criminal justice system including the police, and social service and justice organizations (Vanderschueren, 1998). This definition, while extensive, does little in the way of defining what exactly these partnerships do and how they operate in different contexts.

CSPs should also be distinguished from community policing. Community policing is a philosophy and overall strategy of how a police service should be run focussing specifically on how the police should work with community members in identifying and resolving community safety issues (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997). Community-safety partnerships, on the other hand, can be a strategy used in community policing and

---

\(^6\) For the purposes of this study, partnerships and collaboration will be used interchangeably.
problem-oriented policing but are often more crime prevention focused and do not require the police to be the locus of control (Saville, 2013). In this regard, many definitions of community safety focus on community policing and put the police at the centre of the partnership (Myhill, 2006). Bradley et al., (1986) claim that a definition of partnerships that centres on the police as the leader in crime prevention will maintain the status quo with the police as the key experts in crime prevention while ignoring the transcendent potential of community agencies and members as the local experts. Saville (2013) argues that power should be redistributed and community actors need to be the leaders of change in order to make crime prevention partnerships sustainable. These are important issues to keep in mind when attempting to understand CSPs. Furthermore, CSPs involve several distinct concepts such as community, community safety, and partnerships that require further consideration.

Partnerships

There is no one definition of ‘partnerships’ however the concept generally pertains to a “cooperative relationship between two or more organizations to achieve some common goal” (Rosenbaum, 2002, 172). Rosenbaum (2002), postulates that any theory of partnerships should not only acknowledge the dynamics between partners, but it should also break down the strategies of intervention, such as which problem(s) is being addressed, in which domains, by which groups, and in what ways. It is important to define partnerships in terms of community safety in the Canadian context and also the process by which these partnerships are created and operate.

Additionally, Walters (1996) defines partnerships as the “networking of agency expertise, collaborating ideas, involving the community in decision making and management” (p. 76). In the context of Canadian partnerships, Jamieson and colleagues (2002) define partnerships simply as a way of working together. They developed a typology of crime prevention partnerships that includes consultative, cooperative, coordinated, collaborative and co-created. In this typology, the level of engagement increases as you move forward along a continuum from consultative to co-created. Amalgamating these concepts and acknowledging the benefits of a definition that emphasizes process, partnerships are defined here as:
the cooperation of several individuals, groups or organizations, including the police, other justice and public sector organizations, private sector organizations, local community organizations and community residents to co-create initiatives to reduce crime and enhance community safety.

Community safety

To define community safety, I must first define community. The term “community” has had a number of different connotations over the years (Seagrave, 1996). In 1982, Hillery located over ninety definitions leading many to claim the term had become meaningless (Seagrave, 1996). However, several writers continue to lament the loss of this vaguely defined community (Wilson & Kelling, 1982; McKnight, 1995; Putnam, 2000; Sarkissian, 2012), supporting the need to create an accepted definition. Some authors have critiqued the political use and abuse of community to elicit positive public response in neoliberal policy initiatives (Cohen, 1985; Gilling, 2001; Shaw, 2007; Kelly & Caputo, 2011). However, practitioners and policy makers require a tangible definition to establish boundaries of responsibility. As such, for the purposes of this study, the community is defined as a geographically constrained area, also known as a neighbourhood (Jenks & Dempsey, 2007), that includes all residents, participants and organizations in that space (Wellman & Leighton, 1979; Kelly & Caputo, 2011). This definition embraces the diversity of the community, acknowledging numerous stakeholders including marginalized groups such as the ethnic, young, and underclass (Young, 1998; Wilson, 1989). It is from this place that I begin to define community safety.

Community safety, like other similar terms such as “crime reduction” or “community well-being,” generally continues to be understood as a strategy of crime prevention (Ekblom, 1994). In fact, Squires (1999) notes that one of the earliest publications referencing community safety is from the British Government as they attempted to shift the narrative from responsibilizing the government and the police for “crime prevention” to a wider network that included the community through “community safety” language. They claimed that community safety is influenced by a number of social structures that could be addressed as the wider community (Morgan, 1991).

7 However, as transportation and technology improve the geographical boundaries of community are more fluid and new communities emerge online and around intellectual or social commonalities (Kelly & Caputo, 2011; Florida, 2014). This is important to keep in mind as crime issues move to cyberspace as well.
Today, the concept has spread beyond the United Kingdom and numerous definitions of community safety exist, many of which emerged out of the public health literature. For example, the World Health Organization defines community safety as community-led prevention of injury, violence against the self or others, and natural disasters (WHO, 2006). The United Nations defines community safety (or community security) as freedom from fear and want for both the individual and the group (UNDP, 2009). In the Canadian context, the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime defines community safety as the mutual tolerance and respect of numerous groups in a community with the intention of creating quality of life for all community members (ICPC, 2010). Each of these organizations emphasizes the need for numerous stakeholders to participate and partner in order to make community safety a reality.

These definitions are useful in providing some insight for understanding what community safety means. However, further questions exist regarding the specific goals of community safety, the prevention strategies to be used and a way to measure and assess outcomes (Ekblom & Pease, 1995). The Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (2017) attempted to address some of these concerns by offering a more detailed and encompassing definition of both community safety and well-being stating:

The ideal state of a sustainable community [is one] where everyone is safe, has a sense of belonging, opportunities to participate, and where individuals and families are able to meet their needs for education, health care, food, housing, income, and social and cultural expression. (p.54)

While this definition offers a number of indicators to be measured (The Canadian Index of Well-Being at the University of Waterloo is an excellent example of this work), it does not critically examine how community safety is done in practice and what it means for the different types of stakeholders involved.

Gilling (2001) takes a more critical approach and defines community safety as a social construction within international policy development. He claims that when practitioners, policy makers, and academics actually define community safety in their work, because they rarely do, they tend to provide five particular types of definitions. These include a response to fear of crime or risk, something that is the direct
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8 https://uwaterloo.ca/canadian-index-wellbeing/
responsibility of the criminal justice system, concepts that envision a possible well-ordered society, definitions that focus responsibility on partnerships, and those who treat community safety as a combined effort of crime prevention measures (Gilling, 2001). He claims that definitions of community safety are often normative and can “other” particular marginalized groups. Never is this more evident than when it is used to support zero tolerance tactics that focus solely on low level social incivilities and only work to further marginalize the underclass (Kelling & Coles, 1997; Wilson, 1987), while ignoring much more heinous corporate crimes (Gilling, 2001; Snider, 1993).

If we accept that community safety is a social construction (Gilling, 2001), then perhaps it should be the specific community of interest that is responsible for defining which safety concerns matter most, rather than those who are in a position of political power. This can be done by eliciting local knowledge to address local issues (Mosca & Spicer, 2008; Sarkissian, 2012; Stringer 2013). Local issues cannot always be captured through a survey, as survey questions are rarely designed by local experts (Davis & Wagner, 2003). Local councils, regional organizations and search conferences⁹ are all ways in which to elicit local knowledge and definitions around safety (Leighton, 1991; Morley & Trist, 1993). These methods are often avoided as consensus is not simple (Gorisi, 2001). However, consensus is also not always desirable as it can lead to new issues to address (Crawford & Jones 1995). If community members are able to create their own definition of safety, in partnership with policy makers and the criminal justice system, they are more likely to take ownership of that safety and work with partners to achieve it (Perkins et al. 1990; Saville, 2009). Based on this analysis, I do not offer a specific definition of community safety partnerships but allow the participants to create meaning around the concept as it pertains to their experience of partnership making.

The study of community partnerships

The push for CSPs in Canada largely emerged out of two changes. The first change was the downloading of responsibility for many social issues from higher levels of
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⁹ The participants of a search conference are usually representatives of organizations who would be interested in the outcome of the conference. The search conference consists of four stages, scanning, vision, constraints and opportunities, and planning. Thus, participants scan the current environment, envision a better environment, discuss the constraints and opportunities around achieving that vision and then begin to plan and make that vision a reality. Because all actors are involved in the process, they are committed to the outcome.
government to the local level (Lithopolous & Rigakos, 2005; FCM, 2007). This push was
due in part to the apparent inability of the criminal justice system to reduce burgeoning
crime rates in the 1980s and early 1990s and the lack of evidentiary support for reactive
policing approaches (Shaw, 2001; Sherman et al. 1997). Different levels of Canadian
government began to create strategic plans on preventing crime and reducing violence
(Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, 2008; Toronto Police Service,
2017). The emphasis on CSPs can also be seen as one of a host of strategies
introduced by neoliberal governments that have come to be known as the New Public
Management. The rise and impact of neoliberalism is explored in greater detail later in
this chapter.

The second change that affected CSPs emerged out of a demand for more
holistic, system wide approaches to crime and its control that included a growing
recognition that complex crime and community safety issues are not easily or effectively
dealt with in silos. These demands emphasized a coordinated and integrated approach
including a certain level of measurement and evaluation to guide action (Rosenbaum,
2002; Sherman et al. 1997). Integrated approaches are, in large part, a result of a
growing movement towards evidence-based policy and prevention tactics (Welsh &
Farrington, 2007; Waller, 2013).

These two developments created a dichotomy in the partnership literature. Some
social theorists, particularly those from the UK, viewed partnerships with suspicion: a
product of neoliberal tactics and cost-cutting aimed at increasing the ability of the state
to exercise control over local police agencies and populations (Hughes, 2013). This is
not surprising considering the largely superficial partnerships created in the UK as a
result of the Crime and Disorder Act that was introduced in 1998. Other theorists saw
partnerships as the way forward including the building of evidence-based and effective
crime prevention programs and promoting the benefits of community policing practices.
Partnerships such as the Scottish Violence Reduction Unit (Carnochan & McCluskey,
2011), the Kirkholt Project (Pease, 1991), the Winnipeg Auto Theft Suppression Strategy
(Linden & Chaturvedi, 2005) and the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council
(Janhevich et al. 2008) are examples of how sustainable funding, coupled with
appropriately chosen partners, can lead to a decline in various types of crime and
positive improvements in community safety (Rosenbaum, 2002). However, these
success stories alone do not contradict the critiques directed at CSPs. The following
section discusses the literature that is critical of CSPs as part of the New Public Management’s neoliberal tactics to reduce public spending.

**Political economy and neoliberalism**

After World War Two, the entrenchment and expansion of the Keynesian Welfare State lead to significant increases in public spending in Canada and many other western democracies (Kelly & Caputo, 2011). However, by the early 1970s, a variety of factors including high interest rates, growing labour unrest, increasing inflation and huge government debt resulted in fiscal crises for many western states. The skyrocketing inflation rates and mounting national debt made the conservative political approach, promoted by political leaders like Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, very appealing to the general population at the time. As a result, many western democracies embarked on a slow, but steady, shift to neo-conservatism and eventually towards neoliberalism (Volsho & Kelly, 2012; Kotz, 2015).

Neoliberalism is a political philosophy that emphasizes free markets, deregulation and minimizing the role of the state, including reducing its responsibility for providing social services (Hayek, 1979; Harvey, 2005). It is based on the notion that the market will sort itself out and government intervention misrepresents human needs (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalism has led to a shift from “government” to “governance” in which institutions outside of the state operate independently and interact and organize with numerous stakeholders (van Steden et al. 2011).

Authors such as O’Malley (1997) and Gorisi (2001) have argued that in relation to community safety, neoliberal political and social changes have led to increased demands for police partnerships with the community, as a way to reduce public spending and “responsibilize” citizens, i.e. making the public responsible for meeting crime and community safety needs that were previously the domain of the state. The potential challenges of responsibilization for poor and marginalized communities are considerable, however, as some observers have pointed out, an unintended consequence has been the proliferation of grassroots and community-based initiatives that have given power directly to those involved (Saville, 2009; Rifkin, 2015). The experiences that community groups and individuals have gained has important implications for CSPs given the ability of these actors to be assertive (in the form of
decision-making, etc.) when engaging with criminal justice and other organizations in pursuit of common community safety goals.

One of the challenges for communities is that few programs can succeed without having access to consistent and sustainable public funding (Lelieveldt, 2004; Waller, 2006). Neoliberal politics have stressed budget cuts and the decentralization of responsibility. At the same time, the state seeks to retain control by using various techniques such as controlling funding, requiring increased accountability, and promoting “best practices” selected from those that best reflect the ideology and objectives of the state (Kotz, 2015; Kelly & Caputo, 2011). As well, many neoliberal governments have introduced policies and practices from the for-profit sector into the public sector including performance assessment and incentive schemes (Ilcan, 2009). One consequence of this development has been that citizens are increasingly viewed and treated as clients or customers as opposed to citizens with inherent citizenship rights. The transactional nature of such relationships includes making clients responsible for providing their own public services, including community safety\(^\text{10}\) (Poole, 1997; Rochefort et al. 1998; Ilcan, 2009).

Neoliberal crime control often involves a “fortress mentality” in which safety and security is a commodity available only to those who can afford it, while simultaneously excluding the marginalized and underclasses (Gilling & Barton, 1997; Bauman 2013; Parnaby, 2007). Neoliberal crime control tactics usually involve cutting state funding for crime prevention, identifying prevention as the responsibility of the local community, and shifting the language of crime prevention to “crime reduction” (Kelly et al., 2005). The role of the state is then defined as merely financial or technical (Kelly et al., 2005). Citizens, in turn, are expected to be self-reliant and address their own crime problems, rather than simply relying on the government to provide police protection (O’Malley, 1997).

The result of these policies and practices has been that crime prevention has become a “contested terrain” in a neoliberal context. For example, in some countries, those providing social programs that are no longer funded entitlements as a result of
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\(^{10}\) It is important to note that community actors have always been involved in government social policy making. In a neoliberal world, however, community members become solely responsible for their own safety (Kelly & Caputo, 2011; Rose, 1999; Parnaby, 2007).
budgets cuts to social services have attempted to secure public funds by branding themselves as “crime prevention” programs (e.g. breakfast and afterschool programs for youth, services for women experiencing domestic violence, etc.) (Gilling & Barton, 1997; Kelly & Caputo, 2011). These strategies do not undermine the research supporting social welfare approaches to crime prevention (Gilling & Barton, 1997). Rather, they draw attention to the fact that there is resistance to neoliberal practices such as responsibilization as those working at the local level attempt to pursue their own agendas while managing the strategies deployed by the state (Kelly & Caputo, 2011).

The shift towards neoliberal crime control strategies has led to significant changes in public policy for some countries. For example, in the UK, the Crime and Disorder Act of 1998 required and institutionalized partnerships between the police and community agencies. Under this Act, agencies were brought together to form hundreds of partnerships called Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) to address crime issues (Ellis et al., 2007). The Act was particularly attractive to social welfare agencies that lacked funding and desired to gain legitimacy as contributing to crime prevention (Gilling & Barton, 1997). These agencies began to define their work, however loosely related, as “community safety.” This was rather easy to accomplish as the Home Office provided minimal guidance on how these partnerships should operate and which agency should lead the collaboration (Gilling & Barton, 1997).

Although the structure of the UK partnerships was not prescriptive, the funding applications associated with CDRPs were both restrictive and time consuming. Goddard and Myers (2013) found in their study of community crime prevention projects that many of these programs were subject to audits and benchmarks that failed to measure community-driven successes. Not only did some of these organizations lose valuable hours creating data and outputs, they also shied away from applying for funding that did not exactly describe their mandate, or where they could not produce the data required to qualify for particular grants and their audit procedures. Goddard & Myers (2013) have noted that groups and organizations also felt that their structures were affected by the demands of the governance of the audits, including that the audit requirements restricted their creativity and ignored the complexities of community crime prevention. These audit practices maintained a government-based power dynamic in which community crime prevention partnerships must satisfy particular expectations, even if these expectations are not explicitly formalized in policy (Goldson & Hughes, 2010).
Crime prevention partnerships in Canada differ significantly from those introduced in the UK under the crime and Disorder Act of 1998. For one thing, they are not formally structured even though some government funding streams encourage/require partnership formation as a condition of receiving a grant.\textsuperscript{11} There is no Crime and Disorder Act in Canada nor anything like it. As a result, there has been little research done in Canada regarding crime prevention partnerships beyond a few evaluation reports on partnership programs which focused on their usefulness or potential problems (Jamieson et al. 2002). At the same time, much of the pressure to cut costs and redistribute responsibility related to neoliberal policies also exists in Canada, albeit to a lesser extent because of Canada’s history of support for social welfare programs and services (Lepreucht, 2014; O’Connor et al. 1999). Importantly, few studies have examined the socially constructed nature of these partnerships and the situational context in which the actors involved establish and execute agency.

**Partnerships as evidence-based policy for community safety and well-being**

On the other side of the partnership literature dichotomy, attempts have been made to examine what works and what does not. This has been done to offer practical guidance for those engaging in partnership-making, as well as attempting to measure the success and failure of these partnerships (Nilson, 2018). While much of this research does not examine the finer details of how these partnerships emerge, develop, and operate, they do identify some important common themes (Cornwall, 2008). These themes include power, conflict, sustainability, diversity, trust, organizational structure, and people and relationships. Each of these themes is examined in greater detail below.

**Power**

An important theme in the partnership literature is power. In any partnership there is an inherent power dynamic that exists prior to collaboration (Rosenbaum, 2002). In the case of police partnerships with community groups and organizations, the police already hold a great deal of power, as they generally have more resources than community

\textsuperscript{11} This is the case despite the fact that many funding programs in crime prevention require the applicants to form partnerships to receive funding.
groups. Also, their role is based on legislative authority that includes their ability to exercise force. This authority places the police in a primary position when it comes to dealing with crime problems (Walters, 1996; Sklansky 2008). The historical changes in policing roles and responsibilities (increased professionalization, the move to car-based patrol, the focus on ‘rapid response’, etc.) have reduced the level of contact the police have with the public. The lack of regular contact can impede the ability of the police to establish connections with community actors and engage with them as effective partners (Myhill & Bradford, 2013; Saville, 2013; Rogers & Coliandris 2015; Hendricks et al., 2015).

As a result of the increasing distance between the police and some community actors, the police have lost legitimacy in the eyes of some community groups (Rogers & Coliandris, 2015). For example, a history of police harassment in some communities will require considerable efforts aimed at reconciliation before any discussions of establishing partnerships can begin, even if the harassment is only perceived (Thacher, 2001). The combination of their legislative authority and related policing powers, coupled with the reduced legitimacy of the police, is a potential source of conflict for police – community partnerships. The power dynamic that exists in some communities can dramatically affect the ways in which a partnership is developed, the role the community plays, and the possibility for collaborative and democratic processes to be used.

**Conflict**

Conflict exists in all partnerships in some form or another. This is often a product of the different power structures in each partnership (Coleman et al. 2002); particularly, because the police hold a lot of power and often characterize the community as bothersome activists who complain, rather than help problem-solve (Terpstra, 2008). How this conflict is managed is very important, as it can affect the partnership and lead to sabotaging the group or their efforts (Crawford & Jones 1995; Patterson et al. 2012). Although the police usually have several partnerships with the community, they are not trained specifically to collaborate with the community or deal with conflict in partnership making settings (Crawford & Jones, 1995). For example, Presdee and Walters (1994) found in their study of CSPs that the first year of partnership meetings largely consisted of arguments, lack of involvement, and little progress. However, conflict does not need
to be perceived as negative, as it is often necessary to add to the complexity and creativity of a project (Thacher, 2001; Christie, 1997).

Thacher (2001) addresses conflicting values between police and the community (and within the community itself), by examining several police-community partnerships. He notes that embracing complexity represents an important and useful way to proceed in CSPs since it can enhance the likelihood of success including promoting more democratic processes and genuine collaboration. Communities have a great deal to offer in this respect. The people who live in a community carry the history of an area and the local knowledge that is often lost in current policing strategies that disconnect the police from these communities (Walters, 1996; Jackson et al. 2013). Community-based approaches have been shown to be more effective in the long term because local actors hold a vested interest in the success of the plan (Pease, 1991; Cook & Roehl, 1993; Saville & Cleveland, 1997; Braga et al., 2001).

**Sustainability**

Another concept that emerges in the partnership literature is sustainability, particularly sustaining the partnership. Poole (1997) and Joseph and Ogletree (1998) argue that many partnerships do not last because they fail to properly include the community; they do not know the community or engage its assets. These partnerships also require sustainable resources that are not controlled by the funding provider (Hirschfield et al., 2013). As previously discussed, this was clear in how transformative crime audits in the UK were for crime prevention partnerships (Gilling & Barton, 2005). Kelly et al. (2005) also found that for the partnership to be sustainable, the community must be defined fluidly. Thus, in exploring the process of creating and sustaining these partnerships, we must also consider the ways in which the community is defined by those involved in the partnership. Careful management of the partnership, once established, is considered paramount (Walters, 1996), however specific management guidelines have yet to be offered.

**Diversity**

Diversity is also a concern in the partnership literature. It is often difficult to determine who should be included and to what extent (Kelly et al., 2005). The more diverse the
group, the more problems that may arise, and the more difficult it may be to manage (Rochefort et al., 1998). Certain groups are often marginalized and this can shape how community safety is defined (Kelly et al., 2005). There are also gender assumptions, with female stakeholders, including police officers, often expected to be better at partnership making. This not only removes male voices but can also cause male counterparts to not take the work of the partnership as seriously (O’Neill & McCarthy, 2014).

Different community groups can have different ideas about what crime prevention means. It is important to acknowledge that the community is heterogeneous and represents many viewpoints and needs (Durkheim, 1960; Walters, 1996). Furthermore, these partnerships tend to only include the “good” community partners (as defined by the state funding agency) who should be involved (Kelly & Caputo, 2011). This ignores the potential contributions of the “bad” people in the community (those supposedly causing the problems) and the “stranger”, the unknown partner who is not easily identified (Bauman, 1988).

Additionally, when partners are included largely for political reasons, such as name or position, rather than because of their sincere interest in change, they tend to not only cause conflict, but leave the partnership early (Walters, 1996). In both cases, poor collaboration practices act to marginalize and isolate voices from the crime prevention discussion and contribute to inequalities in partnerships. Authors such as Gilling (1994) and Liddle and Gelsthoepe (1994) argue that sustainability requires inclusion of relevant partners, as well as making serious attempts to include the supposed “bad” partners and the “strangers.”

**Trust**

The concept of trust emerges throughout the community safety partnership literature, both directly and indirectly. Researchers argue that it is often imperative to have the trust of the community to be able to engage in any significant intervention with the necessary populations (Goddard & Myers, 2013). But trust is not limited to the community trust in the police. Trust is often understood by consistently showing up, by committing to make the partnership work, by actively attempting to understand other organizational cultures and respecting them, and by spending time together (Sarkissian, 2012). Sloan and
Oliver (2013) found in their longitudinal study of one partnership that “critical emotional incidents” (p. 11) affected the development of the partnership, specifically that of trust. How participants managed particularly tense or highly emotional moments affected the long-term success of the partnership. These incidents were understood as turning points in the partnership development process (Sloan & Oliver, 2013). However, if work is being done informally and certain groups are not included in decision-making, other tensions can emerge (Crawford & Jones, 1995; O’Neill & McCarthy, 2014).

Organizational structure

The organizational structure of a partnership is also important when developing partnerships. Presdee and Walters (1994) found that little thought was given to process strategy and maintenance of the partnership when creating the partnership. Partnerships often operate outside of the organizational mandates of the individual partners and this can lead to the transformation of job descriptions and expectations (Kelly et al. 2005).

The literature also points out that “doing partnerships” takes time (Kelly & Caputo, 2011). Those working in partnerships need to be patient and invest in building relationships before attempting to take action on problems (O’Neill & McCarthy, 2014; Joseph & Ogletree, 1998; Kelly et al., 2005). O’Neill and McCarthy (2014) also found that collaboration required a physical place to meet. Meetings often result in action, as the face to face interaction builds relationships and creates accountability to put a plan into action (Kelly et al., 2005). Taking the time to build relationships and to deal with bureaucratic matters is also challenging in partnerships because both the police and community stakeholders often want immediate action on community safety issues (Pearson et al., 1992; Presdee & Walters, 1994).

People and relationships

Relationships emerge consistently in the partnership literature as important to both the creation and maintenance of partnerships. Crawford and Jones (1995) claim that two main relationships exist in partnerships: the relationship between agencies and the relationship between these agencies and local communities (Crawford & Jones, 1995). Interestingly, this dichotomy does not seem to acknowledge that agencies are part of the community, but rather treats them as separate entities. Agencies are largely made up of
members from the local community and, thus, cannot be treated as strictly separate from it (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1993). More collaboration between agencies will create the impetus for new practices that acknowledge the ideological and practical contradictions of the different goals various agencies may have, especially as transformations occur and new, mutually determined goals emerge (Baldwin & Kinsey, 1982; Bourdieu, 1990).

Little is written in the partnership literature about the personality types of people necessary to make collaboration work. However, Saville (2013) argues that democratic CSPs require the involvement individuals who consistently focus on improving themselves, particularly improving their emotional intelligence. Unlike traditional intelligence, emotional intelligence is the ability to identify and understand others and one's own emotions and how these emotions contribute to different situations (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Goleman, 2006). Individuals who are emotionally intelligent excel in social situations and should be able to partner more effectively. Walters (1996) claims that success in partnerships is often a result of the efforts of a few key individuals, rather than those of the entire group. Thus, understanding the characteristics of the individuals involved in partnerships, as well as their approach to, and understanding of, partnerships, should contribute to a better understanding of the partnership process.

Towards a holistic theory of community safety partnership making

Again, while much is written about partnerships, little is written on the micro-situational specifics of the partnership making process. Doing so is imperative to developing an integrated theory of CSPs and, in turn, offering guidance for partnership making and evaluation. The high-level theoretical critiques of neoliberalism and the responsibilization of the community leaves little possibility for human agency in partnership situations, or for the development of an alternative approach. At the same time, research on CSP cannot follow the administrative literature on partnerships that largely ignores the current economic and political climate affecting crime control (Hall & Winlow, 2012). CSP theory has to avoid infantilizing communities and treating them as merely receptors of neoliberal policies and practices. Doing so, ignores the complexity that exists at the community level and the ways in which local community actors can see personal and organizational benefits in partnering with the police.
It is not a question of whether or not partnerships are useful (Pearson et al., 1992). In fact, most studies of partnerships attempt to develop a “successful model” of partnerships that ignores process and the complex constraints and opportunities that face organizations and people involved in these partnerships (Jacobs, 2010; Crawford & Jones, 1995). Partnerships will occur despite determinations of what works and what does not. We need to examine the process of “doing” partnerships (Pearson et al. 1992; Crawford & Jones, 1995). Examining this process would address much more complex questions, such as: how and why both sides of a partnership engage in the first place, how tension and conflict are dealt with, how trust is established, and how success is defined and determined by the players involved (Crawford & Jones, 1995).

**Social constructionism and constructing meaning**

In order to begin to analyse the transactional process of CSPs, it is important to first interrogate the sociology of the knowledge that emerges in the transaction. Berger and Luckmann (1966) explain that meaning and knowledge of reality are shared in the form of common sense. However, this common sense reality is usually taken for granted, as though it exists externally to these interpretations as objective and omnipresent. Their treatise casts doubt upon and interrogates the possibility of objective knowledge. While doubt about the objectivity of knowledge is suspended in order to engage in the routine of daily life, this doubt is not to be abandoned in the examination of these social phenomena (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). As Berger and Luckmann (1966) suggest, social reality is influenced by both the spatial and temporal experiences of those who construct its meaning. As such, it is clear from their perspective that social reality is socially constructed.

Best (2008) explains that the objective quality of the social phenomena in question is not of interest when examining a social issue. He argues instead that it is the subjective reaction to the social phenomena that makes it a social issue. Further, he suggests that we cannot investigate a social issue as a category of social phenomena. Rather, a particular social issue must be understood as a process of response to social phenomena (Best, 2008). Thus, certain individuals and social groups make claims with respect to social phenomena (Spector & Kitsuse, 1977). As such, the study of any social issue should not focus on the phenomena itself, but on the response to it such as the claims being made about the phenomena and who is making them (Best, 2008).
Language is the core of claims’ making and social constructionism. We create categories and classifications to help us understand and make sense of the world around us. Then, we use language to establish the bounds in which the categories and classifications can be conceptualized (Pinker, 2003; Burr, 2006). Language superimposes subjective knowledge onto the world and creates meaning (Berger & Luckman, 1966). However, language is flexible and, as such, different speakers can change and adapt their conceptualizations of knowledge (Best, 2008). As Best (2008) suggests, how participants involved with particular social phenomena define and redefine that phenomena matters to the understanding that phenomena.

Best (2008) suggests that we could approach research from an objectivist perspective. Doing so in the case of CSPs would simply mean studying the nature of the partnerships in question. In fact, a lot of the normative literature on CSPs has done just this. However, looking at CSPs through a social constructionist lens requires the researcher to ask how and why people came to hold their understandings of the partnerships in which they are involved.

Efforts to define phenomena, or determine what works and what does not, do not help us to understand how people involved in the partnerships make sense of their experiences. Rather, as Best (2008) suggests, thinking systematically about any social issue requires a subjectivist approach by which those involved (in this case in the partnership making process) identify and explain their conceptions of the issue. They provide understandings of how their conceptions of the issue have “emerged and spread” (2008, 10). Based on this analysis, participant understandings and constructions of CSPs are seen as important, necessary, and pragmatic in the current study since these understandings represent a crucial part of the social context within which CSPs exist. As such, these understanding are a key focus of the research described below.

Applying a social constructionist model

A social constructionist model is useful for understanding partnership making as an event. Those working from this kind of perspective argue that there is the potential for multiple understandings of an event to exist among the individuals who are involved in the event (Adler & Adler, 2003). According to Fine (1997), macro-level understandings of the social structure and social order are often ignored in social constructionism. In
contrast, Berger and Luckmann (1966) claim that the social order does not exist beyond the product of human interaction. Alternatively, Fine (1997) claims that the social structure informs how participants understand and react to social issues. The social structure creates the social conditions that permit certain interpretations or social constructions to gain precedence over others (Fine, 1997). While Fine (1997) makes this claim in reference to Smelser’s (1967) Value-Added Model, the analysis is applicable to a more integrated theoretical model of social events. For example, one cannot claim that social constructions are real in their consequences and are able to be analyzed without claiming that social conditions are real in their consequences as well. The reality of social conditions makes social constructions plausible. Thus, to understand the meanings of partnership making and how it is perceived by participants, a knowledge of the social context (i.e. the structure) is necessary. Based on this analysis, the insights derived from both social constructionism and current macro-level political economy explanations have been incorporated in the current examination of CSPs in Canada.

**Micro-situational analysis**

In order to better understand the interactions and meaning making of actors involved in the partnership making process, it is necessary to make the interactions themselves the focal point of the analysis (Collins, 2008). In examining the nature of violence, for example, Collins (2008) argues that the characteristics of the situations in which violent acts occur should take precedence over other factors such as culture, social background and motivation. Furthermore, Collins notes that these events are interpreted within the conceptual and moral categories predominant at the time. Thus, in describing something like the violent beating of Rodney King, Collins argues that the interpretations of this event reflected the prevailing ideologies of racial tension that existed at the time (Collins, 2008). While the theory of forward panic that Collins lays out in his research does not apply to the current study (partnerships as violent would be somewhat antithetical), his approach to thinking about measuring the transactional phase of a social event is important to integrating levels of social analysis (from macro to micro). He places interaction at the centre of the study of the transactional phase and compares across different instances of interaction (Collins, 2008).

The study of community-partnership making then, should include a careful analysis of the dynamics of partnership-making situations, while taking into account the
potential impact of the current political and social climates (the precursors) on the interaction. This should be followed by a comparison across similar partnership making situations to identify the nature of the existing interaction rituals (Goffman, 1967; Collins, 2004). These comparisons will allow the researcher to observe patterns of behaviour specific to the situational context (Collins, 2008). Thus, following Collins (2008) in order to understand the transactional nature of partnership making, and to contribute to an integrated understanding of this process, the situations of these partnerships, and the interpretations their participants have of them, must be at the center of the analysis. A situational analysis is adopted in the current study.

Summary

This literature review has attempted to explore the partnership-making process as a social event. In doing so, each level of analysis (from macro to micro) has been parsed. At the macro level, I have acknowledged the role of the political economy, particularly the impact that neoliberal tactics such as the New Public Management have had in creating financial and political precursors that pushed police organizations to actively pursue CSPs. I have also discussed the critiques of the research in this area, particularly the lack of agency afforded to the actors involved in these partnerships.

The normative literature on the themes that emerge in CSPs has offered some insights into the nature of participant agency, power and control. However, it too fails to provide a useful theoretical model for understanding how those participating in CSPs make sense of their experiences including the role of human agency. Rather, research in this area largely reflects an administrative approach to partnership making, specifically focussing on what does or does not lead to success.

As a result, I have attempted to demonstrate that a more integrated model is necessary. This model will examine the meso and micro levels of partnership making, specifically an examination of the precise situations in which partnership making occurs and the ways in which participants make and remake meaning out of these interactions. By examining the transaction, and the social constructions of that transaction, I can better contribute to a holistic understanding of partnership making. Furthermore, I can focus attention on the last piece of the social event process, the aftermath, and
potentially provide useful information on how CSPs could contribute to achieving collaboratively determined community safety goals.
Chapter 3.

Research Methods

Research questions and analysis overview

It can be difficult to determine the appropriate methodological framework for research that is largely exploratory in nature. Often, a myriad of approaches is necessary to gain a better understanding of the phenomena under study. Additionally, these methods must adhere to a theoretical perspective that guides the overall research questions. This study attempts to address two main research questions: 1) what is involved in community safety partnership making in Canada? and 2) what contributes to making a community safety partnership work for the partners involved? Additional inquiries emerge from these two guiding research questions including: what do these partnerships currently look like, what is their structure, how have they emerged and developed, who is involved and to what extent, which issues have emerged, which factors contribute to overall satisfaction and success, which factors have hindered the process of partnering, and what lessons can be gleaned from those involved in community safety partnerships?

To answer these questions, the current study used a contextual social constructionist approach and began with an examination of the perspectives and experiences of leaders in policing and community safety organizations in Canada. This research provided important background information regarding the current study of the process of community safety partnership making on the ground in Canadian communities. This latter phase of the research focused on gaining a better understanding of how these partnerships form, develop, and function.

Social constructionism and critical realism

In determining one’s methodology and specific methods, it is important to first set out theoretical parameters that guide the research (Chamberlain, 2000). The researcher must specify both the ontology of the phenomenon and, subsequently, the epistemology. Ontology is understood as the study of being or reality, i.e. what can be known and what exists (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Epistemology focuses on the relationship between the
phenomenon to be known and the would-be-knower based on their ontological assumptions (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Methodology and methods, then, involve determining what can be known based on how the would-be-knower makes decisions about what to make knowledge. Methodology and methods emerge out of the following two questions: what can be known; and how can that knowledge be created (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

The current study relies on critical realism as its guiding ontology and contextual social constructionism as its epistemology. While critical realism and social constructionism do not typically coexist when approaching methodological concerns, I deconstruct these concepts to demonstrate how they can complement each other. Critical realists accept that a reality exists independently of social interpretations (i.e. that objects do exist in the world), but they do not attempt to achieve absolute understanding of said reality (Scott, 2004). Rather, they attempt to gain the best possible understanding of social phenomenon through extensive critical investigation. This investigation acknowledges the particular orderings of knowledge and how these orderings can be replaced through paradigm shifts (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006; Scott, 2004).

Research conducted under a social constructivist paradigm accepts the collaboration between researcher and participant in meaning making (Stake, 1995; Yin 2003). Recall that constructionist scholars operate under the assumption that reality is created, sustained, and influenced by people (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Strict constructionists, however, claim that there is no one ‘truth’ for the researcher to ‘discover,’ but rather a collection of participant realities that inform their actions (Lather, 1993; Robbottom & Hart, 1993). These competing views often leave the researcher in a position where he or she is unable to do more than speculate about meaningful knowledge and how it can have an impact upon the real world.

Contextual constructionists, on the other hand, focus on participant meanings while also acknowledging that some meanings represent physical realities more appropriately than others (Searle, 1995; Best, 1990; 1995; 2008; Loseke, 2003; Sacco, 2003). In this context, knowledge making becomes a reciprocal process of meaning-making between the researcher and the researched (Weiss, 1994). This approach allows for a process of deconstructing and reconstructing the phenomena (constructionist) in question while recognizing the real-world implications this has for the
individuals involved (critical realism) and developing knowledge from that place (Yin, 2015).

It is from both a critical realist ontology and a contextual constructionist epistemology that I determined the appropriate methodology for the outlined research questions. This methodology had to recognize that while an objective reality may exist for how community safety partnerships emerge and function, it fails to acknowledge that the greatest possible understanding of this reality can only be achieved through extensive investigation and co-operative meaning making. Some have critiqued constructionist case study approaches, claiming that discourse analysis is enough to identify and analyze important information and, subsequently, build knowledge (Ibarra & Kitsuse, 1993). However, while this form of analysis can be useful, textual representations alone ignores the interactional and co-created nature of social knowledge in different situational contexts (Marvasti, 2008). Meaning making is emergent, and by relying only on written text, the researcher cannot analyze how these writings emerge in every day practice (Snow, 2001).

The appropriate methodology then requires in-depth engagement with these partnerships in their natural settings. Furthermore, the methodology must also recognize that while the knowledge about these partnerships is an emergent process between the researcher and the participants, some meanings may represent reality better than others and that these meanings can only be achieved through numerous and differing forms of data collection. The methodology must allow for an iterative process, where meaning can be made and remade and questions can be asked and reformulated as new ideas emerge, and knowledge is constructed and articulated by both the researcher and the researched. Thus, the appropriate methodology would have to be able to deal with a significant amount of time directly involved with the phenomena and the opportunity for co-created meaning-making. The constructivist case study (Best, 2008), incorporating early stage interviews with key actors to determine nature and scope, and a focus on the situated transaction (Collins, 2008) of partnership making within and across partnership making contexts, is the appropriate methodology for these requirements. Support for this conclusion is outlined in the following sections.
The case study approach

Case studies are frequently used in the social sciences to illuminate new insights and inquire into social issues (Thomas, 2011). Case study research is typically considered most appropriate for research questions that seek to describe or explain a phenomenon and often requires data collection to occur in the context of that phenomenon (Yin, 2017; Bromley, 1986). Descriptive research questions ask what is happening or what has happened, while explanatory research questions seek to explain how or why something happened (Yin, 2017). In the current study I examined the process of how community safety partnerships with the police emerge and how they are currently operating. Thus, both types of research questions are being addressed in this case study.

As with many research methods, numerous definitions exist for a case study. Yin (2009) and Stake (1995) are frequently cited with respect to case study definitions. Yin (2009) defines a case study as “an empirical inquiry about a contemporary phenomenon (e.g. a case) set within a real-world context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 18). Similarly, Stake (1995) refers to a case study as “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (p. xi). Both refer to the importance of context and a detailed analysis of a particular phenomenon. While these definitions can provide a basis for understanding case studies, taken alone these definitions fail to identify the specific methodological rigour involved in conducting a case study.

Tight (2010) critiques the fluidity in defining case studies and in describing the methodology. He points to the lack of coverage of the concept in many methodological texts and the definitional inconsistencies across the published research (save for Yin, 2017 and Stake, 1995). He laments these inconsistencies, pointing to some who treat case studies as a methodological approach (see for example; Punch, 2013 and Bryman, 2004) and others who describe case studies as a ‘style’ of research (see for example; Cohen et al. 2012). Tight (2010) claims that attempts to define detailed examinations of small phenomena as case studies are futile. He argues that the number of ways in which case studies are defined and, thus, operationalized create a meaningless term that undermines the sometimes rigorous methodologies employed to understand particular
social phenomena (2010). Instead of ‘case study,’ research, Tight advocates for
describing this kind of work as a “small-sample, in-depth study” (2010, p. 338).

I would argue that using different terms for what is essentially a case study
actually does a greater disservice to the understanding of a research method. Many of
the important paradigm shifts in sociological and criminological thinking occurred as the
result of “small-sample” case study research (see for example: Shaw, 1930; Sutherland,
1937). This is not surprising considering human learning relies heavily on case
knowledge or story telling (Barnes et al. 1994; Cragg, 1940). Despite this, Yin (2003)
often calls case studies “a weak sibling among social science research methods” (p. xiii).
Interestingly however, for criminologists and sociologists, most research specifically on
the case study methodology comes from the fields of education (Stake, 1995) and
psychology (Yin, 2011) and not criminology or sociology. Criminologists and sociologists
then are not leaders in defining one of the methodologies that is core to the development
of several classic theories in both fields. Rather than reducing case study research to a
“small-sample in-depth study,” perhaps it is more appropriate to specifically identify the
methodological rigour involved and to do so from a sociological or criminological
perspective.

Verschuren (2003), a medical sociologist offers a more extensive definition that
acknowledges the exhaustive and cyclical nature of the case study research process
stating

A case study is a research strategy that can be qualified as holistic in
nature, following an iterative-parallel way of preceding, looking at only a
few strategically selected cases, observed in their natural context in an
open-ended way, explicitly avoiding (all variants of) tunnel vision, making
use of analytical comparison of cases or sub-cases, and aimed at
description and explanation of complex and entangled group attributes,
patterns, structures or processes (p. 137).

This definition is useful because it illustrates many of the choices and processes
involved in a methodologically rigorous case study. Case studies allow the researcher to
develop a comprehensive and detailed understanding of phenomena in their social
context, and across contexts, with the intention of creating new ideas and meaning
(Bromley, 1986; Yin, 2017). The social context is imperative to understanding the case
and, thus, the researcher must observe these cases in their natural settings (Yin, 2017).
For the purposes of this study, I adopted Verschuren’s (2003) definition.
Not only have case studies been difficult to define, but numerous critiques of using case study research also exist. In his 2006 article, Flyvbjerg dismantled the conventional wisdom surrounding case study research, including the argument that case studies cannot act as the foundation of “full-fledged research schemes” (p. 219). He interrogates the notion that case studies must act as a preliminary step in research and cannot propose theoretical understandings of social phenomena. Instead, he states that case studies can act as both exploratory and explanatory, depending on the particular case(s) and how it is chosen (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

While some claim that almost anything can serve as a case in social research (Atkinson & Delamont, 1985; Punch, 2013), Stake (1995) argues that not everything is a case. Rather, the researcher must use current theory to define the parameters of the case. The parameters of the cases involved in this study have been clearly defined by the theoretical work available on community safety partnerships as well as the experience of the researcher as a community safety practitioner. The combination of theory and practice contributes to theoretically appropriate and practically applicable parameters discussed further below in the section on sampling procedures.

Case study research is also frequently critiqued for poor unreliability due to a small sample size (Sandelowski, 1995). However, a small sample often equates with theory building research for two reasons. First, it allows the researcher the space to engage deeply with the topic of interest and peel back parts of the phenomena that illuminate the larger social processes at play. Second, in large n-size research, there are few opportunities to revisit the definition of the case and draw new boundaries around the understanding of that case (Ragin, 1987). Instead, the researcher is limited to collecting information only on the variables they set out to research, because it would be too costly and time consuming to revisit the understandings of these variables in the process of data collection. Hence, while some might question the reliability of small n-size research, reliability is only one methodological concern with case studies. Their contribution to ensuring valid and meaningful data represent an important aspect of the research, especially when compared to large n-size studies where validity is often much more problematic. Participants involved in these studies are not able to contribute to the meaning making of survey questions, nor are these questions necessarily measuring what they set out to measure (validity concerns). Finally, in-depth research on a small
number of cases incorporates much more flexible options for exploring issues related to the nuances of the phenomenon under study.

This is not to say that large-n size research does not play an important role in theory advancement, as it can be designed to include a reflexive and heterogenous approach to data collection. In so doing, it provides important and reliable information for guiding social theory (Ragin, 1987). It is important to not draw spurious distinctions between qualitative (often small n-size) and quantitative (often large n-size) research and their relation to theory building. Rather, researchers should address research questions through the most appropriate methodologies (Flyvberg, 2006; Glasziou et al. 2004). In the instance of exploratory and process driven research questions, case study methodology provides a viable option.

Other critiques regarding case study research include researcher bias and validity. Often in case study research, researchers are criticized for only finding what they intended to find (Yin, 2017). In considering this verification bias, Campbell (1975) points to the widespread experience of falsification, not verification, in case study research. Furthermore, Aguinaldo (2004) argues that the assessment of findings should not be dichotomous: whether or not the findings are valid. Rather, he claims the goal of valid research should be a continuous practice of examination and interrogation of the intention and function of the research.

In fact, unlike many research designs, case study research does not rely on isolated variables, but rather demands that the researcher obtains data from multiple sources, using multiple methods, until the researcher has confidence that any more data collection would not result in different results. This exhaustive data collection approach subsequently contributes to overall validity (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Yin, 2017).

Additionally, a social constructivist would state that the findings of case study research are valid if they translate to into a particular social purpose (Aguinaldo, 2004). In the case of the current study, the purpose is to build a theory of partnership making, accounting for the voices of those involved, while acknowledging the role of power, economics and politics.

Having acknowledged the usefulness of the case study for the current research questions and addressed some of the critiques of using case studies, it is important to
flesh out the types of possible case studies and the methods involved in the selected type. Stake (1995) identifies three specific types of case studies: intrinsic, instrumental and multiple/collective. Intrinsic studies are those that examine a particular case in order to gain a more in-depth understanding. Instrumental studies attempt to create understandings or draw generalizations. The multiple or collective case study looks at numerous cases at once, to allow for the exploration of differences between and within cases with an eye to understanding a phenomenon more broadly (Stake, 2005).

Additionally, Collins (2008) argues that to understand the micro situation of action, one must examine that action across numerous situations. In stage one of the research undertaken in this study, which is described in detail below, interviews with key actors identified the diversity of community safety partnerships across Canada. The theoretical approach to situational analysis, coupled with these inductive interviews helped to guide the decision to use a multiple/collective case study approach as they are appropriate for gaining a broader understanding of the diverse nature of community safety partnerships in Canada, and informing future public policy around these partnerships.

**Research design**

This study began with in-depth interviews with 30 police and community leaders from across Canada in order to gain an understanding of the current state of community safety partnerships. These interviews were followed up by case studies of specific partnerships between the police and community organizations. Case studies often involve a number of methodologies (Fincham et al. 2008; Ajodhia-Andrews & Berman, 2009; Snyder-Young, 2011; Bronken et al. 2012). This offered an opportunity for the triangulation of sources, in order to investigate as much of the phenomena as possible (Hyett et al. 2014). Triangulation also contributes to overall validity, as the researcher is able to cross reference the ideas and perceptions that emerge from the data in additional ways (Nagar-Ron & Motzafi-Haller, 2011). The current study achieved triangulation by employing content analysis, observation, focus groups, and interviews.
Eleven case studies were conducted involving six police services across three Canadian provinces (British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan). Each police service provided access to two community safety partnerships - except for one service in British Columbia that could only provide one partnership at the time of the study. Numerous methodologies were used within these case studies to capture the best understanding possible of the process of partnership making and collaboration for these CSPs. A summary of the specific methods employed for each case study can be found in Appendix A.

**Sampling Strategy**

In conducting research on CSPs, it is important to determine which partnerships to sample and examine. Theoretical (or non-probability) sampling requires that cases are selected based on their ability to illustrate particular constructs (in this case – community safety) and processes (in this case – how partnerships are developed) important to the research question (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). The research question lends itself to non-probability sampling. Non-probability sampling, particularly purposive sampling, involves making a sequential set of decisions about whom to talk to, where to look, and when to study (Tansey, 2007). These choices are dependent on the research objectives with the intent to address these objectives (Tansey, 2007). This sampling technique ensures coverage of a variety of possible partnerships, but also diversity within the data. Unlike deductive methods that often demand a representative sample for reliability, the current inductive methodology prioritizes validity, i.e. what partnerships should be included to allow for the best understanding of the phenomena. Although attempts were made to sample a variety of police services, part of the purposive sampling in the second sample was based on the access provided by police leaders in the first sample. While some may argue that non-probability sampling is a methodological constraint, the sampling strategy allows for collection of much richer data that can prompt additional ideas and concepts (Suri, 2011) and is appropriate for the research questions posed in this study.

---

12 The service had several partnerships but had a number of studies of their department occurring at the same time and thus were experiencing research fatigue.
For the first research sample, the police and community leaders, I used a subset of purposive sampling called criterion sampling. Criterion sampling involves selecting participants based on their attributes meeting particular criteria (Palys, 2008). In this case, the criteria for selecting the participants in the first sample differed between the police and the community leaders. In the case of the police, they were in a leadership position (Inspectors or higher) in which they had significant decision-making power within their organizations. In the case of the community organization leaders that were interviewed, their selection was based on the influence they had in terms of organizational or policy decisions.

The first sample of police and community leaders is based on access to police leaders through connections with the Canadian Police College as well as municipal and government officials. There is no list of community safety leaders in Canada, thus every attempt was made to ensure that I was able to speak with individuals who had been involved in community safety in Canada in a leadership role for over ten years. This ranged from local municipal organization leaders, Public Safety Canada officials, and other community agency leaders. The intention behind this sample was to gain a better understanding of the unwritten history and policy of partnership making in Canada from those who had been involved in this process.

The sampling procedure for the second sample was based on access provided by the police in the first sample. A purposive approach was used to connect with agencies that already had police-community collaborations around community safety. The first sample of police leaders is larger than the sample of community and government leaders, as these police leaders were largely responsible for connecting me to the potential case study sites. I decided that having the police make those connections ensured that the partnerships directly involved the police and were current and top of mind for these leaders.

It is important to note, however, that once given access, the police did not determine the partnerships that would become part of the study. As the researcher, I

---

13 The police who provided access for these studies were part of municipal police services (Not RCMP or provincial). Municipal police services were the focus of this research for two reasons. 1. Municipal police services encompass the vast majority of policing done in Canada. 2. Municipal policing accounts for the largest amount of police expenditures in Canada.
was presented with current community safety partnerships that met the criteria I set out for the police. These criteria included:

1. The partnership was with a local community or social service organization or a community organization that had local representatives (i.e. it could not be another criminal justice organization with similar mandates) as long as the intention was to enhance community safety.\(^\text{14}\)

2. The partnership involved some ‘face time’ during the year between the police and the community organization.

3. There was at least one police member who was dedicated to developing or maintaining that partnership.

4. The partnership was ongoing or recently completed (if around a particular issue).

These selection criteria allowed for the inclusion of a broad range of community partnership types in the study. No restrictions were placed as to the size, quality, or length of the partnership; however, attempts were made to ensure that different types of partnerships (emergent, existent and completed) were included. By combining both current cases with recently completed (or retrospective) cases, researchers can reduce bias in their study (Leonard-Barton, 1990).

The cases selected for this study allowed data to be collected over time which can moderate issues of recall bias and self presentation. As well, the inclusion of completed or retrospective cases allowed for more extensive comparisons to be made and greater accuracy (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Leonard-Barton, 1990). Once, I had reviewed the possible partnerships that could be included in the study, I consulted with the police leader involved and together we chose two partnerships to be included in the case studies that were completed for the current study. These decisions were made with the involvement of the relevant police leader in order to ensure that there would be

\(^{14}\) Not all of the community safety partners in this study were the typical “not-for-profit” scheme that is often associated with local organizations. Some were crown corporations and others were part of health or social welfare and fell under the public service umbrella. However, care was taken to ensure partnerships were not between other criminal justice system entities such as courts or corrections as the mandates of these organizations would likely mirror each other and thus not address the fundamental questions of how do the police effectively partner with agencies who are unlike themselves.
enough data to contribute to the study objectives, and that the cases suited and respected the timing and staffing needs of the police organization and their partners.

**Specific methods**

As part of the case study approach, a number of methods were employed to capture the phenomena from all possible vantage points. As previously mentioned, the specific methods used as part of each case study are described in Appendix A. The following section outlines how these methods were put into practice and include comments on any anomalies that arose.

**Interviews**

Interviews were used in both stages of the research. Interviews involve a purposeful conversation between the researcher and the participant (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). They allow the researcher to gather extensive and information rich data on a particular phenomenon, particularly when that phenomenon is sporadic or infrequent. (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). However, interviews are often critiqued for problems of recall bias and impression management (Ellis et al. 2002). This can be addressed through interviewing numerous and knowledgeable informants, and by ensuring data saturation (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). Interviews in this study were semi-structured, allowing me to ask about certain concepts, but permitting the participant to also influence the direction of the discussion (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Semi-structured interviews were appropriate in both stages of the research, as they contributed individual perceptions of the partnership process as well as additional questions to explore.

Interviews according to constructionists are an encounter involving a ‘social performance’ between the researcher and the participant resulting in a co-created definition of the interview situation as well as the social phenomena being studied (Goffman, 1959; 1967). Symbolic interactionism provided a guiding framework for the interviews which include both dramaturgical and active interaction between the researcher and the researched (Holstein & Gubrium 1995; Berg, 2004). Constructing the relationship between the two, the dramaturgical and active interview is a social performance from which information can emerge and be negotiated (Berg, 2004).
Epistemologically, interviews can be placed on a continuum (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). On one end, the participants are viewed as containers of unsourced and unbiased information from which the researcher can extract (Charmaz, 2008). On the other, the interview is seen as a process of meaning making between the participant and the researcher, and the interaction is not only an exchange of information, but also a building up and creation of knowledge (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). Taking the latter approach, the interview, much like other interactions in the research process, can be understood as an ‘event.’ The legitimacy and methodological rigour of capturing the information is not about transporting information from one container to the next, but rather conveying the co-created reality of the event that acknowledges the situated context (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; Charmaz, 2008).

Focus Groups

Focus groups are used to illuminate new themes around the partnership process, in general, and to allow for additional observation of group dynamics, in particular (Morgan, 1998). Focus groups involve engaging a group of people, between six and twelve participants (Baumgartner et al. 2002), in a discussion of a particular topic (Wilkinson, 2004). In a focus group, the researcher is a moderator who prompts the discussion, with an assistant to keep notes and time. Not only is the researcher able to collect a lot of data, but can also do so efficiently and economically (Krueger & Casey, 2004). The social nature of a focus group can also contribute to group cohesion and willingness to share information (Peters, 1993; Vaughan et al. 1996). Not only do focus groups contribute to detailed and sometimes spontaneous information (Butler, 1996), but they can also contribute to the iterative process of meaning-making and possibly the construction of new understandings of the phenomenon.15

Observation

Observation has its methodological roots in ethnography and classic sociological studies such as Whyte’s (1943) Street Corner Society and Humphrey’s (1970) Tearoom Trade. Observation allows for a deeper investigation into the norms and beliefs of a group, through immersion into the group (Hammersly & Atkinson, 2007). While full immersion

15 Questions for both the interviews and the focus groups can be found in Appendix B.
was not possible for the current study, due to time and funding constraints, I made every effort possible to engage in observation when the opportunity arose to compare the content from interviews and focus groups with action. The data obtained from the interviews and focus groups could then be triangulated by observation. Although observation was not available in every case study, (for example, in one case study the partnership had completed their set goals) the use of this methodological procedure allowed me to observe some partnerships in action and validate the findings from the interviews, focus groups and content analyses.

**Content Analysis**

Content analysis involves analyzing the content as well as the context of documents (Berelson, 1952), with the purpose of eliciting meaning from the communication (Krippendorf, 2004). Themes are identified, as is sentiment around these themes. Observation, interviews and focus groups continuously informed and updated this analysis. Content analysis was appropriate for this study as it provides the documented history of the development of the partnership, which participants may not know in its entirety. It also has the potential to provide additional questions and ideas for observation. However, not all of the partnerships had formal documentation and, thus, content analysis was not a key focus of this research design.

**Field Notes**

Throughout the process, detailed field notes were taken reflecting on the nuances of what I was observing, the conversations I was having, and the interactions and processes between the partnerships and the larger social and government landscape. Oftentimes these notes were captured after a focus group or meeting to document general themes and ideas that emerged from the situation as a whole. Summaries of these interactions were kept, helping maintain the general perception and interpretations of the interactions between participants. Field notes were used to compliment transcribed data and to provide context (deMarrais & Lapan, 2004).
The data collection process, access, ethics and informed consent

The data for this study were collected over 14 months between October 2016 and January 2018. The data collection began with hour-long interviews with police leaders and community organization leaders across Canada. These interviews were largely done over the phone with only five being conducted in person. During the interview, the second component of the research was discussed and willing police leaders were able to volunteer their organization to participate. I then followed up with these contacts and other referrals through a second research request form. Those who continued to express interest in participating were asked to approve the participation of their organization. This typically resulted in a connection with another police officer in middle management in the police service who became a key point of contact. These individuals were asked to provide a list of partners, and together we identified two partnerships to include in the study based on the criteria outlined above.

I then contacted the community organization to request their participation separately in order to demonstrate neutrality. Once approval was provided from both the police organization and their community partner(s), we began to set up dates for interviews, focus groups, and the observation of meetings. When both parties agreed to it, partnership documents were also shared with me for content analysis.

As mentioned above, in almost every case study of a specific partnership I was introduced to the partnership by a police contact, most commonly at the middle management level. However, in two cases I was connected with these middle managers through their Chief. It was clear in one interaction that the middle manager initially thought I was there to observe him on behalf of his superiors. I had to clarify in all of my interviews, focus groups, and observations, and especially in this situation, that I was not connected with any police service, but rather that I was a university researcher; I did not represent any organization except the university and that anything they shared with me would be kept in strict confidence. Each participant in any form of the data collection (interviews, focus groups, observation) was asked to sign an Informed Consent form that outlined the purpose of the study and how their identity would be protected. The information provided also explained how the data would be presented in aggregate form.
to protect the identity of the participants and the partnership. It also noted that all direct quotations would not reveal the identity of the speaker.\textsuperscript{16}

There were times when this confidentiality was tested. I had several police managers ask me “how the research was going” and if their people “were being helpful.” While seemingly innocuous, answering these questions directly might have compromised the trust I had built with the officers involved in the partnerships, and potentially put their positions at risk. However, to leave these questions unanswered would have also compromised the trust I had built with these police managers. Thus, I consistently answered as vaguely as possible, with responses such as, “they’ve been great” and “all the conversations have been very helpful.”

It is important to note that the data collection was impacted by my status as a white, young, female researcher. This is particularly the case when a large portion of the research takes place in a male dominated setting like a police service (Gurney, 1991). My status impacted the access I had to these partnerships, the stories I heard, and the actions I observed. I was able to gain access to these police services largely because of my repeated contact with police as a researcher and practitioner. I had helped organize a large policing conference in Canada (the economics of policing conference), I had assisted in teaching police at the Canadian Police College and at Assiniboine College, and I was a research assistant for the Institute for Canadian Urban Research Studies (ICURS) which consistently put me in meetings with police Chiefs and other leaders in Canadian policing. Though there is often concern around academic researchers in observing and interviewing police (Marks et al. 2009), I only experienced hesitation or trepidation by police participants on a few occasions. This may be due, in part, to the fact that I have been present in the policing research world in a number of capacities and, possibly, because female researchers are often seen as less threatening (Marks, 2004).\textsuperscript{17} The combination of these experiences resulted in numerous police leaders

\textsuperscript{16} While anonymity was protected in the reporting of the findings, I could not guarantee confidentiality in the focus groups as participants of those groups could identify each other.

\textsuperscript{17} I often hesitate to comment on the gendered nature of research as I don’t believe I am immersed enough in the feminist literature to interrogate these experiences fully. However, I would consider it a disservice to not mention the ways in which my gender affected access. I often experienced male police officers over-explain basic policing concepts to me as though I would not be familiar with, or understand, these issues. Additionally, I had many participants confide in me some of their frustrations and emotions that I feel a male researcher may not have experienced. In the process of data collection, I did not try to confront these gendered experiences, but rather took on the role
being willing to introduce me to other police officers and community partners as “someone we can trust.”

Trust in the policing world is crucial because police are trained to look for dishonesty (Caplan, 2003). This impacts both their ability to trust local partners (O’Neill & McCarthy, 2014), and their ability to trust researchers and other practitioners (Johnston & Shearing, 2009). Often the police are the target of heavy public and academic scrutiny and, as such, they are very hesitant to allow outsiders into their organizations. For these reasons, trust became a key component of data collection. I often had to spend the beginning of every encounter explaining my history of working with Canadian police services, whom exactly I had worked with, and specifically why I was there and what I wanted. I also had to spend time assuring them that I was not interested in discussing success or failure, but rather process and what works for them specifically. The time I spent building trust ended up being invaluable, as many police members commented that it helped them to ‘place’ me and my research.

I also had to build trust with the community partners, but surprisingly, this was not as difficult as I imagined it would be, considering that I was introduced by a police officer in every case study. I spent several days in each community in order to build trust with community partners. I tried to introduce myself to everyone I came into contact with and explain why I was there. I also worked around their schedules, making an effort to go to their locations and meet with them one on one. I also promised to share my aggregated findings upon request with the participants who contributed to the research and solicit their feedback before drawing final conclusions. I believe the time spent and the willingness to keep the conversation open resulted in many community partners welcoming me with open arms. This is exemplified by a comment from a client of a partnership in Alberta, when she said:

You’re here! You’re the researcher. We’ve been waiting for you. Your work is so important. You have to tell our story. Others need to know what we are doing here.

She followed up this statement by presenting me with a personal note and dream catcher, as a gift for coming to her community. This happened in the context of the

of the ‘naïve researcher’ (Gokah, 2006) in order to encourage honest and open communication from the participants.
community holding an extra community event on the dates that I was coming, just so I could observe. Although this experience may appear overwhelming, it was not uncommon. Other community partners took me by the hand to show me their offices and the work they were doing. Still others, tried to buy me lunch, brought me coffee and chocolates, offered me rides while I was in town, and even came in during their vacations to speak with me. Again, while seemingly inconsequential, these small acts demonstrated their openness and willingness to speak with me and I believe contribute to the overall validity of the experiences they shared. Additionally, it suggests the timeliness and importance of the research questions to these communities.

**Anticipated problems**

As with any research design, certain problems are likely to arise. In the case of this research, these included access, partnership preference, time commitment and longitudinal observation. Some police services were not interested in the research and hesitated to participate at any level. Their hesitation could be a result of a lack of certain kinds of partnerships (I would suggest here a lack of strong and positive relationships with the community), but could have biased the overall research, as police participants may have been less willing to speak with me. However, it could also have simply been an issue of timing, as many larger police services are often over committed. As a result, I rarely pushed for access with these organizations and this has the potential to affect the outcomes of the research. Additionally, it was clear that when police services were interested in participating, they often had a particular partnership in mind. Often, these were partnerships that had the potential to ‘make them look good.’ I worked very diligently to avoid selection bias by working with these services to involve a combination of partnerships that matched the criteria I set forth, as well as partnerships they felt strongly about.

Exploratory research also frequently involves pursuing one research question only to be tangentially led to another, possibly more interesting question (Maxwell, 2012). It is key to keep the research methodology flexible enough to adapt to new ideas and leads, but researchers must also find a way to continue to focus on the questions that led them to their original research design. Many of the decisions about research focus and whether to pursue tangential avenues of research were restricted by time and resources. Travel and visits to communities in three provinces over the course of a year
can be time consuming and costly. As a result, logistical constraints required me to keep the research limited to six locations and eleven partnerships.

**Methodological modifications**

The initial four case studies led to particular understandings and methodological shifts for the final seven case studies. For example, it was clear that accessing content beyond promotional materials, presentations and some MOUs would be difficult. This was not because participants were unwilling to share, but rather that this content simply did not exist. Most decisions were made informally, and most conversations occurred off the record. Due to these restrictions, the plan to triangulate the data collection with written materials was modified. Additionally, it became clear that meetings and planning sessions were not regularly held for most partnerships. In order to address this situation, every attempt was made to travel to case study locations on days when events and/or meetings were scheduled. Finally, despite the intention to engage in a dramaturgical interview by speaking to all participants in person, schedules and location constraints meant that some interviews were conducted over the phone or via skype. These instances were very few (about three), however, and often were augmented with several other face-to-face interview experiences.

The need to be flexible also resulted in some modifications to the methodology. It was important to plan to spend additional days during site visits in order to engage in data collection since participants often identified additional potential participants to include in the study or provided suggestions for additional observations of partnership interaction. These kinds of opportunities are common in snowball sampling in qualitative research, yet they required flexibility and a willingness to respond to circumstances as they unfolded. Similarly, transcription practices used throughout the data collection process also resulted in new ideas for questions and potential themes to follow up on in later iterations of the research. This also required flexibility and careful consideration in order to decide on which of these questions to pursue.

**Transcription and approaches to data analysis**

Transcription was conducted as an iterative and reiterative process. Each recording was transcribed in individual word documents. Each transcription also involved recording
thoughts for possible themes in the comments section of the transcribed document. An
original archive of the transcribed notes was kept separate in order to ensure their
integrity (Weiss, 1994). Additional copies of the transcriptions were made and used as
working documents. These working documents were used to organize the dataset into
separate sections e.g. all responses related to a specific question. These sections were
then examined in order to identify common themes as well as emerging concepts. This
process of transcription allowed for both inductive and deductive coding of the data
(Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006).

**Approaches to analysing participant understandings**

The ability to generalize from findings is one of a number of practical skills that
researchers must possess when carrying out research (Kuhn, 2012). Oftentimes in case
studies, no formal academic theory guides the research. Instead, as discussed here,
ontological and epistemological choices guide methodological ones that, in turn, guide
the theory and constructs that emerge and become central to the research (Yin, 2017).
However, these decisions also require the researcher to provide adequate description of
the phenomena (Meyer, 2001).

According to Aguinaldo (2004) there are four possible representations of
research. These include realist, critical, deconstructive and reflexive narratives. Realist
describes what is happening. In the case of the current study, this would describe what
community safety partnerships look like on the ground. This is done in the first section of
the findings chapter, meeting the need for adequate description (Meyer, 2001). Critical
representations interrogate the phenomena within a broader social or political context.
Again, looking at the current study, this involved examining the role of power in these
partnerships, the responsibilizing of communities and the perceptions of the police
partners versus the community partners.

A deconstructive narrative breaks down the definition of terms, such as
‘partnership’ and ‘success’ and how these partnerships define themselves in relation to
others (Aguinaldo, 2004). In the current study, this representation was particularly
important for partnerships that were just emerging or had achieved their defined goals.
Importantly, I examined these definitions along a “partnership continuum” in the analysis.
The partnership continuum used in this study ranged from consultative partnerships at one end through cooperative, coordinated, collaborated and finally co-created. This continuum is useful in thinking about CSPs in this study, as it may contribute to understanding the nature of the processes involved in each stage of the continuum. On the left side of the continuum, consultative partnerships usually involve limited interaction and partners mostly support each other and share information. At the other end of the continuum, co-created partnerships include much more extensive engagement. These types of partnerships feature fully integrated planning and decision making as well as shared responsibility for resources and operations. The CSPs in this study are defined according to this continuum in Chapter Four. As well, a detailed outline of the continuum including a description of each component can be found in Appendix C.

Finally, a reflexive narrative focuses on the researchers’ experience and impact on the research (Aguinaldo, 2004). While some may argue that reflexive narratives are mutually exclusive, the current analysis blends them. This is a necessary step, because it allows for a general description of the findings, while at the same time acknowledging how these findings emerge in a larger social and political structure, comparing these findings within and across the partnerships in the study and critiquing my own practice of power and place within the research. I have commented on these issues in the data collection portion of this chapter and do so again in the Conclusions chapter.
Chapter 4.

Findings

Introduction

This study intended to answer two main questions: 1. What is involved in community safety partnership making in Canada? and 2. What contributes to making a community safety partnership work for the partners involved? The first main question was addressed by pursuing the following questions:

a. What do community safety partnerships in Canada currently look like?

b. What is their structure? And,

c. How have they emerged and developed?

Questions supporting the second main question included:

a. Who is involved in community safety partnerships in Canada and to what extent?

b. What issues have emerged?

c. What factors contribute to overall satisfaction and success?

d. What factors have hindered the process of partnering?

For holistic purposes, questions ‘c’ and ‘d’ are combined in the discussion below since they emerged as co-occurring and could not be disentangled from each other. Thus, these two questions will be asked as:

Which factors contribute to overall satisfaction and success or hinder the process of partnering?

The following section presents the findings obtained from asking these questions. These findings will be discussed in the context of the literature in Chapter Five. Speaking to several of the themes that emerged in the administrative partnership literature, but with a clear focus on the socially constructed nature of the partnership making process.
The first set of questions attempt to understand what was happening more broadly in community safety partnerships in Canada. The answers for these questions arose mainly from interviews and discussions with the police and community leaders in stage one of the research. However, the leaders who were interviewed at the site visits, and additional information collected during the site visits themselves also offered important insights into these research questions.

1a) What do community safety partnerships in Canada currently look like?

This question addressed how partnerships appeared more globally within the research. Their structure and formation are examined in more detail later in this chapter. Here, I attempt to provide a general picture of my observations and participants’ descriptions of community safety partnerships in Canada and in the 11 case studies.

Police and community leaders interviewed in the first stage of the study were asked questions regarding what was happening with community safety partnerships in Canada. They provided their perceptions of partnerships in general, their own experiences of partnership making throughout their careers and how partnership making is a new form of community policing.

As expected, many felt intense pressure to create partnerships in order to address increasingly complex and expensive social problems in their communities and related areas of expertise. However, leaders in both sectors expressed that they were already heavily engaged in community safety partnerships. Many were frustrated at the lack of support for, and recognition of, current partnership work. In several cases, the participants were able to describe partnership making that took place as far back as the 1980s18. They listed numerous partnering organizations that they worked with on an ongoing basis. Also, as expected, they explained that some of these partnerships were more superficial than others. These superficial partnerships often involved visiting a community organization once a month or once every few months to offer services or ask for guidance on an issue but did not involve any real collaborative work.

18The participants would likely be unable to describe partnerships prior to this point as it would be prior to their career tenure.
When speaking with both police leaders and community leaders in Canada regarding the partnerships they participated in as part of their career, they tended to focus on significant partnerships that were well funded and had a sustainable structure. For example, many police leaders discussed well-known partnerships like the Hub and COR (Centre of Responsibility). Others discussed ones with other criminal justice organizations such as Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit (CFSEU) that were more similar to task forces than community safety partnerships. Still others referenced important collaborations from early in their careers that gained national attention. For example, a police leader interviewed during Phase I offered the following comment:

I have spent a good chunk of my service working and leading integrated teams. It started with the (specialized) section which became an integrated (specialized) unit across the country where we worked with municipal partners. When I was an Inspector, I was in charge of (that unit) in (Western Canada). From there I (worked with) the CFSEU - Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit BC – there we had all of the police services in the lower mainland. I think there was a total of 11 forces targeting organized crime. I did that for (a few) years. A good chunk of my service...was working and leading integrated teams. (Police leader # 4 – Stage I).

However, as these leaders moved through their careers into management, they seemed to be less familiar with current partnerships that were not well funded (or funded at all) but were occurring among their front line or middle management and the community. This differs greatly from the community organization leaders in the study who were quite aware of current partnerships under their organizations and the partners at the table. In fact, many of these leaders described being directly involved in these partnerships themselves:

I go to the meetings personally. I think most of the people at the table in these meetings are also leaders in their organizations too. This might be a product of the size of our organization, but most of us at this level are used to being involved, so we stay involved (Community Leader #6– Stage I).

Interestingly, many individuals who are in leadership positions in Canada were responsible for creating partnerships when they were front line or middle managers. Many of the leaders I spoke with believed that they had built their careers on the partnerships they had created. They also commented that it was the most meaningful experience of their careers. Several respondents noted that they never felt so fulfilled, or
that they had done as important police work, as they did when they were in these partnerships:

When I was in (city) we were just starting the community policing initiatives then. It was the 80s and I was given this huge area and told to lead it. Really early in my career. And I did. I built partnerships throughout that neighbourhood to deal with all of the local problems. Those partnerships were the springboard for my career. I think that’s how I got here (to a leadership position) today. (Police Leader #19 – Stage I).

Importantly, many of the leaders commented that they viewed partnerships as the ‘future of policing and community safety’ (Police leader #5 – Stage I) and that they relied heavily on these partnerships to carry out their work in the community.

When asked how they understood community policing and the future of community policing, many commented that partnerships were the new community policing, explaining that to address the increasingly complex problems in Canada today, they needed partnerships more than ever. Several respondents commented that they could not accomplish all of the work they did in the community without their community partners. They explained that they did not have the connection to the community that these partners did and would not be able to provide the kind of service they do without these partners.

We can’t do the work we do without partnerships. It’s the basis of everything. It’s how we know our community. I can’t imagine a police chief today saying that partnerships aren’t important, if not the most important. We just can’t do business without them. (Police leader # 3 – Stage I).

Our relationships with the police are so important. Our police in this country are incredible. Not like they are in America. Really good cops here. Really good. We need to be addressing these problems together. With the help of the police, not working against them. I mean that is community policing isn’t it? Working with the community? Partnering with them? (Community leader # 2 – Stage I).

When speaking with community leaders, they also commented that they felt that the partnerships contributed to a different type of policing in their community. However, they did not feel as though they were actively involved in police decision making and often only acted in a consultative role. Some commented that this made them feel as though they were not really partners, but rather, they felt like they were playing a tokenized role that allowed the police to gain credibility with the community.
Sometimes they just contact us, so they can put us on a list of their partners. I see us on their website as a partner. We don’t really partner with them though. They only reach out sometimes. I wonder if it’s just a check box for them, so they look involved in the community (Community leader # 8 – Stage I).

The community leader here seems to be describing a consultative partnership, as was described in the partnership continuum in the methods section. Police leaders tended to describe partnerships that were consultative as well:

Policing is seen as having the answers to everything and quite often we don’t. We have embedded officers, so we can share information more easily. We are also on numerous committees. Homeless issues where people are seeking out how we can help. So, we are the jack of all trades, so we get the fact that we offer a different perspective on things. We are on the boards in the women’s shelter. We sit on all those boards because we want to be included and inclusive as well (Police leader # 11 – Stage I).

In the quote above, the police leader is describing partnerships that largely involve information sharing. Some police leaders discussed did mention not how these partnerships are an opportunity to create new structures or solutions, but spoke instead about how these partnerships allowed them to leverage learnings from other organizations:

I lead and started what we call a (name) initiative. Long story short our (description) partners coming around the table not to talk about operations per se, or specific files. It was trying to leverage each other in the technological areas. We might be good in one area but need support in another. Alignment of our toolkits if you will, so I know this will work in our system as well as theirs... it’s still our own little world but it’s had an impact to make sure that we can keep pace and keep up (Police leader # 9 – Stage I).

Here again, the police leader describes consultative partnerships that are created strategically to learn from other agencies. While describing partnerships with other police organizations, police leaders rarely identified collaborative or co-created partnership forms.

Case studies according to the partnership continuum

Each of the case studies were coded along the partnership continuum based on the descriptions provided by respondents. I did not ask the participants to look at the

19 General summaries of each case study can be found in Appendix D.
continuum and rank themselves. Rather, I asked them how they would describe the partnership if on one end they only spoke on occasion to ask for help with specific issues and at the other end where the partnership as created completely together and all resources were shared and all decisions were made together. I then triangulated their responses with those of the other participants and my own observations, field notes and content analyses. The following quotations offer an exemplar of how each of the partnerships were viewed by the participants. These exemplars were used to code each partnership according to the categories of the partnership continuum. A brief summary of the codes for all partnerships examined in this study is also provided.

**Case study A – Consultative**

I mean we really just get together to talk about what we are each doing to deal with the problem. We don’t have any initiatives yet. We offer support when we can, but we generally are doing our own thing. These meetings give us a chance to talk about what’s happening (Community partner).

**Case study B – Co-created**

We knew we had to deal with it better. There had to be a different way. So, we got together and figured out how to create our own unit. I’m still a police officer, of course, but I’m seconded here, and I do all of my work here. We have our own office, our own space together and so we can work on client files as a team. If I need help I just wheel my chair across the room and we figure it out together. No one makes a call alone (Police partner).

**Case study C – Collaborative**

When we started out we were pretty separate. But now we have our own paperwork, our own system. (The police service) is funding it, but (provincial health) is helping as well now. We attend calls together and fill out the paperwork together. We’ve got it figured out down to a science. When we get there, she goes in first and assesses and I’m there to support and protect. I get into the car with her and we are there for 10 hours together. My sole job is this (Police partner).

**Case study D – Cooperative**

I mean they help us out and we help them out. They have given us radios to use. We call them when we see problems starting downtown. We meet when we need to, but really, we are just each other’s eyes and ears (Community partner).
Case study E – Consultative

She’s pretty helpful. But we don’t do a lot of planning together. We just reach out when we have a case of abuse that we need help with. And she’s right there. To offer advice and help us deal with it. Or you know, she will come to (problem location) with our client and talk about what is going on. We can call her if we need her, which is great (Community partner).

Case study F – Co-ordinated

We really got together because the (local leader) made a call that we needed to do something about this. And so, we put in our own time and figured we could address this better together. We’ve developed a plan and it is going into action (time period). We are building something really great for the community together, but we still have our own work to do. (Community partner) is leading the charge. Which they should be. I offer up my guys and my time. (Police partner).

Case study G – Coordinated

I’ve been helping them set up safety events for years. We used to have more money for it, but not as much now. But they give me volunteers and I train them as part of their volunteer program and then I work with their members on the programs. I usually go see them once or twice a year to see how they are doing and what they need help with and then we schedule safety events together from there. (Community partner)

Case study H - Cooperative

We meet about once a month or so to talk about what’s come up. We usually plan a (social event) for a different community to come together with the police and the rest of the committee. The (social event) gives them a chance to meet us and we meet them. And helps us figure out what is going on in their area... We’ve done some stuff around (a local event) with the committee because the (local activist group) was trying to ban us from (a local event). And so, they help us get talking with that group too (Police partner).

Case study I – Collaborative

I started off by just showing up and asking what they needed help with. Bringing coffees and getting to know people. Asking them what they needed help with. We (referring to community partner) spoke about what they needed and what we could do to help. Now I have an office here and I’m here one-two full days every week. I run three programs and I think they’ve got me on another soon. We just see what comes up and then we create solutions together (Police partner).

Case study J – Cooperative

I saw the number (crime rates) and I sent them a letter asking if they wanted to get together and do something about it. And we agreed to
work together to create a policy to reduce the (crimes). And so, we met and set about that policy. I helped them get the numbers they needed, and they mandated the security changes necessary. It took some time, but we got it done. Now (crime type) has dropped to zero in (city) and their safer (Police partner).

**Case study K – Collaborative**

They’ve been really great (referring to police service). To send (police partner) down here. He is here and so the kids can go see him when they want, and we can talk to him when we want. He helps with all the games and stuff. We figure stuff out together. We gave him an office here and he works here full time. He is completely involved in our community. Everyone knows him (Community partner).

The above quotations demonstrate the diverse nature of CSPs and how they operate along the partnership continuum as outlined by Jamieson et al. (2002).

**In summary:**

- Case study A – Consultative
- Case study B – Co-created
- Case study C – Collaborative
- Case study D – Cooperative
- Case study E – Consultative
- Case study F – Coordinated
- Case study G – Coordinated
- Case study H – Cooperative
- Case study I – Collaborative
- Case study J – Cooperative
- Case study K – Collaborative

Based on the discussions with participants and comparisons across partnerships and the description of each kind of partnership on the continuum, out of eleven site visits, 2 of the partnerships were consultative, 3 were cooperative, 2 were coordinated, 3 were collaborative, and one was co-created. This differs from the leaders’ descriptions of partnerships and may reflect sampling bias on behalf of both the participating police
organizations and the researcher. Nonetheless these partnerships generally involved a few key partners and many involved more than simply consultation. More specifics about partnership size and involvement level are discussed in the results for the second set of questions.

1b) What is their structure?

In both stage one and stage two of the research, I asked respondents to discuss the structure of their partnership, including questions about financial support, administration, physical infrastructure, key players, meeting places, and how they operated on a daily basis. They informed me that the community safety partnership(s) they knew rarely had any formal structure. These partnerships were seldom institutionalized and differed dramatically from partnership to partnership. Some were very fluid in their structure. Partners could shift and change, mandates were unclear and goals rarely set. There was very little evidence of strategic planning or developing of measurable outcomes.

There is no other way standardization in policing can go except locked up air tight in bureaucracy. Because the moment you take out the flexibility of our discretion, (it) impact(s) our outreach...As soon as there is a set expectation and rule and MOU everything in place, I think that’s the end of it. It kills outreach. I have to talk to an Inspector who doesn’t have a clue, who talks to a Staff Sergeant who doesn’t have a clue... And I think you can’t do that to outreach. Because then it takes us out of it. And it’s just our organization. It will be the end of community policing... (Case study I – Police partner)

For this respondent, and others in the study who expressed similar views, flexibility proved to be a very beneficial structure for partnerships that required discretion when working with their community partner and the clients they were serving. This was particularly true when the goals or outcomes of the partnership were not clearly identified.

Others were very strict with regard to what they intended to accomplish. This kind of structure was far less common and in stage two of the research such a structure was

---

20 Although the decisions of which partnerships to examine were made collectively, the police organizations may have wanted to showcase their more collaborative partnerships. Furthermore, based on the methodology, the researcher may have chosen partnerships that allowed for more observation and as such, would mean more engagement across the partners. Nonetheless, the partnerships described by police leaders differed in the level of collaboration when compared to the partnerships described by police middle managers and their community partners.
only observed in one site. This occurred in a consultative partnership. This particular partnership was created with the intention to reduce a particular type of property crime that was affecting local businesses:

We had a very set plan from the beginning. We knew what the problem was, and we had a good idea of how to address it. Once they agreed and signed on we were set. We contacted a few people who had experience putting these (security measures) in place and had a history of getting results. Once we had put in (those measures) and done our campaign, we saw the (crime type) drop substantially. Actually, last year, there weren’t any! (Case study J – Police partner).

This partnership continued over the course of policy changes that introduced agreed upon structural changes to reduce the property crime. Once the changes were implemented and there was a demonstrated decline in property crime for the businesses and the community, the partnership was terminated. However, the participants explained that their working relationships remained between the police and the organization in case new issues emerged. Nevertheless, it was clear that the police partner had a particular vision of what needed to be done and got the other partners to “sign on” to his vision. Thus, there was no co-creation of goals for the partnership.

Additionally, many of these partnerships were structured to serve a clientele. Thus, both the police and community organization leaders, as well as the community safety partnerships in the case studies were designed to provide a particular service ‘to’ or ‘for’ a specific population in the community. This meant that the communities were often not involved in the development of the partnership or active agents in shaping the goals or outcomes of the partnerships. However, two of the partnerships in stage two of the research attempted to actively involve the community of interest (case study F & H).

And like for me, I did not feel at all, one bit, that I was sitting there and not really doing anything, not really being heard. I was more involved than I had expected to be and that was extremely important for me on a lot of different levels. I was finally being heard and listened to about these issues. Because outside of this, I’m very passionate about this kind of stuff. It just happened to fall in my lap that I got this position and to be asked at every meeting – (Name), what are your updates? Like I felt like I was reporting back! But to be able to come in on all these issues…Like, they are talking about whatever issue and then I chime in and say my piece right. And as I’m talking I’m thinking “is this appropriate, should I even be talking, should I be opening my mouth. Like these are professionals and I don’t really talk professional.” I’d throw a swear in here and there. And then at the end of it, they all understood what I was saying and heard me. Whether they were on my
side or not, they still heard me. And like I felt professional and like totally part of the group. It was cool. (Case study F - Community partner and client)

Participants in these two partnerships discussed how having the community actively involved dramatically changed how they ‘did business.’ This was felt by the clients/partners as well, who felt that they had an active and informed voice to contribute.

Another indicator of structure that emerged in the data was the setting of formal meetings. More generally, the organizational structure of the partnerships in the study was often described as quite flexible. Most of the partnerships only met once every few months or when necessary. While some CSPs had started out with a number of meetings, the frequency and formality of these meetings decreased as relationships improved:

We used to have meetings all the time. Monthly or something like that. When we were trying to get it off the ground. But now that it’s up and running, we only hold a meeting if something has happened. Even then I usually just call (Staff Sergeant) and let him know what’s happening (Community partner – Case Study D).

The community partner in the above quotation described a similar experience for a number of community partners and the police who explain that meetings were really a way of getting to know each other and get the partnership going. Once a general plan of partnership making was established, the structure of meeting changed:

I was traditionally meeting with (the Staff Sergeant) once or twice a year when I first started but now it’s just pretty social. I try to let him know all the stuff I do... But his role has changed (he was promoted) and now I have his blessing to do what I want to do with his police service. We don’t even meet now because a lot of it is so repetitive, but now I need to build relationships with his newer staff in these different ranks. I go directly to who I need now to get these things done...because of our history and we all know each other... I used to be more formal, we had a standard template (on what they are doing) ...so I would have a list of our successes and then a list what is coming down the pipe and what we want to do...but not now. (Community partner – Case study G).

The community partner above explained how the partnership initially was more formal, but that she is now able to rely on personal relationships with the service. However, she does point out that these relationships need to be created with the newer
police staff she partners with currently, as much of this flexibility relies on relationships with police staff who are no longer working with her directly.

In Case Study A and F, the date of meetings was usually more frequent, as these partnerships were still emerging around a particular issue:

We are meeting all the time. We have monthly formal meetings, and then our subcommittee meetings and then we are on the phone with each other. A lot of that is because of the grant. We were trying to get the funding. Now that we have it, we are starting up the (location) and we just have so many logistics to deal with. We have to talk (Community partner – Case study F).

There was not a consistent time period between the meetings for any case study. Furthermore, based on the observations of partnerships that held meetings I was able to attend and the meeting minutes I obtained, a lot of the work that occurred between meetings appeared to occur outside the meetings by a few key players. Meetings were then held to update the other members on their progress. Thus, in most cases, the partnership really consisted of a few key people from each organization who worked together on an issue, rather than full organizational involvement.

Interestingly, almost half (5) of the partnerships, did not hold any meetings at all after their original meeting to create the partnership. In fact, some partnerships operated largely from personal relationships between a few key actors.

I think when (police partner) got together with (community partner) and other (community partner) that’s when the (partnership) really started to ramp up. And just got more and more involved. More events planned. More communication between them on who was going to do what at these events. I would say in the last four years that it has really taken off. And it was because of them (referring to the three key actors) (Police Partner – Case study H).

It really was just (community partner) and (police partner) who got this off the ground. He was only a Staff Sergeant then, but they just get along. And she was a real go getter. Wouldn’t take no for an answer. And they led it, just the two of them for a long time. Only in the past few years have more of us on the service taken on this role. But it was really them (Police partner – Case study G).

These quotations demonstrate the role of a few key actors in the transactional process of partnership making. Decisions were made informally between partners when
they came into contact with each other. They simply reached out to each other when a problem arose.

Another indicator of structure that emerged in the data was infrastructure. Infrastructure can be understood as physical or service-based facilities that support a function. In this case, they would support the partnership. In each case study I was afforded the opportunity to see where and how the partnerships worked. I also asked specific questions about how and where the partners came together and what infrastructure was in place. A few of the partnerships described some shared infrastructure:

They have given me an office here, so I can work down here every day. It’s good, because then the community doesn’t see me as a cop. They see me in street clothes and working with the other social service offices. It also gives me easier access to who I need to talk to, when I need to talk to them. I don’t have to set a meeting, I can just knock on their door. It makes it easier to do my job (Police partner – Case study K).

So, while the partners in some case studies allowed access to office space or shared resources, more generally, participants would come together from different roles and mandates. However, in one Case study (B), the partners shared an office and administration. They were a completely integrated unit and explained that they “get twice the amount of work done, because we don’t have to go through certain channels to get to each other. I just turn to (name) at the other desk and ask for help” (Case study B – police partner). They believed that this structure added to their collaboration and shared vision.

Other participants in the study also commented that they felt they would be more collaborative and productive if they had a shared work space or some type of shared infrastructure.

We don’t really have a place to meet. We work out of the police car. Or sometimes at her office (referring to community partner). I’m trying to get us space here at the police station because it is so cramped there. And everyone else from her office is there too (Police partner – Case study C).

However, this was not the case for the other partnerships in the study and most of the organizational work that occurred as part of these partnerships did not involve a specific person dedicated to administration. Rather, the key members of the partnership
took on the collaboration work “off the side of their desk,” or in addition to their regular duties in their organization. This issue is discussed later in this chapter, when a community member explains how their partnership emerged, however, it was a repeat issue in other partnerships as well. For example, in Case study H, both the police partner and the community partner commented on the lack of administrative support:

I do most of this work off the side of my desk. I love it, but I don’t have a lot of time for it. And I’ve been doing it a long time (Police partner).

We need help to do this kind of work. We need someone who is a dedicated admin who can deal with the logistics. Most of us are doing this work off the side of our desk and we just don’t have the time necessary to dedicate to all the work there is. (Community partner).

Another indicator of structure was the additional time respondents invested in making the partnership work. This issue of time to dedicate to the partnership and working extra hours or when they could to continue the partnership weighed on a lot of respondents. They explained that they needed extra funding to hire an admin person so that they could focus on their work and not repeat labour. Some also commented that this would help solidify the partnership, provide a neutral employee for all parties and legitimize the work they were doing in the community.

Funding was an additional indicator of structure. This issue came up as a result of general questions regarding funding and support for the partnerships. In fact, funding emerged as another inconsistency in the two stages of the research. Many of the leaders in stage one described well-structured and funded partnerships, in which all parties either contributed or funding was provided by the provincial or federal government,

The government really wanted to put some money into it and so they did. It was a hot topic you know? So, we got the money and we just did it (Police leader # 16 – Stage I).

However, the funding structure for the case studies in stage two was far less constant.

We don’t really have a lot of money to do all the things we’ve talked about doing. We do little projects and pamphlets here and there, but mostly we are relying on our own resources. And it’s tough because those resources are usually already budgeted elsewhere (Community partner – Case study E).
Many of the partnerships relied on funding from major municipal or provincial partners like the police or health, if they had any funding at all. The police also often offered the meeting space as they had dedicated administrative employees and meeting rooms that the community partners did not.

Getting agencies to work outside their comfort level is challenging. We need to be willing to take a risk and spend some money on a new idea. Right now, all I can give is my time and this meeting room (Police partner – Case study A).

This quote speaks to how, in most cases, the police merely allocated some of their resources towards the partnership and paid their police employee to participate as part of their role as a police officer.

1c). How have they emerged and developed?

This question is a combination of two separate questions. Respondents were asked to discuss both the beginnings of the partnership as well as its development over time. Respondents often had a hard time defining an exact start point and differentiating between specific dates and events. Thus, the learnings from these questions are best presented together, as similar concepts and themes emerged and overlapped in the responses.

Several themes related to how partnerships emerged were identified. Many of the partnerships were described as emerging out of a catalyst or crisis event, followed up by a local initiative to address this catalyst or crisis by one or two key people. A reliance on previous relationships in the community then seemed to help get the partnership off the ground, in tandem with support of leadership. The partners and the leaders also described learnings from similar situations in other places through discussions, conferences or workshops. Respondents also discussed their future planning for the partnership. However, there also seemed to be an avoidance of partnerships that were overly complex or addressed difficult and systemic issues. These themes are discussed below.


**Catalyst or crisis**

In both stages of the research, the participants referenced a local community crisis or catalyst that sparked the creation of the partnership. They spoke of increasing use of intravenous drugs resulting in local youth dying,

> It’s gotten bad. We’ve lost so many kids lately. We have to do better. They are clearly going to get it one way or another (Community partner – Case study A).

or a number of business owners experiencing a sudden increase in violent robberies,

> It was becoming a major issue. They would go in there with their backpack, hold them at knife point or gunpoint and tell them to fill it (the backpack) with drugs and get out. And then those drugs are on the street. It’s like two crimes. People were quitting (Police partner – Case study J).

or several youth traffic deaths in a row that sparked a need for road safety.

> And there was also a call from the community. In 2003, (around 10-15) young people were killed in less than a (three-month period). And so, (police member) went to his Staff Sergeant at the time and said, ”we have to do something” (Community partner – Case study G).

Others described how mental health or race relations were increasing issues in their community and, thus, were at the top of everyone’s agendas:

> And so, I think that we didn’t have the crisis four or five years ago that we do now. But now we are going – “oh hey look we have a crisis, how can we get police to work with schools, with parents, with health, and cities around a solution” …We are so good at reactionary planning, but not so good at proactive or responsive planning. (Community partner - Case study A)

A part of it is that we have a crisis right now and that brings people together. But it’s funny, because some of our residents, we have a crisis and they recognize that, but they don’t like what we are doing to deal with it. But I mean this is the most logical approach in my mind to do this. It’s the only thing you are going to do (Police partner - Case study F).

These quotations help to demonstrate that partnerships appeared to be easier to establish if they addressed a current hot topic or local crisis. However, in many cases it was clear that the partnerships were creating mandates that did not always support popular opinion of how to deal with these local issues. Nor was the current hot topic
necessarily easy to deal with. But participants did comment that they had to be “seen as doing something” (Police partner – Case study A).

**Local initiative of key actors and consistency**

In most cases, participants explained that they witnessed a problem emerging in their sector (either policing or the community organization) and reached out to a contact or made a cold call to ask how they were dealing with the same issue. One police leader provided a typical example of this recounting that when they were in middle management that is how they created their partnership:

> I guess I’d have to really sit down and think, “was there anything really specific that I did back then? Did I have to put a lot of effort into some?” Well a couple I did, you know getting together. You know oftentimes I’d rather do it informally like “hey I’m going for breakfast” and those type of things for the difficult ones. It was setting up regular – “let’s get together once a month here and have breakfast and see how we are doing” – so I’ve found really, it’s the informal one on one relationship building that proved successful. The willingness to just make a call. Because then when you get into a larger group you’ve got those relationships, everybody can talk and move a process forward much quicker. (Police leader #15 – Stage I).

Thus, these ground-level partnerships were not usually a product of direct leadership, but rather they reflect the actions of middle managers that were close to the front line and understood current issues in the community.

> I don’t think you can do this stuff if you don’t show up. If they don’t know you. You have to put in the time, especially with this community. The (referring to community) don’t trust the cops. Can you blame them? But I’m here day in and day out. They know me. I got to the kids’ games and I help with coaching. You have to be present or it all falls apart (Police partner – Case study K).

Similar to the literature on partnerships, consistent relationships between partners over time arose as an important factor to the creation and sustainability of current partnerships.

**Government initiative versus previous relationships**

Two different stories of how community safety partnerships emerged appeared in the data. The community organization and police leaders often talked about how they came together at a conference on public safety or crime prevention and an idea for a partnership came from discussions at that conference or workshop. This was very clear
when participants brought up examples like the Hub or the COR. They explained that there was an interest in this kind of partnership and so some kind of forum was held to address the current issue and start the partnership more formally.

I got called to Ottawa for a conference on it. It kept coming up in our circles, so I wasn’t surprised (Police leader # 7 – Stage I).

However, in the site visits, it became clear that most of the partnerships between local police and community organizations began because of a long-standing relationship between a member of middle managers from the police and a local community organization leader.

I’ve known her for years (referring to community partner). She is a bully (laughs). She just knows how to get stuff done and I like working with her. When (community partner) suggested we needed to move this forward, I agreed immediately… I don’t think we would be where we are (referring to an outcome of the partnership) if we didn’t work together so well. She’s basically one of my good friends now (Police partner – Case study F).

The partnerships were rarely developed formally or through larger channels like large conferences or meetings. Decisions were not made at this high level. Rather, these participants explained that partnerships were often the result of an individual in one of these two positions reaching out to the other through a letter, an email or a phone call to ask for help with an issue that may or may not have been discussed at a larger meeting/conference.

You have to have your radar out and take advantage of something when you can. I think that’s just how the system works. Everyone has limited resources. When (police partner) sent us that letter to ask if we would get on board, I knew immediately that this was something we needed to do. (Community partner – Case study J).

I had met him (police partner) a few times. And so, I talked to him. So, we just started talking about what the (police service) could do about these issues in (city). And then we started meeting. As it became more formalized, more people got involved and other police services nearby wanted to be a part of it as well. But it was really just us (police partner and community partner) talking at first. (Community partner – Case study H).

The previous quotes demonstrate that a willingness to initiate a conversation and build a relationship would often translate into other parts of both agencies agreeing to be
involved. Reaching out and asking for help seemed to create a relationship that helped build the foundation for the partnership.

**Support of leadership**

Interestingly, in speaking with participants in each case study, it became clear that these partnerships were supported by leadership. However, the amount of support differed from one partnership to the next. In some cases, the Chief or Deputy Chief had been approached about a community safety problem and assigned a specific middle manager to develop a partnership:

I was in a meeting with that community’s leaders and they asked us directly to be involved. They said they needed help in their area and together we needed to figure out how to address their issues. And so, I assigned (name) to that area so he could work directly with them (Case study K – Police leader).

A conversation was had between the director of (community partner) and my previous inspector, now superintendent at one of the mayor’s working groups – where it was determined that there was an opportunity to work with (community partner) in a capacity. Nothing was defined, it was just put out as an opportunity... Being that I was the outreach coordinator and the officer that would deal with that – (superintendent’s name) flipped me over (community organization leader)’s contact information and asked me to take it from there. I took a look at that and realized ... that was a huge opportunity for outreach within (the community partner) (Police partner – Case study I).

In other cases, middle managers had reached out to their leaders to ask for support on a particular issue:

I knew we could either work with them or at odds with them. I kept meeting with (their leader) because of the area I was in charge of. And so, I spoke with (Deputy Chief) about creating a partnership with them. He was really supportive (Police partner - Case study D)

Several respondents expressed that this support or engagement from leadership, particularly for the police, was key to their overall success in forming and sustaining the partnership.

They (police leader) just let me come down here and start working. That was amazing. It just became my job. They just let me do what I wanted and that let me build real relationships here. I think it’s why I’m so embedded here now (Police partner – Case study K).
Leadership appeared to play an important role in not only helping to create, but also sustaining community safety partnerships. While much of the partnership making process was still occurring at the ground level, it seems from these quotes that the leadership could influence the level of partnership based on how much flexibility they gave their staff to engage.

**Learnings from other sectors**

Respondents in both stage one and stage two spoke of how the partnership was created through learning across existing partnerships in other parts of the country. Many of the leaders spoke about learning opportunities when they pursued their education or visited police services in other parts of the country or internationally as part of their police role. They pointed to the major project they conducted in the police executive leadership program and how, through discussions with other police leaders in that course, they developed innovative ways to try and address the problem in their community. They also consistently commented on how their exposure to other police leaders was indispensable, as they felt they could call them up any time to talk about shared issues and brainstorm with others on their level:

It was a very varied group. Very varied group. And you know I made some connections both within the RCMP and within other organizations that resulted in similar people, you know like the fellow from (Ontario) who had a somewhat similar job, he ran a somewhat similar division as I did in Manitoba and we had conversations – you know there’s people I can reach out to and say, “hey you ever run into this?” So, it was the varied experiences based on somewhat similar details across the country. (Stage one – Police leader).

This helped several of the police leaders who were concerned about testing out these ideas with their own, more junior staff, who they explained may not understand the organizational or political issues at stake.

Realizing that you can actually leverage the learnings of your peers to assist in your own organization - that was huge. And the relationships...the names and people and I still communicate for work purposes with several of them. In fact, just a year and a half ago I went to visit on the other side of the country. And I’ve been asked for support too. That 30,000-foot perspective. Only other police leaders are going to see it like that (Police leader # 13 – Stage I).

In stage two of the research, an important theme of cross-pollination of ideas emerged that differed from stage one. The respondents described different learning
experiences than the leaders. Many of the community partners referenced their organizations’ own conferences and workshops and how they were exposed to new and creative ideas in these places. Several spoke about taking time, with their police partners in some cases, to visit organizations that already had the kind of partnership they wanted to create and spending a few days with those organizations to learn from them:

> So, when we were doing the meetings everything was all agreed upon. I got called and I had to leave with our lawyer. Because again, they just wanted to know how things worked in (another Canadian city) … I had given them all the MOUs from (that city) and we requested the stuff from (another city). Somebody still had a contact in (city) and got their stuff. So, (Community leader) was like – ‘we’re not reinventing the wheel here. We are all in Canada. We have a few bylaws that are different here and there.’ So, they just had to tweak a bunch of stuff. (Police partner – Case study C).

Others spoke about attending small conferences or symposiums with their partners that allowed them to learn from other speakers in Canada and start a conversation:

> (Name of community partner) who works here, (name) from the city and (name) from the police attended an elder abuse discussion in (Canadian city) … And, – over a beer of course – cause that’s where the best things happen. They were at this conference, they were talking about elder abuse issues and they had been working literally off the side of their desk as a team to try and look at elder abuse issues. We are lucky that our police department has a diversity unit where they deal with social issues as well as police issues. And they sketched out what (the partnership) would look like. Literally on a napkin. Like it was one of those – Aha! kind of moments. They had this epiphany of how they would like to see it because they were the ones driving this. (Community partner – Case study E)

These quotes not only suggest that a lot of partnerships are created out of shared learnings across the country and a desire to not “reinvent the wheel,” but also reinforces the true informality of some partnership creation in the study and more generally.

**Purpose and planning**

As partnerships emerged and developed, participants were often unclear about the purpose of the partnership and were also unable to provide a definitive measure of when their work was complete. As such, I incorporated questions about strategic planning (or
the lack there of) into the conversations. Because they did not set clear intentions or outcomes, there appeared to be no way to determine when the partnership had succeeded in accomplishing its mission. Only one partnership (Case study J) was able to define their goals and outcomes clearly. And indeed, this was the partnership that completed partnering once they achieved these goals. However, the issue of long-term strategic planning and goal setting of the partnership was generally brushed past as not as important as their current collaboration work.

Participants spoke comfortably about how community safety partnerships had emerged, but very few had a succession plan to continue the partnership when they left that was part of their overall organizational training protocol. Some community leaders explained that their organization had clear long-term intentions for collaboration and partnership making and it was integral to the training that they provided. For example,

I believe we do a lot of work in that area, trying to bring our managers along in that way, so they can develop their capacity and leadership and community engagement. So, we spend time supporting them to do that. We’ve supported them all, including some people who aren’t managers...The same program that I was in years ago. So, we actually try to make sure we are giving people we see with leadership potential opportunities to take training. So, we are pretty intentional about that kind of succession planning when we can be (Community organization leader – Stage I).

However, most could only express hope that their hard work would be carried on by others. They did not know if they would have capable replacements:

You can only hope that their influence is deep and that their replacements are solid. We can't expect that everyone is going to go on forever, but they are going to build a tremendous amount of influence and they already have in this community. Because I had a relationship with (them) beforehand. And (them) now? Looks nothing like (the organization) beforehand. There was no relationship with the street population and there was certainly no reaching out to other organizations, like the police and fire and EMS. We had to go to them if we wanted to have a relationship. (Case study F – Community partner and leader).

Indeed, there was a lack of definitive goals or purposeful planning that may impact the long-term sustainability of these community safety partnerships.
Avoidance of complex issues

In describing how partnerships emerged and developed, there appeared to be an avoidance of certain kinds of partnerships, e.g. complex, multiple partners, and funding arrangements or challenging issues that required a deeper commitment to structural change. An example of this might be homelessness. Several respondents commented on how their partnership was not addressing the larger structural issues that were causing their local problems in the first place. However, many of the respondents wanted to do what they could to help in their community and often had a long history of involvement in community safety:

We’ve had other successes (here). Like (partnership) was a community driven thing which was to bring a (specialized) court (here). We did it independently without provincial assistance and then eventually the province came on board, but by then we were up and running already. So, I think we’ve had successes in the past. So that’s why we feel confident when we start new initiatives now (Community partner - Case study F).

This doesn’t mean however that they were willing or able to take on larger structural issues and address them head on. Indeed, many participants also expressed that they were able to partner around their current community issues because of previous successes in partnership making.

2a). Who is involved and to what extent?

This section addresses two separate questions from the data collection. While these questions were dealt with individually as part of the semi-structured conversations with respondents, they are important to analyze together, as one informs the other. The partnerships that were discussed in the first stage of the research and in initial access meetings with each police service varied in involvement. Most of the partnerships described involved a collaboration between 2-3 separate organizations: the police, a community organization and sometimes another governmental or similar organization such as health, education or a crown corporation. In the second stage of the research, 5 of the partnerships were between the police and a community organization, 3 were between the police, a community agency and a government partner, and 3 involved four or more partners including the police service.
Despite the variability in number of partners, most of the partnerships in the second stage of the research occurred between a few key individuals who acted as representatives for their organizations in the partnership. Those individuals who consistently came to meetings and were vocal were usually referred to by others as “key” or “core” partners.

(Police partner) is always there. He’s been there since the beginning. So, has (name of community partner). (Community partner) isn’t even in charge of it anymore. But he still shows up. I mean he’s the core. They both are. (Community partner – Case study H).

Other representatives who were inconsistent, or where their agency representation changed from meeting to meeting, were considered less committed to the overall partnership.

They are here sometimes. When they can get someone to show. I mean, I think they want to be involved, but they aren’t really around. Maybe they just want to say they are at the table (Community partner – Case study A).

Throughout the research, it appeared that many of the collaborations were between partners who had similar organizational mandates. They were often service organizations that were responsible for community health and safety. This is not surprising as it is often easier to develop collaboration around shared goals (D’Amour et al. 2008). However, one partnership (Case study F) had very different mandates for the community partners and the police service. The community partner was focused on harm reduction while the police service usually addressed this community safety issue through enforcement. Despite differing mandates, and a more cooperative approach to partnering on the partnership continuum, these partners worked together to start to build a new shared vision that reflected more of the community partners’ mandates.

I mean everyone is involved in this. We are all working from our organizations, but this is bigger than those. We are creating a new way for our community to deal with this. A new way of thinking about this. It’s not what my guys are used to (referring to police members), but it’s what we all want now (referring to the partners). We need to be more progressive and that starts by thinking differently. Locking them up isn’t working (Police partner – Case study F).

Similar to how the partnerships emerged and developed, good leaders were also consistently identified as playing a significant role in the partnership. More generally,
many participants commented that the partnership would never have emerged if a specific leader were not in place and supporting the collaboration.

And I think it was executive leaders. Almost everybody on that committee was educated on the system to know what was needed. I mean, personally I’ve been banging my head against the wall with (them) for years and getting nowhere. And then all of sudden coming into a room where the police are going to support this, EMS is going to support this, everyone is supporting this. And, in fact, it was probably the one thing that finally got (their) attention. Because they finally realized that maybe ... they are doing some things... that are working. And that was huge for us... I think right now that they have very strong leadership. And knowledgeable leadership that has been much more accepted. It’s no longer a fringe organization but an actual working key player. (Case study F- Community partner and leader)

Another important theme that emerged was the need for strong leadership within both the police and community agencies. A number of respondents pointed to this leadership needing to not only support the partnership, but also ensure that others within the organization followed suit. When asked about how a partnership got started, many pointed to specific leaders who decided an issue was worth pursuing and their ability to convince others of the same.

Leadership succession also emerged as an important issue. Some pointed to an overall paradigm shift in the organization that would continue to support the partnership if one leader left. However, others feared that the loss of a charismatic leader may mean the end of the partnership all together. Thus, in the process of partnership making between the police and community organizations, leaders not only needed to support the partnership, but ensure that this support was consistent throughout their organization.

I think he’s (police leader) being able to imbed a bit of a paradigm shift in there that I think will be sustainable. I mean who knows who the new Chief is going to be, but there are enough people on their senior leadership team, in terms of superintendents and inspectors, with whom we have evolved incredible working relationships (Community partner - Case study C).

When the leaders were supportive it appeared to encourage others to take risks on partnerships they may not have otherwise taken. Furthermore, leaders who were willing to get involved on the ground appeared to contribute to the overall success of the partnership. Many believed it demonstrated support for the partnership throughout the organization.
2b). What issues have emerged?

The respondents in the study, particularly in stage two, were very eager to talk about the successes of their partnership. However, some respondents, especially leaders, identified a few issues that emerged throughout the process of partnering. These issues included the perception of the police as a symbol of power, concerns around legitimacy, and a lack of resources.

First, I will focus on the police as a symbol of power, as this is an issue that was consistently raised. Police control caused issues for some partners because the police were not always viewed as neutral and, at times, were described as intimidating. Very few community partners described engaging in a conflictual debate with their police partners in meetings and as part of their partnership, despite informing me of their differing opinions outside of official meetings:

There’s something about the uniform. And the authoritativeness that stands behind that. I mean from my own experience, from the majority of the interactions that I’ve had with the police, out in the field on calls, they’ve always been very positive. But you do occasionally run into those situations where it’s not so positive. And when you picture yourself sitting in a car alone with someone for ten hours, it was really intimidating going into it. (Community partner – Case study C).

The respondent here commented that they did not like the idea of being isolated with a police officer and away from their work team for several hours, even describing it as "scary."

Interestingly, this quotation also points to an issue that emerged in several of the case studies: the perception of the police uniform. In Case study C, the partners described how both their clients dealing with mental health issues, and also their staff were uncomfortable with the uniform based on the power and violence it represented. In Case study H, a number of the community partners expressed similar concerns.

I would never be caught in a room with (police partner) before this. I saw that uniform and walked the other way (Community partner - Case study H).

The partners and their clients were both from marginalized racial and religious groups and had experienced both fear of, and victimization by, the police, both in Canada and in other countries. In Case study F, this fear of what the police uniform
represented translated into one of the police partners, who was responsible for biweekly events, not wearing a uniform to these events. They commented that it was better for the partners and the client to see them as ‘Joe’\textsuperscript{21} than as a member of the police. The partners in this case study also commented on how important it was for the police officer to show up out of uniform, because so many of their clients had been victimized by the police. One of these clients explained that he used to get into fights with the police, including Joe. However, seeing Joe at these events, as a real person, had contributed to him participating more regularly and even becoming a key event partner, assisting with set up and organization. The client explained,

I still can’t believe the cop I used to fight every Friday night is now letting me drive his truck to bring the barbecue to this event. I used to be the big Indian fighting the cops. Now I’m the guy setting up the Tipi and handing out burgers. I got clean because of Joe. I’m here because of Joe. He’s not a cop to me. He’s a friend. He’s one of us. (Community client turned partner – Case study F).

The description of the police partner as “one of us” emphasizes the work of the partnership, and also the levelling effect of removing the uniform when engaging with the community partners and their clients, particularly when the clients have had negative contacts with the police in uniform.

The police partner in Case study K took a similar approach and described how he did they not wear his uniform at all in the community. He also preferred the other police who attended the community to not wear their uniform. He felt that the uniform worked against the trust-building he had done in the community. In Case study I, the police partner was also cognisant of the perception of the police uniform but attempted to change this perception with his behaviour. When I commented that one of the partners wore a uniform and the other did not, the police partner explained,

It has served really well for (other police officer) to be here in plain clothes and me in uniform because it gives the people that we interact with the ability to see us as we might be. And part of our introduction is showing them badges and identification and what they might interact with in both capacities...I wear a uniform here, because I think it’s really important to broach some of those fears around the uniform... I think (referring to self) the person could much more easily break through to these people and interact. I think when the uniform comes on, I represent a much bigger problem for a lot of people. And so, I think it

\textsuperscript{21} Pseudonym used.
is important that they see that one, this is what we look like, this is what they can expect to see out there. And at the same time try to recover some of that trust for me the person in the uniform representing the police departments more broadly. (Police partner – Case study I).

The police partner here also described how it was important for the community partners to see them in uniform as well, considering that (similar to Case study H), many of these partners had also experienced negative contacts with the police in their previous countries. The police partner wanted to change that perception. When speaking with the community partners in Case study I, they affirmed these claims, referring to the officer as a “great cop” and “someone we can trust.” They also commented that it gave their clients a “good impression of the police,” because the police officer was friendly and participated in offering orientations and courses for newcomers.

In the other case studies participants did not describe the uniform as an issue. Negative perceptions of the police seemed to be more common in partnerships that involved community partners with marginalized clients and negative contacts. In fact, the community partners from case study D noted that they were often confused with the police because they wore a similar uniform. They explained that while some of their clients were initially wary of the uniform, they could now recognize these partners and that the uniform signalled to the larger community that they were ‘police-like’ and could be helpful.

Other partners, such as provincial health services or crown corporations, did not describe the same concerns about the police. These partners tended to perceive the police as an equal partner. This could represent their own positions of power, as the police are a municipal service and these partners were either provincial or stand-alone organizations. In all of the meetings and interactions I observed for these case studies, the police partners were in uniform and there was no comment about the police partner being interpreted as intimidating or authoritarian. Nor did issues of power emerge in the interviews or focus groups. Indeed, the social position (for example, marginalized versus municipal government employee) correlated with the perception of the police as a symbol of power.

Issues of police legitimacy also emerged in the process of partnership making. In both stages of the research, respondents discussed the issue of the police being viewed as genuine. In the following section, I discuss the issue of trust more broadly, and how
police in particular needed to build trust with their partners. Importantly, the police leaders in the first stage of the research frequently mentioned their need to build trust in order to establish legitimacy. They explained how when they initiated contact with a community partner, they often experienced hesitation. For example, one police leader recounted how at an initial meeting to create a partnership a local community organization leader asked him “Why are you even here? What do the police have to do with this problem?” He went on to explain that the police often had to prove themselves as being genuinely supportive and wanting to help as a way to counter previous negative experiences with partnering with the police. Other leaders said that they relied on personal relationships with community partners to “vouch” for them when trying to collaborate. Concerns around legitimacy echoed in stage two of the research, where a community partner (Case study H) commented,

In my six years, we went from what was essentially a pseudo public relations kind of exercise – gather community members and police around the table and we will call it (name of the partnership). And isn’t this wonderful? But I think it would have been acknowledged by almost everyone around the table, with a couple of exceptions from the police, that nothing really meaningful or substantive was being done year in and year out. But over the last few years – and I’m going to keep referring to the (collaborative event), because that seemed to be the real catalyst. Where people definitely felt like ‘Oh, there’s something here!’ We’re listening, we are understanding, we are building relationships.

Here, the respondent, and others in the focus group reiterated a common experience for community partners throughout the research; collaboration with the police often initially felt like a public relations exercise and not real partnership-making.

Several of the community partners explained that they initially approached the collaboration with hesitation, waiting to see if the police were serious about collaboration and if they would really have a say in how the partnership unfolded.

We didn’t really know if he was serious at first. We’ve reached out to them (the police service) a few times when a (problem) happened or we had a (problem). They weren’t there when we needed to partner, so we

22 This is not to say that the community partners did not need to establish trust. Indeed, I’ve discussed the police being very hesitant to trust outsiders. However, I’ve discussed the issue of police power and control here. While trust may be a requirement of both sides, the police often had more work to do to prove themselves as trustworthy to community partners and their often marginalized clients.
weren’t sure what was going to happen and if they meant it. (Community partner – Case study J).

Community organizations who had partnered with the police in the past also expressed how police partners often ‘took over’ the partnership and ‘did what they thought was right’ without consulting others. While the police partners also expressed some hesitation working with community partners, they were generally less concerned about genuine partnership and more about if they would be perceived as genuine. As seen in the above quotation, however, many of these concerns subsided as the partnership continued and developed beyond merely consultation.

A lack of resources was another issue that emerged in the process of partnering. Recall, that in the case studies, the police often offered funding to support the partnership. In some cases, this was because the police were the larger agency and had more funding than their community partners. In a few cases, the partners would offer some financial support or resources, but these were usually limited to providing staff. Only in case study G, did the partner provide the bulk of the resources and staff support. Many of the community partnerships relied on piecemeal grants available through the provincial or federal government. Some commented on the extensive and time-consuming process of finding and securing funding and the subsequent insecurity of not having sustainable or long-term funding options:

So, they just applied for grant after grant after grant application. And they finally got some money from the Solicitor General’s department. They have a fund called (name of fund) … and we were able to get three consecutive one-year contracts. And then we are just finishing the third year of our first three-year contract. So, you have to do three one-year contracts to prove yourself and then do three years. So, we are finishing up the last year of our three-year ones and we will be doing another one. So that’s going to keep (name of community partner)’s job safe for at least three years. (Community safety partner – Case study E).

These short-term funding streams translated into issues of job security and the overall sustainability of the partnership. In some cases, this resulted in police leaders taking over and offering funding when others would not, because they personally wanted the partnership:

Met with all three of the agencies. All said, ‘yeah, great idea, we’re not paying for it.’ That’s what I got out of it...So finally, our Chief said, ‘don’t care, we need this. I agree with everything my staff have developed in their proposals’... The Chief said, ‘we are doing this, I’m taking this out
of my patrol guys. Patrol guys are doing the work right now. We are going to do a better job.’ (Police partner – Case study C).

This kind of decision making on behalf of police leaders occurred in a few of the case studies, where the police simply decided to include the partnership in their budget because other partners would not or could not. However, a few of the respondents commented on how this was a larger structural issue. They noted that in the case of partnerships around mental health or drug use, they needed more support from provincial health services, but these services were already “strained or exhausted” and “had their own (stuff) to deal with” (Community partner – Case study F).

Additionally, some noted that the lack of awareness from larger funding streams (like the provincial or federal governments) about the ground level issues, meant that funding often went to larger provincial partnerships that failed to address local concerns. Many of the participants felt frustrated with the current funding model because they believed it was not supporting the development and sustainability of partnerships that could address their local context more appropriately. Police leader # 18 from Stage I summed this up when he stated,

The problem is this, you are doing what you are doing. You don’t want to stop what you are doing, but you know you need to do better. So how do you adjust to do better when you don’t have the money or the resources? Unless you stop what you are doing now. Well nobody wants to stop that because they go “well then we are creating other gaps.” But I think it’s like you are trying to chase your tail. Like if there was a bunch of money to sink into a program, people would be willing to do that but there isn’t any money coming in... So, to do it with existing resources, and always have work in our own silos, it’s difficult to change.

In several cases, partners noted that they were doing work ‘off the side of their desk’ to keep the partnership going,

I do all of this off the side of my desk. I care about it so its fine. But it’s a lot to do when you have all this other work (Police partner – Case study G).

Some participants felt a dedicated but neutral administrative assistant was necessary to keep the partnership accountable and efficient, and not add to the already heavy workloads many of the partners.

We just need some help. If we could hire someone to help with the paperwork that would be great. We could get more done. We wouldn’t be repeating things at meetings. I have my own full-time job (Community partner – Case study H).
However, they lamented that this was not financially feasible without consistent funding. Furthermore, organizational issues such as allotting time and energy to the partnership, while still attending to one’s own duties, appeared to impact the time participants could dedicate to partnership making.

2c). Which factors contribute to overall satisfaction and success or hinder the process of partnering?

While this research question may appear convoluted, it is in fact the product or several separate general questions that encouraged respondents to carry the conversation where they wanted. Once these conversations began, I was able to use appropriate probes, including what was and was not working. The following analysis combines the results of this probing because the themes that emerged in these conversations all focused on a common set of issues and inform one another.

Throughout the course of this study, some participants appeared to be more satisfied with their partnership experience or believed in the possibilities of the partnership than others. A number of factors contributed to participants’ overall satisfaction with the partnership and perceptions of what factors either contributed to its success or hindered it. These included issues of negative perceptions of the police, interpersonal relationships and trust, training and education in collaboration, consistency in staff, personality, and social skills and timing.

Several respondents raised generalized negative perceptions of police as an issue in partnering. In a few of the case studies, there was a clear distrust of the police and police power. This did not seem to apply to their specific police partners, whom many described as ‘not a typical cop’ or ‘oh, she’s different.’ Rather, it appeared to be a distrust of the policing organization more generally. Several respondents explained that they had gone into their partnership not trusting the police. This was particularly true for partners who had personally experienced police violence or been threatened by that violence:

I have them on speed dial. Again, just reflecting on my own journey with this, I’m originally from east LA and as a kid growing up, a young man, a Chicano Mexican American, when we saw the police, I turned in the other direction. I avoided the police at all costs. Even though I had done nothing wrong, but I just didn’t want to get stopped by them,
caught by them, it was just like that. And I carried that with me all the time. I noticed with police, even as I got older. And when I started off with the (partnership), I was completely that way. I was guarded. And now it’s completely changed and morphed. (Community partner – Case study H)

Or had witnessed police abuse of their clientele:

When this program came into our office, no one would take it. In fact, no one would take the job. And it was basically because we are a very small agency and we work very close... to figure out the answers or to make a good plan. And here you are alone with a police officer, that you don’t know. And they think completely different. And you’re making a judgement call on your own. So, I think that seclusion when we work as a team was a big factor. And yeah, they think very differently than we do. And I think that was my apprehension. And I think it was quite a while before the cover offs (temporary staff) came in, because no one would do it. They got a few to stand up and then no one else for quite a while. (Community partner – Case study C).

These quotes demonstrate that perceptions of the police as a whole can potentially affect the overall partnership from initial interactions to who from the community might be willing to participate in the partnership.

Many respondents informed me that they had built trust with their partners and that trust is what supported the overall partnership. They pointed to the fact that without trust, and interpersonal relationships with their partners outside of the collaboration, they may never have been able to get the partnership off the ground in the first place.

I asked participants to provide specific details about how they built trust. Most respondents struggled to provide me with specifics, however, some attempted to give me an interpretation of the actions they took,

You’ve got to be open and honest with people. You’ve got to let them know you are not here to tell them what to do. And I think a lot of people think “Oh the police are here, they are just going to tell me what to do.” Cause a lot of the time, in regular policing, it is what we do. But not in things like this... You have to tell them “I’m open. I have no preconceived notions and I’m asking for your help. I will actually listen.” ... So, listening, listening, listening is always a good way to build trust. (Police partner – Case study H).

You find that common thread. Whether it’s grandchildren, fishing, motorcycles whatever. Then you find that common ground and then you start building from there...just build that rapport. And then from there you build momentum with that person and then you can say “hey, I need some help.” (Community partner – Case study G).
Participants said that it meant being present, showing up, making time for a quick conversation, and being willing to take risks and offer their support first.

Through regular communication. Trust is built over time... the only way to build trust is where there is a pattern of behaviour, decisions and support. Where someone feels like you said something, and you did it. You said you were going to follow up and you did (Police partner #14 – Stage I).

In fact, the police specifically pointed out the need to take risks more than the community partners. Several police leaders and police partners explained that taking risks meant offering financial support first, or offering space for a meeting, or taking on a small local problem that the community partner had been asking the police to address for a long time.

You got to give them something first. Extend that olive branch. Offer your skills or how you can help without asking for anything back. They might not help you down the road but as a police officer, you have to take that risk first (Police leader #17 – Stage I).

Interestingly, this ‘risk-taking' behaviour on the side of police also gave them control over the financial support or location of their work.

The ability to build trust was also important because it was not evenly distributed throughout the data. Some individuals who had been working in their organization for a number of years were much more comfortable describing how they built trust than were newer staff. More experienced staff were able to point to a number of incidents in which they built trust with other partners and in their community and how they learned from each of these experiences. However, some new staff, particularly in the community organizations, described how their profession was built on the ability to develop trust and relationships.

Relationships are what we do. It’s what we have to do. It’s the lifeblood of our work. If the client doesn’t trust you, you have nothing. So, everything we learn is about building and maintaining trust (Community partner – Case study F)

These findings suggest that relationship building and trust, while sometimes viewed as an inherent sociable trait, involved skills that could potentially be learned and enhanced through training. This is not to say that trust building should be seen as a
marketable or manipulative skill, but rather something that does not require decades of experience to develop.

Some participants did refer to professional training for collaboration and partnership making. Most of the police I spoke to, and some of the community partners, had not been trained to partner with other agencies. However, the community partners were often more likely to have had some kind of formalized partnership or collaboration training. Interestingly, one of the community partners described extensive experience in collaboration training as part of their education or the ongoing training provided by their organizations:

(Our organization) has invested a lot of leadership training in about the last ten years. And I think that’s made a difference. That people understand how to be a leader and how to use those kinds of skills and manage conflict and how to do engagement. And then, when I was in that leadership program – I actually had an executive coach me on how to build community partnerships. And so, a lot of my leadership journey – it was a two-year program – had a large focus on specifically building community relationships. (Community organization leader # 2 – Stage I).

The police in this study, however, were unable to point to specific guidance or training in collaboration or partnership making. When asked where they learned to partner or collaborate, many looked confused and explained they learned from experience. One police leader described the lack of collaboration skill training while updating his education and training as a police officer, saying,

The soft skills of connecting with people at the right level. There wasn’t much of that. There was a lot of varied presentations, but not too much of those finer skills in leadership that make the big difference... I’ve had to learn that from books, from experience. No one ever gave me direction or taught me how to do this. (Police leader #20 – Stage I).

In these two quotes, a common distinction between how the police and community organizations approach collaboration emerges. The police officer described the lack of training or support in collaboration despite over twenty years of working with that community. Alternatively, the community organization leader described a significant amount of training and pointed to a number of cases in which she was trained in working with other organizations to improve collaborative relationships. These differences were also described in stage two of the research, where many of the community partners were exposed to some training, albeit far less than their leadership, in collaboration,
whereas the police were exposed to very little educational or training support on collaboration or how to partner.

As mentioned, participants also described that building trust meant consistency. Several of the community partners described the need for the people who attended meetings and did the planning to be consistent. Partners from marginalized communities, who were already hesitant about the police as an organization, struggled to build trust if the police officer changed each time their group met. While some police leaders explained that they preferred to change the officer to give everyone a chance to get to know the community, this often worked against trust building. Community partners expressed how they and their clients liked to attach a name to a face and work with someone they could get to know.

Assigning one office to a partnership for an extended period of time usually worked against the police mandate of changing officer assignments every 3-5 years. When asked, police leaders explained that this was protocol. It kept their police officers up to date on training and gave them experience in other areas. I pushed them further on this question. I could not understand why a leader would want to jeopardize a strong partnership and relationship for these reasons. Many of the respondents explained that this diversity of experience would help their members advance in their careers and, in turn, make them better leaders. The implications of perceiving partnership-making as a utilitarian or political, rather than genuinely impacting community safety, will be discussed in the following chapter.

In this study, I found only one case (Case study F) in which a police officer requested to stay on with the community partnership long after his assignment should have changed. He did so because he explained that he had built the community’s trust and felt it would be more harmful to the partnership if he decided to move on. This potentially could put the trajectory of his career in jeopardy. When asked about this he explained that he had built trust with the First Nations community there and believed they would be uncomfortable with an outsider replacing him. However, not everyone had this choice. When I asked another police officer about staying on with the partnership he had created, he said, “I can’t. You have to be a year out of a position before you can come back to it. That’s our rules here, because they want you back to patrol” (Police
partner – Case study C). Thus, it appeared as though some organizational mandates were interfering with what the participants described as being important to trust building.

Other partners described how the trust they had built between particular members of the community, and subsequently the members of their partnership, was longstanding and was not partner dependent. They believed this contributed to them being more productive than expected even in the face of controversy. One community partner explained it this way,

I don’t think the entire community follows suit. I mean we are in (a conservative town). But honestly, I think it comes down to partnerships every time. Like it’s the one thing that we do better than everywhere else. Like we have travelled all over to figure out what path we need to be on and glean information, and over and over again, it has become clear that it’s through our partnerships that we have been able to move things the way that we are. (Case study F)

This comment also represents a very unique partnership in the study. They were aware of the larger community’s distaste for their harm reduction approach. However, they also consistently commented on their relationships across partners as some of the best they have had throughout their careers. Many had lived in and traveled to different cities and worked with different partners and continued to refer to their city, at this time, as the more progressive and cohesive. Several respondents referenced the size of their city (one of the smaller cities in the study) and the education level of their partners (they described as quite high) as contributing to the strength of their partnership. They believed having less bureaucracy because of size, and more progressive attitudes because of (higher) education levels was important. Several participants said they could never succeed in partnering around these controversial issues in another city with a similarly conservative community. However, they felt that their partners made all the difference and continuously praised their efforts. This was also visible in the meetings and focus groups I took part in and the welcoming nature of all of the participants and their clients in the community. This finding also emerged in my field notes, as I had noted on several interactions with local shop owners and community members I came across had spoken about how the agencies in their community were very cohesive. This was not mentioned in a similar way in other communities.

I only witnessed this cohesiveness in one other partnership. This was Case study H. Interestingly, when I held a focus group with the participants here and when I observed
one of their meetings, I witnessed them each embrace each other as they entered the room. This appeared to be led by one of the community partners. When I asked him about it, he told me that he always “wanted people to feel welcomed.” It was clear that this individual was contributing to the overall cohesiveness of the group. This was reiterated when the focus group ended, and, in parting, I too was embraced. It follows that particular types of people appear to contribute to the overall type of partnership and the members’ satisfaction with that partnership.

Personality emerged as another important theme in this line of questioning. Throughout the two stages of the research, the respondents consistently commented that partnership work took ‘particular kinds of people.’ Actually, this may have been the most common finding in the entire study. When asked how things emerged, how the partnership worked, how they brought people together, what contributed to the success of the partnership and so on, without fail the participants responded that it was because of particular types of people.

She’s just a wonderful person. She’s always eager to help. And so, when you talk about partnerships and what makes them work? I would argue that it’s the people. And the relationships that people have, that make partners want to work with partners in order to achieve their goals. (Police partner – Case study G).

No one else could do this. He just has the personality you know? Everyone likes him. He comes in and just everyone feels safe. It’s so obvious that he cares. He wants to be here (Community partner – Case study I)

She’s a total bulldog. I love it. No one else could do this job but her. Everyone supports her. (Police partner – Case study F)

We just all get along so well. All the right people are in the room. We are all so close now and I don’t think we would be if the people were different (Community partner – Case study B).

23 This was not the first or last time I was embraced during the research. This may partly be a result of my previous interaction with some of the community members and perhaps partly because of my demeanor. Either way, it reaffirmed that I was trusted by the participants and welcome in their communities. It also supports that some of the partners understand that physical touch can build trust and genuine connection, both of which were commonly referenced as the basis for the success of their partnerships.
They would explain that a partnership needed “the right kind of person” or “the right personality.” In some cases, participants explained that a particular leader or active community member made all the difference.

First of all, he’s an excellent speaker. He’s very persuasive. But he just has a nice way about him. So, he created this relationship with us which really worked I think. They really respected him making the time and I think it showed...You need to bring in somebody they respect, someone on their level, that leader (Community partner – Case study G).

Furthermore, when I asked participants to explain what made “the right personality” or the “right person” some consistent findings emerged.

First, a number of the community partners described the “right” police partner as someone who was educated24. This was already mentioned in the context of Case study F, when their community partner claimed that education level contributed to the kind of partnership they were able to establish. In this case study and others, the education being referred to was in the social sciences. For example, one community partner (Case study C) explained how their police partner was trained in psychology and had worked in mental health prior to becoming a police officer.

He’s actually trained in this stuff you know? I don’t have to deal with someone who doesn’t understand mental health. He studied that. It makes a difference. When they are educated. They just get it. I don’t have to explain why our clients are where they are. They know, and they get why we are doing what we are doing (Community partner – Case study C).

The officer described here had also already worked on a similar partnership in another city and had focused almost exclusively on mental health there as well. Thus, a number of the respondents in this partnership explained that this was the right person because they understood and were trained in the issue and had experience working with the community on that exact issue in the past.

Second, if the police partner had worked with the community for a long time, or had a history of experience, this was often seen as a contributor to making them ‘the right fit.’ For example, one community partner pointed to the fact that the police partner had previously worked as a social worker and how that ‘lens’ contributed to how they

24 There is no comparison group in this study to measure the education of all levels of police officers, but it appeared to be something the community partners felt contributed to the partnership work.
worked with others and understood local community safety issues. A community partner (Case study F) explained how a police leader in the partnership was “really socially minded. Like social justice – that’s different for a cop quite frankly.” This partner and others noted that the difference between police in the past and now, stating,

... (older police recruits) didn’t grow up in multicultural communities and societies and their relationship with First Nations growing up, during their formative years, is very different than what I am seeing now in some of the younger, more hip if you will, more savvy, more millennials... (Community partner – Case study I)

Here, we see that the community partner described a transition in the types of police officers participating in partnerships; officers that are educated, understand diversity and are more aware of social issues than in the past.

Third, many of the respondents described social skills as important to creating the ‘right personality.’ The opposite was also true. A few participants described how their partnership had ‘weeded out’ those who were naysayers or did not support the goals of the partnership early on.

We had a couple of board members who were very against (our way of addressing the issue). No matter what we tried with them. The literature supported it. The experience supported it...We wouldn’t budge and one of the board members quit over the issue. Actually, two did. He felt in his conscience that he couldn’t support something that was going to cause more harm to (his organization). So, there was some dissention... I don’t think we were going to convince those board members either way... we had done a lot to make sure this was the right response. We had done our homework (Community partner – Case study J).

Many of these individuals did not want to partner around these issues and so they refused to partner at all. However, they left a great deal of tension in their wake that two of the partnerships in the study had to surmount. Participants from both case studies commented how this brought them even closer together on the issues. In the first stage of the research, the police and community leaders described this as emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence is commonly known as part of popular psychology and refers to a person’s ability to manage themselves and others, and to be self and socially aware (Goleman, 2012). It has become a common buzzword in management and leadership training, and this is how the community and police leaders in stage one explained their knowledge of it when asked.
However, the concept of emotional intelligence is rooted in psychological literature as a set of social and personal skills that can be acquired through training (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). In stage two of the research, participants described emotional intelligence as partners ‘being willing to listen’ and ‘knowing how to read people and keep their cool.’ These respondents were not able to provide exact details of these social skills, but believed it was easy to partner with individuals who were ‘friendly and open’ rather than formal or too ‘by the book.’

Fourth, many of the partners expressed their perception that there was only one opportunity to succeed in partnership-making. These participants explained that if the wrong partner came to the table, or the wrong personality type, the partnership would fail before it began. Others explained how they had to rebuild partnerships after a particularly problematic partner had caused problems within the partnership. For example, a community partner, from Case study C explained,

If there would have been some way of mitigating the problem, before it got to the point where it did, our staff that were involved in it and partnered up with a specific person, probably could have avoided a lot of the hardship that they had to go through in that partnership. And I think it definitely tainted perceptions of going into (the partnership) for a lot of our staff here.

This idea of ‘tainting’ the partnership overall because of a certain person arose in a few discussions with community partners. However, many participants again commented on how newer police recruits were less likely to encounter these issues as they were generally more aware of social issues and had more exposure to diversity and social justice issues.

Police these days are just different from when I started. They are smarter about this kind of stuff. You get these kids who have spent their whole lives growing up in a diverse school, a diverse community. They have different friends. Then they are educated, you know? Not fresh out of high school. So, they just treat people better. It just isn’t new to them (Community partner – Case study H).

The previous quotations demonstrate that personality type matters to those involved in partnership making. In fact, several participants described a need for the right person for the job as key to the success of the partnership in this study.
Summary

Many of the themes present in these findings were consistent with those from the administrative partnership literature. These include trust, structure, power and sustainability. However, other concepts emerged including personality type and symbols of power. These findings also indicate how the actors engaged with and understood the partnership making process. Furthermore, the findings highlight the nuances of how participants come together in time in space to partner around local issues.
Chapter 5.

Discussion

Introduction

As noted in the Introduction to this thesis, the event model offers a way to understand community safety partnerships (CSPs) as a social event with precursors, transactions, and an aftermath. Much of the research has discussed community partnerships by focusing on the precursors of the partnership process. Specifically, the research has examined the impact on partnerships of social structures and government policies that have promoted particular neoliberal agendas including the introduction of New Public Management practices. However, this research has failed to examine the transactions and aftermath of the partnerships that have been established. How do they play out on the ground? How do the actors engage with pressures to partner? How do these partnerships proceed once they have been created? How do those involved in these partnerships navigate competing mandates, power differentials and the personal agendas of the various participants? Have governments been able to impose their visions from the “top-down” or do CSP participants at the local level, resist, re-interpret or redirect external attempts at control?

These and related questions have largely gone unexplored in the existing partnership literature. The few attempts that have been made to offer guidance on how to develop partnerships (EFUS, 2018; Prevention Institute, 2018; UNODC, 2010; Braga et al. 2018) have failed to provide specific details on what is meant by “building trust,” supporting cities or training police differently. The research undertaken in this study has begun to answer some of these questions by focusing attention on the views of the participants of CSPs and asking them about the partnership making process and their experience within it. Conceptualizing partnerships as partnership making events directs attention towards the precursors, transactions, and aftermaths of the partnership making process. By adopting this approach, we can better understand a partnership event and more clearly identify the implications of this research including why the findings matter, and how the findings from this study can help guide future partnership making initiatives.
What challenges do CSP participants experience?

An important implication emerging from the current study is that partnerships are not a panacea for community safety. In fact, by examining the transaction phase of partnership making, numerous issues and processes appeared including the following:

- A crisis event often drove the partnership
- funding is a consistent issue for those involved in CSPs,
- those involved in CSPs do engage with agency the different agencies within these partnerships,
- trust is important, but trust building skills are not equally visible among participants,
- certain types of partnerships take precedence over others, and
- concerns about power and control do exist, but perhaps not to the extent outlined in the current literature
- a lack of planning and evaluation

The findings discussed above indicate that a crisis event can play an important role in partnership making. Many of the partners described how their particular issue had existed long before participants got together to do something about it. Not until there was a catalyst moment (such as numerous youth overdosing) was there political momentum to respond. Two important implications for partnership participants emerge out of this finding. One, that the CSPs were rarely able to focus on primary prevention techniques as they were responding to a recent surge in issues. And two, that participants often felt the pressure to be seen as “doing something” and so there was not always time to create appropriate responses. Consequently, responding to a crisis event may garner more public support, but it did not always translate into long term solutions or prevention for the communities.

Short term funding schemes, such as grants or contributions also represent challenges for those seeking to establish and operate CSPs. Short term funding regimes translate into issues of job security for those employed by community organizations under such funding. For example, someone could be hired to work on a CSP as part of a three-year grant. However, if the grant is not renewed, that person would lose their job.
and the partnership would lose an experienced staff member as well as their institutional memory. This could represent a critical challenge for many partnerships and especially those with few full-time employees. In cases where the government is unwilling to fund a partnership, such as the situation in Case study C, police leaders had to assume the responsibility and provide funding out of their own budgets. The police leaders did this because they were personally invested in the partnership and what it could provide to their communities.

The funding for police and community agencies is not equal and community agencies are constantly relying on volunteer work, seeking funding for their diminishing budgets (Ilcan & Basok, 2004). Community agencies rarely have sufficient funding to direct towards CSPs themselves. In fact, the lack of funding for community agencies is often the reason for their willingness to collaborate and get involved in CSPs. In many cases, if these agencies choose not to engage in partnerships, they will not have access to the funding the police can provide. In this context, their focus on collaboration and partnership skills training may be a key to their livelihood as an organization. The findings presented above also suggest that community agencies that are able to make some compromises on what they want to get out of the partnership, have the potential to access a significant amount of funding and infrastructure support through their participation with the police in CSPs. However, consistent with the literature on community-based initiatives (Bania, 2012), there still appears to be a need for reliable and sustainable funding for new initiatives to reduce some of these challenges.

Alternatively, the police may spend less time on collaboration and partnership skills training because, until recently, they have not had to be particularly good at collaborating to attract partners to help them meet specific community safety goals (Caputo & McIntyre, 2015). This is not to say that community agencies are being manipulative in the partnership-making process. Rather, despite the conclusions of the literature by macro-level critics of community safety partnerships, community organizations can exercise some agency and do have some power when they enter into CSPs. They can resist or redirect externally imposed agendas while striving to strategically serve their clients as best they can, given their circumstances (Kelly and Caputo, 2011).
So, in contrast to much of the political economy literature on partnerships, actors in the partnerships included in this study did assert agency. Not only did community agencies partner with the police for strategic reasons, but participants in the study, in general, deliberately engaged with some partners and not others. Participants were aware of budgetary pressures but tended to work closest with people they trusted and from organizations that shared similar values. Moreover, participants actively built trust, commenting on how trust is core to partnership making and sustainability. In the literature, many have commented on the need to build trust in order to successfully partner (Williams, 2007; Holton, 2001; Goldsmith, 2005). However, few studies outline the specific steps involved in building trust. This is disappointing, as it assumes everyone innately understands how to build and maintain trust. Clearly, this is a fallacious assumption or trust would not be such an important challenge in partnership creation and development. In the findings chapter, I outlined how different actors built and maintained trust. These comments provide important learnings on how to engage in trust building in community safety partnerships.

Issues like distrust and inconsistency did not have a clear resolution. This is likely because each partner was arguably attempting to achieve their own group’s interests as much as possible. Indeed, both police leaders as well as community partners in this study noted that they were often involved for their own interests. For the police in particular, the perception that the police were only trying to serve themselves, could lead to distrust more generally. In fact, some police respondents described needing to take a risk in order to create trust including offering something to their potential partner to reduce their skepticism. Several of the participants in the study described having to take a “leap of faith” in partnering, believing that their partner was going to take advantage of them.

There were no mediating or unbiased participants in any of the case studies, who could assist both sides in a partnership. This is interesting because the literature on community engagement and collaboration consistently emphasizes the need for unbiased mediation or facilitation\textsuperscript{25} (Lathlean & Le May, 2002; Johnson, 2001; Palloff & Pratt, 1999). For example, Morley and Trist (1993) claim that when addressing a shared

\textsuperscript{25} Interestingly, the concept of facilitation also emerges out of constructivism, which is consistent with the theoretical framework of this study (Johnson, 2001).
problem, parties are best able to develop innovative and sustainable ideas when they are being directed by a third party. In this context, local experts can interact as peers and co-construct solutions (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999). Those involved in partnership making would be wise to consider involving a third-party facilitator in order for participants to enter the partnership with peace of mind that both sides will have their interests protected.

Despite the lack of unbiased facilitation, many of the partners described how they attempted to build trust. For example, some of the police leaders described extending an initial offering to their partner, with “no strings attached.” However, when the police were asked how they learned to build trust, there was a heavy emphasis on learning through experience. While experience may be an important form of learning, a few of the leaders, described partnership making that had gone completely wrong and had hurt or destroyed relationships for them in the community. This suggests that learning from experience could potentially backfire, leading to costly mistakes and setbacks. In contrast, the community partners described having collaboration training that taught them the skills to effectively partner. Again, while this could be based on their motivation to engage in a strategic effort to access wider community resources, much of the social services literature extols the benefits of participatory action research that fosters co-construction of meaning, team problem solving, and mutual benefit (Stringer, 2013; Horowitz et al. 2009; Pain et al. 2011).

The same cannot be said about policing education since it fails to include training in 21st century problems such as collaboration skills and partnering (Bradford & Pynes, 1999). Police are often extensively trained in tactical skills, but very little is provided with respect to softer social skills that account for a large portion of their public service practices (Saville & Cleveland, 2015). Indeed, only a few of the police leaders I spoke with in the first stage of the research explained how they were reading business literature to learn how to partner better, simply because they believed it was becoming a core skill for anyone in their position. The business literature has featured articles on collaboration and partnership making for several decades, acknowledging that employees and companies that fail to work well with others are often unable to compete in the market (Huxham & Vangen, 2013). The business literature also focuses heavily on emotional intelligence. Interestingly, emotional intelligence was mentioned on a number of occasions in the study.
Some have argued that the police do not experience similar pressures to learn partnership and collaboration skills because they are not competing with other organizations (Dunleavy & Hood, 1994; Moore, 1997). The police in Canada are one of the most well-funded public service organizations (Greenland & Alam, 2017). Even though Public Safety Canada may stress the need to address increasing policing costs, there is very little policy in place to reduce or even level off police funding. In fact, most police organizations have received budget increases every year since the 1950s (Di Matteo, 2014). Nevertheless, with the increase in alternative forms of policing, such as private security, and the changing landscape of police work (Burbidge, 2005; Jones & Newburn, 2006), partnership making skills are very important to contemporary police organizations. Police educators would do well to consider incorporating partnership making skills into their curriculum.

Participants reported being more likely to create partnerships if they promised easy wins or action on a current “hot topic.” However, they tended to avoid more complex partnerships that consisted of multiple participants and addressed very difficult issues such as homelessness or mental health crisis prevention. While they recognized the importance of these endeavors, many of the participants were cognisant that structural barriers, such as a lack of housing stock or sustainable mental health funding, prevented them from being able to accomplish meaningful progress on these issues. Their reticence to get involved in difficult or complex problems may also demonstrate a lack of resources to overcome these issues including the lack of substantial and sustainable public funding. In these instances, the participants demonstrated how they exercised their discretion (agency) when choosing to tackle issues that were more likely to result in clear and positive results.

Legitimate concerns regarding power, particularly police power, did exist in this study. However, they were not as emphasized in the findings as they are in the existing partnership literature. While some marginalized groups were concerned about partnering with the police, particularly around sensitive issues, this did not prevent them from partnering with the police or actively contributing to the partnership. Largely, problems

26 Toronto Police Service has experienced stability however over the last two years (Lee-Shanok, 2017).

27 However, these budget increases are often required to cover mandated salary increases.
were related to the perception that the police used their power to marginalize specific groups. These perceptions were less visible when the participants described their relationships with individual members of a police service participating in their partnership.

More generally, participants described the police as any other community partner, except that they had more financial support from the city and could offer meeting space. This was also evident in the ways in which the participants described why their particular police partner was the right partner. These police partners were often seen as equals, well-educated and liberal-minded. In these cases, they were seen as simply another municipal agency to work alongside.

This finding about perceptions of the police and police power has important implications for current community safety partnership theory because it indicates that the experience of power in any relationship including partnerships, is not a totalizing one: no one agency or partner holds all the power. All community agencies have some degree of power that they can exercise in various situations. If police leaders and police partners are correct, and partnership making is becoming an essential part of 21st century policing and that police authoritarianism is on the decline, police leaders should carefully consider the types of individuals they recruit, hire and promote. The nature of policing is changing and those undertaking policing duties should have the characteristics, skills and demeanor suited to the emerging conditions.

The issue of power and control also appeared to differ in the Canadian context compared to the literature on police partnerships from American and Australian sources (Hughes, 2002; Coleman et al. 2002; Gorisi, 2001; Fleming & O’Reilly, 2007). Canadian community agencies may view the police as more equal partners than their counterparts in other jurisdictions because they are perceived to act more justly and fairly (Cotter, 2015). Post-secondary education rates in the general population are higher in Canada compared to the rest of the world (Statistics Canada, 2012). Furthermore, while most police organizations do not formally require a minimum of a college degree, in many police services it has become an informal expectation (Dawson, 2017). Arguably, then, the police in Canada should be highly educated. This is encouraging since as some of the research shows, education has been linked to reduced use of force, increased
professionalism, and the ability to adapt to the changing demands being placed on the police (Paoline & Terrill, 2007; Sklansky, 2011; Roberg & Bonn, 2004).

Some of the participants in the research discussed above described how their participation in the partnership changed their perception of the police. Even those who had been marginalized or abused by the police in the past were able to discern that their police partners were not the same as those who had abused their power. This is important because some police partners in the study commented that they had issues partnering because of a few “bad apples” who had spoiled the partner’s perceptions of the police. While the police have historically held a monopoly over the use of violence (Pinker, 2011), the findings reported in Chapter Four demonstrate that people’s perceptions can be changed including the perceptions of those that have been treated badly in the past by the police. Many of the discussions with community partners indicated that police partners could contribute to changing the police stereotype if they acted in a professional, supportive and consistent manner with their partners. This finding is consistent with the literature on police education and professionalism, but also indicates that it is important for police officers and organizations to bear this in mind during the partnership making process because it could translate into a more positive understanding of the police in the community, and a more successful partnership experience for everyone involved.

Another challenge for CSPs that emerged in this study is that very few of these partnerships are based any specific mandates with goals and objectives. This makes them nearly impossible to evaluate, especially from a program evaluation perspective since they lack base line data, logic models, specifically designed indicators of success and appropriate data collection strategies. Importantly, systematic and rigorous evaluation processes are often a crucial component for seeking funding, especially from government agencies such as the NCPC (Public Safety Canada, 2018). The lack of funding, specific guidance, useful tools and requisite evaluation plans makes it very difficult for those seeking public funding for CSPs to be successful.

In this study, the leaders in stage one described far more consultative partnerships, than those actually taking part in the partnerships. The latter described a much broader range of partnership types. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the participants in stage two had more opportunities for collaboration because of their rank
in their organization. Co-created partnerships describe partnerships in which partners are involved at all levels of decision making. Leaders, however, may not be able to engage at this level because of the number of expectations and responsibilities of their current roles. However, if leaders are not involved in collaborative or co-created partnerships, this could have an impact on the kinds of partnerships they are willing to fund and support.

Partnerships have been described in the administrative criminology literature and government organizations in Canada such as the National Crime Prevention Center (NCPC) and Public Safety Canada (PSC) in ways that suggest that they are a panacea for community safety issues. However, the findings discussed in this study indicate that partnerships are far from a panacea for community safety concerns and often raise challenging issues of their own. As noted, for example, partnership making is non-linear and often difficult to accomplish. An important challenge is that governments rarely provide adequate funding for the partnerships they are encouraging. Nor do they offer any tools or support for creating the type of infrastructure required for successful partnership processes to take place or for generating realistic and sustainable solutions for CSPs to pursue.

**Why are these findings important?**

The findings from this study are important because, until now, the community safety partnership literature has not addressed the full theoretical continuum from the macro to the micro level. In turn, the processes underlying partnership making have not been examined in detail, nor has the informality of the sequence of events leading to partnerships been discussed. Moreover, the literature has not thoroughly explored the pitfalls of the partnership making process. As stated above, partnership making is non-linear and does not emerge simply because the government says that the police and community should partner.

Participants were not involved in CSPs simply because of government wishes, but because they wanted to make a difference in their communities. The findings of this study also point to opportunities for thinking about policing organizations in the 21st century and new forms of community policing. As the findings indicate, partnerships were rarely, if ever, steered by government interests. Rather, participants had a lot of
freedom to create the partnerships they wanted, and to address the issues that mattered to them. Also, unlike the literature that is critical of police-community partnerships, the partnerships examined in this study were rarely created from the top-down. In fact, police middle managers were usually the representatives of their organizations who engaged most often in partnership making in the case studies reported above. As well, they were often the ones initiating the partnerships.

While police leaders had a general sense of what kinds of partnerships were occurring, or what they wanted, police middle managers were typically the ones that engaged in partnership making directly. They were usually the ones that best understood the reasons for partnering and worked hard to ensure that these partnerships were consistent with their organization’s goals. Furthermore, they were typically well connected to the community agencies they worked with and had a strong understanding of community needs. As such, police middle managers were usually more likely to provide specific examples of how partnership making fit with organizational values and vision. These findings suggest that not only did the CSPs in this study emerge organically, they also tended to be led by participants who were connected directly to the issues being addressed.

The findings reported above note that the CSPs in this study were not created linearly and most lacked a formal structure. These CSPs differ from the examples of institutionalized collaboration involving police organizations Canada, like the Hub. However, the Hub does not engage in co-creation as outlined in the partnership continuum and could be viewed simply as working relationships based on a case management process for individuals identified as meeting a set of criteria for involvement in their program or initiative. In fact, the Hub in Canada is more accurately described as a coordination on the partnership continuum.

Comparatively, some of the partnerships included in the current study were described by the participants as collaborative or even co-created partnerships. While these may be difficult to define, or “messy” in their structure since they lack the kind of formal agreements found in initiatives like the Hub, they were often described as crucial for addressing particular problems of concern in the participating communities. The participants in these partnerships spoke very positively about their experience in these
partnerships and about the importance of the contributions they were making to their communities.

Several of the respondents explained that they were involved in the CSP because they were passionate about addressing a specific community safety issue. The respondents believed that they would not be as engaged or committed if they did not think that the work they did mattered. Community partners also expressed that they felt they sometimes needed more of a voice in the decision-making process. They felt that their organizational leaders or the police often made the important decisions and that their voices were not being heard. Several of these participants explained that they felt they were the ones closest to the issue, worked the most intimately with the community and, thus, their opinions would contribute to making their community safer. However, they also felt that simply consulting them for their opinions was not enough. This kind of consultation was perceived as more of a “public relations exercise” rather than meaningful engagement and collaboration, with some participants expressing that it made them feel “used.”

Many participants felt that simply going in and telling people what they wanted to do, or assuming they knew best was, in fact, very damaging to the partnership making process. This was reinforced by several of the leaders in stage one of the research who emphasized that “simply telling them what we need to do to fix this” (Police partner # 12 – Stage I) rarely resulted in an effective partnership and often led to organizations leaving the partnership. As well, several respondents spoke about the need to determine a solution to the issue together so that they equally had ownership over the issue. This is consistent with the partnership continuum as these types of partnerships would fall into the co-created category. Participants of co-created CSPs felt that they were all equal decision makers and did not share the experience of feeling used.

How can these findings guide current and future partnership making in Canada?

The findings from this study can help guide current and future partnership making in Canada by suggesting how the lessons learned here can impact larger social structures and processes. For example, if partnerships exist on only one side of the partnership continuum (consultative – coordinated) then the level of engagement of the
police with community partners will be low and largely instrumental – they get what they need from their partner. While these kinds of partnership might result in some positive outcomes for the community, they can actually do little to change the status quo or alter the underlying causes of the problems being addressed. Recall the community members who felt that they had a real voice or who welcomed me with open arms because the partnership was changing their lives. Having the police simply offering more services with some help from other agencies does not lead to the kind of impact that results in the types of fundamental change that can produce collaborative partnerships.

Police organizations continue to focus most of their efforts on responding to calls for service. Some have argued that an organizational model of responding to calls does not make sense in an environment in which crime rates are declining (Leuprecht, 2014) and the vast majority of calls are related to social disorder and not more serious crimes (Vitale, 2018). However, while crime rates may be declining, the number of calls for service has remained relatively stable for most police services for several decades (Wuschke et al., 2018)28 and the work the police do has become more complex and time consuming (Coleman & Cotton, 2010). Little has been done to address steady calls for service in the literature and responding to calls remains an important part of police work and community perceptions of police legitimacy. Police in Canada may need to consider how to redirect their resources so that they are used in ways that are more focused on current policing issues, while reducing overall call loads. Many of the police participants I spoke with explained how their particular partnership work had reduced calls for service for a particular issue. However, some were concerned that by redirecting funding and personnel to partnership initiatives, new gaps would be created. While the logic behind such a statement seems sound, does this assumption hold up in practice?

In a study of a particular unit in the Calgary police service, Caputo et al. (2018) found that by using an action-based and “public-values” approach, police units could be organized in a way that made them more efficient and effective. In fact, they found that they could provide more service to the community without increasing resources if they worked more collaboratively (Caputo et al., 2018). The police service achieved these results by taking into account the findings of an examination of their partnership

28 Furthermore, with growing complexity in policing, the demands on the police may be growing, as each call for service could take longer to address.
structures and processes. This example suggests that it may be time for police organizations to consider partnership making at more of an organizational level similar to the integrated partnership approach observed in Case study B discussed above. Considering partnership making at the organizational level could also allow for a more thoughtful partnership making process, based on emerging concerns for both the police and community agencies. This could translate into CSPs that are closer to the collaboration and co-created end of the partnership continuum and focus less on policing social disorder or responding to calls for service.

Organizational shifts in policing that take CSPs into consideration as a core function of police work could result in a new form of community policing. In fact, CSPs could be the basis for a re-emergence of community policing with collaborative partnerships at its centre. The concept of community policing has fallen in and out of favour in the policing world, largely because police services do not fully understand the model or engage in it as prescribed in its original conceptualization (Skogan, 2006). Community policing was intended to be a completely new way of structuring police work (Maguire, 1997). However, in practice, community policing has often become something that the police “do” rather than something the police “are.” (Greene, 2000; Fielding & Innes, 2006).

Many of the police leaders I spoke with commented on the importance of community policing and how it was paramount to how they saw police work. These same leaders would go on to tell me about their community policing “unit,” usually consisting of 3-4 officers. Furthermore, they were unable to point to exactly what community policing was, or how it had an influence on their work. In contrast, the purpose of CSPs is usually obvious to both those involved including those receiving services especially when these partnerships are developed to address important community safety concerns. When the CSPs in this study targeted specific and current issues that were identified by the police in collaboration with local partners, the connections of this to community policing was obvious – the police working together with

29 It is important to note here that current police leaders in Canada would have started their career in the 1980s, at the same time that the concept of community policing had gained traction.

30 Police departments in Canada can usually range anywhere from 50 to over 5,000 sworn officers (some very small town operate with less of course), making the number of community police officers described by police leaders less than 10% in even the smallest police departments. This means that the vast majority of their officers were doing traditional, reactive policing.
their community partners to address issues of local concern. Given how common these kinds of partnerships are and how comfortable the partners seem to be with them, it may be useful for police organizations to consider how CSPs can become an institutionalized part of the structure of police organizations. If this was to occur, it would de facto represent a new and more engaging form of community policing.

Another interesting opportunity related to policing in the 21st century can be found in the research literature on Collaborative Public Management or collaborative governance. This literature provides important examples of how CSPs could be reconceptualized (Amsler & O’Leary, 2017; Ansell & Gash, 2008). For example, Amsler & O’Leary (2017) describe Collaborative Public Management as both a structure and a process, and define it as,

the process of facilitating and operating in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved or easily solved by single organizations. Collaborative means to co-labor, to achieve common goals, often working across boundaries and in multi-sector and multi-actor relationships. Collaboration is based on the value of reciprocity (629).

This new form of governance offers an alternative to the type of conflictual or regulatory approach that is reflective of the New Public Management (Ansell & Gash, 2008). In fact, the self-regulation and risk management demands of New Public Management have not resulted in making the police more accountable (Chan, 1999). In contrast, the transactions that make up collaborative governance provide an opportunity to avoid the more negative aspects that have accompanied the introduction of New Public Management regimes (Kelly & Caputo, 2011; Reiner, 2013; Bryson et al. 2014). These kinds of transactions are similar those that emerged in some of the collaborative and co-created partnerships described in this study. These transactions include building trust, engaging with others in person, a shared vision and commitment, and a focus on achieving small but important successes (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Furthermore, and also consistent with the findings of this study, the Collaborative Public Management literature emphasizes the importance of collaboration and relationship-building skills (Amsler & O’Leary, 2017). Indeed, Friedman and Ponomarenko (2015) argue that the police cannot continue to overlook democratic processes in their police work (including CSPs). If they intend to act with accountability and legitimacy, the police will have to engage in more democratic forms of governance.
Summary

Addressing and responding to community and social issues is becoming increasingly complex. These complex issues require public service providers to gain the skills necessary to be able to cross organizational boundaries and engage in inter-sectoral solutions (Amsler & O’Leary, 2017). In this chapter, I have discussed the findings from this study on community safety partnerships. The objective of this discussion was to attempt to provide a better understanding of the transactions that underscore the partnership making event. As well, the discussion highlighted the importance of the findings in the context of the increasing attention being directed towards CSPs in Canada.

The literature on CSPs has benefited from a situated analysis because using this kind of approach has illuminated both the differing experiences of participants in CSPs, as well as how agency factors into their decision making and action. In particular, the discussed noted how partners navigate challenges such as power differentials, competing mandates and attempts to impose a top-down agenda onto the partnership.

This chapter also explored how some of the learnings that emerged from this study can be translated into practice for police organizations and community groups. In this regard, it is clear that police organizations and, perhaps, all public service organizations, can benefit from considering alternative ways of “doing business.” More specifically, Collaborative Public Management, or collaborative governance, can provide a more harmonious alternative to existing police-community interaction – based on collaborative and co-created partnerships that emphasize building trust, sharing power and working together towards common goals. The latter approach could also represent a potential foundation for the new form of community policing.
Chapter 6.

Conclusions

Introduction

This study has attempted to create a more holistic understanding of community safety partnerships. By applying an event-based perspective, I have endeavored to move past the current macro-theoretical dichotomy in the community safety partnership literature that focused almost exclusively on the precursors to partnerships. This effort was achieved, in part, by engaging in a situational analysis of the partnership-making transaction. I have argued that the micro-level processes involved in partnership making, as understood by the actors involved in these partnerships, as well as my own observations and interpretations of them, contributes not only to an integrated understanding of partnership making, but also provides lessons that can guide future organizational and public policy around these partnerships. In this chapter, I briefly discuss the aftermath of the partnership making event, the limitations of this study, and the opportunities for future research.

The Aftermath

The events that take place after the partnership making event occurs are often difficult to deduce unless the researcher is able to follow the partnerships over time and space, because the partnership making event is not a single incident, nor is it linear. While this is a limitation of my research, time and financial constraints made it impossible for me to conduct a longitudinal study of the eleven partnerships, across three provinces, that were examined. However, some conclusions about the aftermath of partnership making can be derived based on the discussions I had with police and community leaders about their experience with partnerships, and through the interaction I had with those involved in stage two of this study including those whose partnerships were more fully developed.

The partnership making event can lead to a number of outcomes. One outcome that consistently emerged in the first stage of the study was that participants got better at the partnership making process. While I argued in Chapter Five that experience may not
be the best teacher, experience alone could lead to better partnership making skills. The police leaders often commented that they felt far more equipped later in their careers to build new partnerships than they had when they first started. While community partners often had more exposure to partnership making, they too described their experience as teaching them about how to partner in the future.

Another outcome that occurred in the aftermath of the partnership making event was the opportunity for new roles for those involved. Many of the participants were in line for a promotion because of the work they had done in the partnership or were being put in charge of creating another partnership with more funding and support. This is important because partnering could lead to a series of successes for both the participants and their communities, as each small opportunity for success leads to another opportunity for success, and with participants who are more experienced at partnership-making.

Probably the most important outcome for the partnership making event was a real change in community safety. While this study did not set out to evaluate the success or failure of the CSPs that were included in this study, some of the participants were able to claim that they had made a difference. Case study J had reduced the number of robberies in their community to zero in only a few years. Participants in Case study B described how they were better able to serve victims of domestic abuse and track down perpetrators. Participants in Case study F explained how because of their partnership, they were now able to provide a safe place for their clients and reduce the amount of needle debris in their community. I also met several of their clients who shared that the relationship between the community partner and the police led them to have more faith in the police and to see them as a potential ally. All of these examples demonstrate a perceived improvement in community safety that could have an impact on both the partners involved and the communities more broadly.

Some of the participants did describe concerns that the success of their partnership may lead to it being institutionalized. They felt that in that way it would lose the “grass roots” beginnings that had originally made it strong. However, the police and other social service providers will need to move beyond their current organizational models and rethink how they do business in order to support these CSPs. If police and other social service organizations consider collaboration as a core function of their
organizations, as discussed in Chapter Five, then bureaucratizing the partnership making process would not be an issue. Indeed, collaborative governance consistently creates and re-creates organizational structures as the needs of that organization change. Furthermore, these organizations would be directed by key actors in the community, thereby maintaining their “grass roots” connections.

**Limitations**

As with most research, this study has several limitations. First, I engaged in an extensive examination of eleven different partnerships in six different police services. Unfortunately, my access to each site was not equal. The type and amount of data I was able to collect in each of the case studies differed based on who was involved, how active the partnership was, their structure (did they have meetings I could attend?), the nature of their work (were they discussing personal health information in which case I was not allowed to be present for legal reasons?) and the state of their documentation.

Importantly, these kinds of limitations are common when conducting research with organizations and especially when multiple players are involved. My approach was to gather as much information as I could in each location. I also attempted to minimize the impact of differences in access by including multiple sites and partnerships in this research.

Second, while I actively attempted to include a number of different types of partnerships in this study, I may have missed some core types and this may have biased the research. However, I recorded examples of all five types of partnerships outlined on the partnership continuum used in this study. This is encouraging and increases the confidence that can be placed in the findings. If other types of partnerships exist, evidence of this did not appear in my findings and the partnership continuum was able to account for the partnerships examined.

Third, and in keeping with the second point, I focused on partnerships in this study that had a number of people who could participate. Arguably, choosing partnerships with more participants may have resulted in a sample that included examples that were further along the partnership continuum toward the co-created end. These types of partnerships may have been over-represented in my sample compared
to those that are consultative. However, more consultative partnerships would not have allowed me to examine the process of partnership making very closely given that partners in these types of partnerships do not have a lot of interaction. Since gaining a better understanding of the partnership-making process was a key goal of this study, the inclusion of collaborative and co-created partnerships was warranted. At the same time, the findings from this study should be viewed with caution when considering how they apply to more consultative partnerships.

Fourth, and again related, I was exposed to all of the partnerships in this study by the police services involved in the partnership. As such, the police had a say in what partnerships to show me and which ones to keep to themselves. The police I worked with may have chosen partnerships that made them appear better at partnering or ones where all the partners got along well, potentially biasing the sample used for this study. However, I asked each police participant to provide me with a complete list of their partners and we went through this list together when possible to ensure that the partnerships chosen made sense for the purpose of the study. Furthermore, I made it clear to everyone that I was not working on behalf of the police, but as an independent researcher, and that all of their responses would be kept confidential.

Fifth and finally, the partnership continuum used in this study was intended to guide the understanding of CSPs. And yet, I did not provide the participants an opportunity to examine the continuum and identify their own partnership category. I did not want to create a “ranking” system in these conversations as a lot of important work is done at all levels of the partnership continuum. Instead, I offered participants the opportunity to talk about their partnership along a continuum more generally. I gave them rough descriptions of the continuum and asked them where they thought they fit into that description. These descriptions, coupled with my own interpretations of the partnerships, resulted in the classifications I assigned to each CSP. Although I may have missed an opportunity to discuss the continuum more generally, and perhaps explore what kind of partnerships they wanted out of the partnership making process, I believe that I was able to categorize each CSP by using the criteria described in the continuum.
Future research

A few opportunities for future research arise from this study. There is an opportunity to further hone and test the learnings regarding the partnership making process. Further, being able to follow a partnership from its creation through its life span would provide a deeper understanding of this process and help to identify the factors that can lead to the dissolution of a partnership. To do this, researchers might consider employing a participatory action research framework in which the researcher helps to facilitate the partnership making process. This kind of approach would allow the researcher to actively participate in the partnership from the beginning and not try to gain access as an outsider. They would also be contributing to the outcomes of the partnership and could assist in developing performance measures that matter to the participants.

Taking the idea of using action research one step further, researchers might consider examining, or helping to facilitate the restructuring of police organizations to co-create partnerships. The work outlined by Caputo et al. (2018) in Chapter Five offers an important example of how this might be accomplished. This kind of work could be targeted to partnership making and potentially, collaborative governance more broadly. The area of CSPs could benefit from more action research into these areas.

This study has offered an event perspective on the community safety partnership making process in Canada. In particular, the study focused on the situated transaction of this process in order to contribute to a more integrated theory of community safety partnerships. While there are increasing pressures for the police in Canada to partner, these pressures are not totalizing. Local actors have agency and execute that agency in ways that benefit themselves as well as their communities. I have suggested that the police may want to consider how their organizations are currently structured, and how they can take advantage of the potential benefits of CSPs including how these partnerships could revitalize community policing in Canada. This would be consistent with a more collaborative form of governance, one which emphasizes direct engagement of the police with the communities they serve, as well as encourage these communities to actively contribute to shaping the role of the police in Canada in the 21st century. Future research in this area could help to inform the evolution of this kind of policing.
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### Appendix A.

**Summary of methods used for each case study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Focus Groups</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study A</td>
<td>One-discussion with police leader</td>
<td>One – three participants</td>
<td>Two meetings – one hour long each</td>
<td>-Meeting minutes -advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study B</td>
<td>One – interview with leader</td>
<td>One – five participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>-document describing unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study C</td>
<td>Six – two police and two heads of team and one police staff sgt and one provincial health</td>
<td>One – three social workers</td>
<td>One ride along addressing mental health</td>
<td>Shared document for data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study D</td>
<td>2 interviews – one police officer and one police staff sgt</td>
<td>One – five CSOs</td>
<td>One ride along with CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study E</td>
<td>One-interview with police partner</td>
<td>Two focus groups – one with community organization leader and two social workers and one with two police officers</td>
<td>Observation of location</td>
<td>PowerPoint presentation about partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study F</td>
<td>4 interviews – inspector with police and organization leader for arches 2 police officers who work with project 10 semi-structured interviews with clients, other workers at event</td>
<td>One – working group on opioid crisis (six people) – fire, arches, police, housing</td>
<td>Observation of event – 2 hours (40 participants) Observation of meeting with the city leader (20 participants) One ride along with police officer who works with clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study G</td>
<td>2 – one with representative and one with high-ranking police partner</td>
<td>One focus group – two police officers who are assigned to road safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Case study H | 3 – Interview with police inspector, interview with organization leader, interview with Chief | One focus group with community agency | Observation – partnership meeting | Promotional material
| Case study I | 4 - Interviews with four community partners, one community organization leader, and Staff Sgt of policing unit responsible for partnership | One focus group with two police officers working with community partner | Observed AGM with Chief of police as guest speaker |
| Case study J | 4 - Interviews with police Sgt involved, community partner lead, security consultant, and provincial health | | Completed partnership – however observed initial meeting as an academic and presentation meeting – 2 | Full report on data and findings |
| Case study K | 4 - Interview with chief and deputy chief, interview with police officer involved and local community organization member | | |
| Total: | 44 interviews | 10 focus groups | 10 observations | 6 content analysis pieces |
Appendix B

Interview schedule for semi structured interviews and focus groups

These are examples of questions that were used in the semi-structured interviews and focus groups. However, because of the nature of inquiry, these were guiding questions and other questions emerged as the conversation flowed.

1. Could you tell me a little bit about yourself and your organization?

2. Can you tell me a little bit about the partnership?
   • How would you describe the partnership?
   • What does the partnership involve?

3. Tell me about some of the activities your partnership involves.

4. What was the original thinking behind the collaboration?

5. What was the intention in partnering?

6. Who started it?

7. How did it emerge?

8. Who carried it?

9. How was the partnership arranged?

10. Who was contacted? Why them?

11. Who else could have been contacted but was not? Why not?

12. Who initiated the contact?

13. Was there a contract? An MOU?
14. Is there a need for funding? If so, where does it come from? Is it consistent? Do you need to apply? Reapply?

15. Could you describe how you are involved in the partnership?

16. How long have you been involved with the partnership?

17. Tell me about the initial interaction with the agency(ies). Was it friendly? How were you feeling? How did they seem to feel about partnering?

18. Was there any initial team building or a way for participants to get to know each other? (Describe)

19. How do you get along with the people from the other agency? What are they like?

20. Is it the partnership continuing? How has it changed since it started?

21. Are youth involved in the partnership? In what capacity?

22. What do you know about the mandates of other agencies?
   - Do they align with yours?
   - If not, how do you deal with that?

23. How often do you meet with the other agencies?

24. Do the same people show up every time? If not, why?

25. Do you and your partners ever conflict over how to address an issue? If yes, could you describe some examples?
   - How were each of those examples dealt with? What was the decision made? Were you happy with that decision?
Appendix C

The partnership continuum (Jamieson et al. 2002)

(Updated version provided through personal communication with authors)

- Consultative
  - Limited interaction
  - Mainly information sharing
  - Partners are independent but supportive of each other

- Cooperative
  - Agreement to work together
  - Limited planning
  - Each partner provides its own resources
  - Informal relationship based upon mutual benefit

- Coordinated
  - Joint planning & decision-making
  - All partners provide resources
  - Work independently but are aware of their partners efforts
  - Informal relationship based upon mutual benefit

- Collaborative
  - Joint planning & decision-making
  - All partners provide resources
  - Work closely with partners as members of the same team.
  - More formal relationship
  - Shared responsibility for success

- Co-Created
  - Shared vision & values
  - Integrated planning and decision making
  - All partners provide resources
  - Equal responsibility in all aspects of relationship
  - More formal relationship
  - Shared ownership of the new entity
Appendix D

Summaries of case studies included in the study

Case study A involved a partnership between the police and community organizations around opioid usage in the community. Numerous groups were involved in this partnership including health professionals, social workers, educators, local shelters, past and present users and the police. Generally, each group had more than one representative and the meetings ranged between 15-20 people. They met monthly or sometimes every other month to try and address the issue of increasing opioid use in their community. They took a harm reduction approach and meetings were usually about how they could educate the local community, how to train people to address an overdose and how to help local families of users. These meetings were generally held at the police station, as the police were seen to be heading this partnership. However, the police leader involved in the partnership expressed that he was trying to shift the leadership to another community member as he did not see the opioid usage as a police issue. Rather, he argued the police had taken the lead to provide resources and support.

Case study B involved a partnership between the police, criminal justice, parole officers and social workers around domestic violence. This partnership was housed together in one unit in a local municipal building. They had a shared database and worked together on cases to help local families dealing with violence in the home. Meetings were not necessary as their shared office allowed for a free flow of communication. Formal data sharing agreements had been drawn up, but again this partnership acted as its own autonomous entity. While each partner was still accountable to their own agency, they were also accountable to this unit as a whole.

Case study C involved a partnership between the police and a local crisis service made up of social workers. This partnership was aimed at addressing mental health crises in the community. The police in this city acknowledged a growing number of mental health related calls for service. Unable to afford the assistance of psychiatric nurses, the police decided to reach out to the local crisis service to determine if they could collaborate. The initiative was largely spearheaded by the experience of one police member in another police service. The partnership involved teams of one police member (with a three day mental health training certificate) and one social worker (often with 5-10 years of experience) responding to mental health related police calls for service. These
teams worked ten hour shifts (similar to the policing shift) and attended calls. When responding to calls, the social worker would address the individual in crisis, with the police officer there to offer physical support and protection. If deemed necessary, the police officer could then also apprehend the individual. The teams then collected data on a shared data form that went into their respective data systems. When not responding to calls, the teams would work either at the police station or at the crisis center following up on cases or filling out paperwork.

**Case study D** involved a partnership between the police and a municipally funded community organization responsible for community safety patrols to address local street and neighbourhood safety concerns. The community organization was created to address localized issues of social disorder. Essentially operating as by-law officers, they worked with the police as a go-between for local citizens concerned about social and physical disorder. They received calls for service separate from the police, however, the police also referred lower level issues to them through a radio system.

**Case study E** involved a partnership between the police and a local organization centered around aging and associated victimization including abuse and fraud. Emerging out of a conference on elder abuse attended by a police member, a city councillor and a leader from a seniors center organization, this collaboration worked to provide information and education on preventing elder abuse and advocate for the rights and protections of older members of the community. The police operated as part of a steering committee that helped guide prevention tactics and respond to issues. Additionally, one police officer was appointed directly to the partnership from the police service’s diversity unit. The police officer could be contacted by any of the case managers (or victims for that matter as they were given a direct line on their pamphlets) for any legal issues. The police officer also assisted with on site safety plans and follow-up. This was done to allow the partnership to be a ‘one-stop-shop’ for victims.

**Case study F** involved a partnership between the police and a community health organization around needle use and refuse. In this city, there were concerns around injection of illicit drugs and the related needle debris. The police and the local organization in this community worked together, as part of a larger municipal collaboration, to develop a number of harm reduction initiatives around this issue including access to clean needles and a safe injection site. Injection drug use appeared to be predominately plaguing homeless and First Nations individuals in this community, and thus, the police also partnered with the community organization to offer a tipi gathering every other
week. This gathering included a large meal provided by donations collected by the police and access to local elders who carried out traditional ceremonies and engaged in traditional activities such as face painting and hand games. The police and the community organization ran the bi-weekly event together, with a local police member bringing his own tipi and barbecue to set up each time. The partnership was marked by these specific events, but also informal exchanges between the members of the service and partners from the community organizations.

**Case study G** involved a partnership between a police service and an auto insurance organization focused on community outreach around road safety. Road safety was very important in this community as it accounted for a large portion of the police calls for service. The partnership largely began with the community outreach member contacting the police to assist with a local campaign. The partnership then grew, and the auto-insurance organization helped to fund a lot of the partnership activities. There were two dedicated police members assigned to the partnership and one member from the community outreach side of the auto insurance organization. Their activities involved bringing in local youth and training them on road safety tools and gadgets, holding roadside anti-speeding campaigns and addressing youth driving issues through media campaigns. Meetings for this group were far less formal or frequent. Rather, the partners would reach out to each other during road safety campaigns or for particular issues that emerged.

**Case study H** involved a partnership between a police service and a number of local organizations around diversity. Diversity here includes cultural, sexual orientation, gender, faith, ethnicity and newcomers. The partnership emerged out of a recognition that the police were often seen as an oppressive or violent force in these communities and all parties wanted to change this relationship. The partnership involved numerous organizations that represented these diverse groups meeting with the police on a monthly basis to discuss local diversity issues related to the police. The partnership also involved café workshops, where the police and these organizations would welcome individuals from different diversity groups to discuss issues that are important to those groups face to face. The partnership also involved holding local events like soccer matches between diverse groups and the police to provide additional interaction.

**Case study I** involved a partnership between the police and an immigration services organization. The diversity section of the police service reached out to the organization to see how they could build partnerships as a response to an increase in immigration in the city from certain countries. Many of the individuals from these countries had dealt with corrupt police services and the
organization saw this partnership as a useful way to address possible concerns. The police believed that having them present as part of their immigration experience would help relieve some of these concerns. The partnership was very much emergent in that the two police officers spent one day a week in the service building and allowed the immigration services staff to dictate what they needed from the police including explaining laws in Canada to newcomers, English language training, assistance with building issues and a recent attempt to integrate a female officer to assist with domestic violence issues. At the time of data collection, the partnership was continuing to grow with no specific outcome measures identified by either side of the collaboration.

**Case study J** involved a partnership between a police service and the provincial pharmacy board around pharmacy robberies. Pharmacy robberies had been increasing in the city. The robberies were very violent and it was difficult to catch perpetrators. The police officer involved initially reached out to the pharmacy board while trying to address these issues alone. This partnership, which had concluded by the time of data collection, (though I had been exposed to the partnership in its infancy through another research study) also included academics, security experts and pharmacy owners and operators. They met monthly to plan how to address the high rates of pharmacy robberies. Together they developed a situational crime prevention policy. Once the policy was rolled out, and the techniques proved to be effective, the partnership ended. This partnership stood alone in the case studies as it centered around addressing a very specific goal and ended once that goal was achieved.

**Case study K** involved a partnership between the police and a local First Nations reserve. The reserve had contracted out a different police service in the past and there had been issues of over-policing and racism. Working with a new police service, the leaders at that service and the leaders of the reserve decided to appoint an officer specifically to the reserve to work with the local social service agencies. He did so in a centralized social service building which was separated from the police station and on reserve. The officer was placed there as a representative for the local community, providing safety and support, and to address issues of distrust. The officer developed numerous relationships based on this assignment with individuals working in the community and has engaged youth in activities and local camps. He acts as a liaison to bring in additional police officers for events. Much like Case study I, this partnership is continuing to emerge with the police and the community mutually determining the nature of the relationship.