An Examination of Police Culture and its Effects on Patrol Officers Attitudes towards

Restorative Justice

By

Braeden Broschuk

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the Master of Arts in Criminal Justice

Department of Criminal Justice

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice

The University of Winnipeg

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

December, 2020

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Michael Weinrath, Supervisor
Department of Criminal Justice

Dr. Kevin Walby, Committee Member
Department of Criminal Justice

Dr. Andrew Woolford, External Member
Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between restorative justice and police culture, and the level to which this culture acts as barrier to the successful implementation and use of restorative justice by frontline police officers. Using a multi-level work group framework, frontline officer's attitudes and understanding of restorative justice and police culture beliefs are examined, and then their impact on frontline police work is assessed. This study employs an explanatory sequential mixed methods design and is conducted in two phases. The initial quantitative phase involved distributing a Likert-style survey to frontline officers to measure their attitudes and understanding of restorative justice and police culture variables. After analysis of the initial quantitative findings, semi-structured interview questions were developed building on these findings to provide for a more in-depth qualitative analysis. Results indicate that police culture variables such as solidarity, teamwork, crime fighting and tough on crime attitudes are still persistent in policing, but frontline officers are generally accepting of restorative justice, and believe that it has a place in their frontline work as a dispositional tool. Findings indicate, however, that officers perceive restorative justice as another option only for less serious crimes and low risk offenders, and not as a new method of managing offender activity. Restorative justice is not being used to its fullest potential. To increase use of RJ diversion more thorough training, specialist designations and supervisory and middle management direction is recommended.

Acknowledgements

It is difficult to express the amount of appreciation I have for all of those who were able to make this research possible. First, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Michael Weinrath, for his support, confidence, encouragement, and patience. Without him I would have never taken the next step in my academic career and this work would have never of been possible. I would also like to extend my deepest appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Kevin Walby and Dr. Andrew Woolford, for their valuable suggestions and feedback which pushed me to think critically about my research and improved my thesis. I am also grateful for all the staff in the University of Winnipeg Criminal Justice Department who made learning and developing at the University of Winnipeg such an enjoyable experience.

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to my peers, Aleks, Jantje and Kelly. Together we experienced the highs and lows of being graduate students and I couldn't have asked for a better group of people to experience that with. I am also extremely grateful for my family and friends who were there for me and provided their support throughout my studies. To my mom and dad, I can't thank you enough for your encouragement and motivation to always better myself, and to my sisters I want to thank you for being there whenever I needed you.

Thanks also to the Winnipeg Police Service for allowing me the opportunity to conduct my research, and a special thanks to retired inspector Jamie Blunden for making this research possible.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Current activities at all levels of government and in communities point to the emerging and increasing importance of restorative justice (RJ) as a mainstream criminal justice practice (Latimer et al., 2005). The evolution of restorative justice, especially within Canada has primarily been developed through experimentation and the willingness of judges and probation officers to try different approaches to justice, especially the early development of victim offender mediation (Tomporowski, 2014). Building on this experimentation, RJ has increasingly been implemented into the Canadian criminal justice system through *Criminal Code* amendments focused on alternative measures, restorative justice sentencing principles, and through legislation like *The Youth Criminal Justice Act* that focuses on moving offenders away from the justice system into more community-based programs. Provinces, charged with the administration of justice, have implemented their own local restorative justice initiatives. In 2014, Manitoba implemented *Bill 60* or the *Restorative Justice Act* (RJA) which aims to promote the development and use of restorative justice programs in Manitoba (*Bill 60: The Restorative Justice Act* 2014), reflecting governments increasing belief in the benefits of restorative justice, and makes Manitoba more consistent with programming in other Canadian jurisdictions (Courtemanche, 2015). With increasing emphasis being placed on restorative justice, it is no surprise that police agencies have increased their involvement in RJ initiatives. The Winnipeg Police Service (WPS), in their updated 2019 Strategic Action Plan (SAP), acknowledged the need for increased use of RJ and diversion programming. In their SAP, the WPS states that they support the achievement of the new objectives of the RJA and aim to consult with community partners and review its own policies to guide officer discretion in determining when diversion into RJ programming would be appropriate (WPS, 2019a). The WPS has since established a

restorative justice diversion program in the North End of Winnipeg. This program outlines a number of offences that can be diverted to various RJ community programs or agencies at the frontline officers' discretion, and if the offender meets the entrance criteria outlined by the WPS. However, the main concern for police stakeholders is the underutilization of this program. Upon an initial review it appeared that frontline officers were not diverting as many offenders to RJ programs as they could be. Police stakeholders involved in this program raised concerns about the possibility that police culture was negatively influencing officer's decisions regarding diversion (Broschuk & Weinrath, 2018). There is limited literature examining the interaction between police culture and restorative justice, with existing research being more focused on police perception and understanding of their role in RJ, rather than concentrating on how police culture can affect its use by frontline patrol officers (e.g. Stockdale, 2015; Crocker, 2013; Abramson, 2003; McCold, 2003; O'Mahony & Doak, 2004; Hoyle et al., 2002; Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003; Paterson & Clamp, 2012). Researchers have, however, examined related topics and their interactions with police culture. For example, Demirkol and Nalla (2017) have examined the interaction between police culture and community policing, which despite the variations between community policing and restorative justice it is reasonable to think that they would suffer at least some of the same implementation and organizational barriers.

With the increased emphasis being placed on RJ within the criminal justice system and the increasing legitimacy given to it by police departments, it is important to have a better understanding of the interaction between police culture and restorative justice. Police culture is complex, multi-faceted, and can present challenges to program implementation within police organizations. In order to begin to reduce the influence of police culture on the implementation

of different policing initiatives, we must first know to what extent police culture acts as a barrier to these initiatives; this research will look to fill this gap.

The study of police culture has become more complex as policing has begun to modernize, with officers tasked with more complicated situations and increasingly being held to a higher standard of professionalism (Montgomery, 2019; Carlan & Lewis, 2009). Researchers note that any type of philosophical change within an organization can be difficult and when considering changes within policing, the context of organizational structure and police subculture should be considered; specifically the beliefs, values, attitudes, informal rules and occupational practices police have as they work together (Alarid & Montemayor, 2012). Implementing changes within police departments depends on ways of integrating realities and experiences of frontline officers. The power of the subculture must be reduced for police organizations to move away from these traditional ways of thinking (Wood et al., 2008). Scholars in the field of police culture have called for more qualitative examination of police culture to tap into specific facets of officers' careers. This will help determine how officers are shaped, develop their adherence to cultural orientations and how culture impacts behaviour (Ingram et al., 2013; Ingram et al., 2018). These deficiencies in the literature point to the need for a more in-depth, nuanced examination of police culture and restorative justice. By incorporating both quantitative and qualitative methods, this key goal of this research is to examine both the extent to which police culture operates within the WPS, how frontline officers balance the competing values of the police culture and restorative justice and examine this relationship in more detail. Following a multilevel workgroup framework this research will also examine how culture varies among officers and workgroups, and how culture influences attitudes towards restorative justice. An explanatory sequential mixed methods design will be used that will involve first collecting

quantitative data, and then explaining the initial results with in-depth qualitative data collection

and analysis.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Restorative Justice

Since its inception restorative justice has benefited from general acceptance among those working within, and outside the criminal justice system. Largely developed through practice, restorative justice involves a wide range of applications and principles, and while some scholars have developed RJ theory through practice, there is no single type of process or theory of restorative justice which can make defining it difficult (Ashworth, 2002). Narrower definitions of RJ tend to be limited to solely victim and offender dialogue, while broader definitions include practices that do not involve such dialogue but make use of some restorative justice tools, or embrace the principles of RJ to address non-criminal transgressions (Karp & Frank, 2016). Many view RJ as an alternative method of addressing conflict where involved parties meet in a collaborative effort instead of an adversarial one (Bolitho, 2012), with the central goal being to replace forms of state justice for a variety of offences and offenders (Ashworth, 2002). Marshall (1999, p. 5) provides one of the more widely accepted definition of RJ, stating that "restorative justice is a problem-solving approach to crime which involves the parties themselves, and the community generally, in an active relationship with statutory agencies." RJ is a process that uses communication and interaction between victims and offenders to address the conflicts, and harms that occurred as a result of a crime (Mainwaring et al., 2019), and to restore victims, offenders and their community (Braithwaite, 1996). Restoration for victims means to restore their sense of security, dignity, empowerment, harmony, and social support. Restorative justice should also restore the offender's dignity, sense of security, empowerment, and social support, but RJ should also work at a micro, meso, and macro level to restore and build community relationships, democratic processes and cohesion (Braithwaite, 1996).

According to Zehr and Gohar (2003) RJ aims to "put things right" (p. 27) by addressing the harms of crime, the causes of crime, and acknowledging that offenders themselves can be victims. Addressing the harms of crime implies that there is a responsibility on the part of the offender to acknowledge their wrongdoings and take active steps to repair the harms to the victims, and in some cases for offenders to take the necessary steps to accomplish this, they may need encouragement from the wider community. Addressing the causes of crimes requires that the offender fulfills their obligation to address the cause of his or her behaviour. This is not done alone as there are often larger obligations beyond that of the offender which may include social injustices, and other conditions that cause crime or create unsafe conditions; others may have an obligation to address the causes of crime including the offenders' family and the community. While RJ primarily focuses on the needs of the victims of crime it is important to remember that offenders may have also suffered harms that have contributed to their offending. Zehr and Gohar (2003) note that the perception of oneself does not absolve responsibility for offending behaviour but argue that we cannot expect offending behaviour to stop without addressing an offender's own sense of victimization. This can be a controversial topic and difficult especially for victims to understand because it can sound more like an excuse than an explanation, and it can be difficult to explain why some people who are victimized turn to crime while others do not. However, Zehr and Gohar (2003) argue that RJ has the ability to put things right by exploring offenders' experiences of victimization, while balancing concern for all stakeholders.

Restorative justice prioritizes new intervention strategies and practices that often challenge the traditional goals of intervention like punishment and treatment of offenders after completion of a court based, adversarial process (Bazemore & Griffiths, 2003). Shapland et al. (2006, p. 506) argue that restorative justice is best thought of as an "umbrella concept,"

underneath which are a variety of practices including victim-offender mediations, which involve the victim and offender of a crime to be brought together with a mediator who facilitates the meeting; family group conferences, which are often used in situations with young offenders to facilitate communication between the victim, offender, their families, and often police representatives; and victim-offender encounters which involve surrogate victims, surrogate offenders of similar types of crimes, and a facilitator who all meet to share their experiences with one another (Van Camp & Wemmers, 2013). Shapland et al. (2006) posit that this umbrella facet of RJ promotes a proliferation of potential tasks and roles for the program and its staff, with different schemes and commentators emphasizing different aspects, while continuing to disagree about what is restorative justice's "essence" (p. 506), which can be problematic when we consider that RJ is not a "ready-made package of roles, actions and outcomes that can be plucked off the shelf," but rather has to be individually suited to particular participants and situations (Shapland et al., 2006, p. 506).

Scholars have noted this lack of a coherent definition of RJ and how this deficiency has led the practical application of restorative justice to outpace its theoretical and conceptual evolution (Armstrong, 2014). With its growth and significant expansion, restorative justice has become increasing hybridized and diffused, with the term "restorative" being applied to a variety of practices beyond just simply conferencing (Wood & Suzuki, 2016), which often coexists uneasily with national justice systems (Robinson & Hudson, 2016). RJ now takes place at any and all stages of the criminal process that includes diversion from court, actions taken in parallel with court decisions and meetings with victims and offenders at any stage of the criminal process (Daly, 2002). The expansion of RJ brings with it the expansion of its practices beyond just simply conferencing. A good example would be the WPS Restorative Justice Diversion Program,

where officers do not participate in RJ per se but are still responsible for determining offenders' eligibility for programs. This is more specifically a diversion process which directs offenders to different RJ programs, and not in and of itself a restorative justice program where the officers are involved in conferencing or mediation.

Wood and Suzuki (2016) argue that this expansion of restorative justice goes beyond the purist definitions of RJ that involve parties coming together in conferences or mediations environments. This expansion still fails to meet the larger expectations of some advocates that claim that RJ should provide a different form of justice, separate from criminal justice itself. This lack of definition attributes to the "growing plasticity" (Wood & Suzuki, 2016, p. 151) of restorative justice where more and more practices fall under its umbrella while at the same time providing less coherence. Robison and Hudson (2016, p. 336) argue that RJ has proven to be "maddeningly difficult" to define, and scholars still disagree as to whether RJ is a set of practices or a philosophy, focused on a means or an ends-based approach, individual or community harms, and what sort of offences can and should be addressed by restorative justice. The lack of any coherent definition may lead some advocates to project their own aspirations of what restorative justice should be onto the complex ways that people react to conflict (Robinson & Hudson, 2016), while at the same time being inattentive to big picture socio-economic problems like race, gender, and poverty, and how restorative justice may or may not be culturally appropriate for racial and ethnic minorities in its own practices (Woods & Suzuki, 2016).

The function of restorative justice at a micro-level has led some to argue that RJ cannot and will not have any meaningful effect on the criminal justice system or incarceration because it does not address structural problems or macro level determinants to incarceration like shifting political landscapes, social policies, and reductions in social benefits (Wood, 2015). These

critiques have led to the development and argument for more transformative justice. RJ is the

most long-standing and familiar concept attributed to alternative responses to violence, and shifts

the focus from adversarial processes to ones that acknowledge both the impacts of harms to

individuals but also to the broader community (Kim, 2018). Although initially developed as an

alternative to traditional criminal justice processes, RJ is still largely practiced within the

criminal justice system and often relies on the involvement of state agents, which keeps the

monitoring of participation and outcomes closely tied to state systems of criminal justice (Kim,

2018). Building on the principles of RJ, transformative justice offers an avenue of redress for

advocates who wish to end the involvement or criminal justice actors in alternative measures.

Transformative justice is defined as "transformative change that emphasizes local agency and

resources, the prioritization of process rather than preconceived outcomes and the challenging of

unequal and intersecting power relationships and structures of exclusion at both the local and

global level" (Gready & Robins, 2014, p. 340). Based largely on the principles of prison

abolition and popularized largely through social movements, transformative justice signifies

opposition to not only the criminal justice system but also reform measures that serve to

legitimize the existing criminal justice system. Transformative justice looks to radically reform

politics and priorities and shift the focus away from the legal to more social and political

thought, and from state and institutions to communities and their everyday concerns (Gready &

Robins, 2014).

When considering where RJ should fit into traditional justice systems, Daly (2016)

proposes that RJ cannot simply be conceptualized as being in opposition to retributive justice.

This is because retributive justice and RJ as coherent systems or types of justice do not even

exist, so the dichotomy between RJ and retributive justice is nonsense. People are referring to

"conventional criminal justice" (p. 15) which has many aims and purposes, with retribution being one. In this case, RJ is best conceptualized as an innovative justice mechanism which is a justice response, process, activity, measure, or practice and not an alternative to retributive justice, nor a new way of thinking about crime and justice. An innovative justice mechanism does not rely solely on the standard tool kit of criminal procedures or practices, but permits greater participation and interaction of relevant parties. Innovative systems are often characterized as being more informal but still being structured by rules and procedures, while introducing the wider notion of the "community" (Daly, 2001). RJ relies on the roles set by the conventional criminal justice system; the roles of the victim and the offender are often already assigned, and RJ normally occurs only after the offender has plead guilty and accepted responsibility for their actions. In the case where the offender disputes their responsibility, the RJ process is ended and the case is referred back to the police or courts because RJ is not a forum for determining guilt (Shapland et al., 2006).

While there may be a failure among advocates and practitioners to consistently define what RJ truly is, one element is typically agreed upon: restorative justice is focused on the harm caused by the crime (Bolivar, 2010). By focusing on the harms of a particular crime, restorative justice views crime as a wrongdoing against an individual, instead of a violation of law, in which crime is defined by the harm caused to the victim. By focusing on the harms done to the individual, RJ aims to "put things right," which can include healing, repairing the harms done, reparations, victim participation in the restorative process, or attempting to redress or achieve closure. Braithwaite (1996) outlines that restorative justice is focused on restoring victims, a more victim-centred criminal justice system, as well as restoring offenders and restoring community. Braithwaite (1996, p. 15) explains that restoration in a restorative justice context

means "restoring the *property lost* or the *personal injury*, repairing the broken window or the broken tooth. It means restoring a *sense of security [emphasis in original]*."

Given this focus on repairing harms, it is not surprising that some scholars argue that reducing recidivism is not the primary goal of restorative justice. While reducing recidivism is an expected by-product, most advocates argue that RJ should be used because victim's needs should be addressed and offenders should be encouraged to accept responsibility for their actions, and those affected by the offence should be involved in the process (Zehr & Gohar, 2003). However, to gain acceptance RJ programs are often promoted or evaluated as ways of reducing repeat crimes. The potential to reduce recidivism is often paramount for policy makers (Bergseth & Bouffard, 2012), and RJ would not be as widely adopted if it was not considered effective at offender reform.

The empirical research surrounding RJ is encouraging. Generally, various forms of RJ interventions appear to have the effect of reducing recidivism for young offenders. Rodriguez (2007) found that when controlling for legal factors like the number of prior offences, and extra-legal factors like age and gender, youth in RJ programs were less likely to recidivate. Bergseth and Bouffard (2012) found that restorative justice contributes to youth remaining offence free longer compared to youth who were referred to traditional juvenile court, even when controlling for initial group differences. In their 2016 meta-analysis, Wong et al. found that restorative justice diversion programs had a beneficial effect in terms of lowered recidivism for youth. Another meta-analysis conducted by Latimer et al. (2005) examined adult and youth and included several additional outcome measures besides recidivism. They found that participation in RJ programming resulted in higher victim satisfaction, and a moderate-weak impact on offender satisfaction when compared to those who participated in the traditional criminal justice

system, and offenders who participated in restorative programming were found to comply more with their restitution agreements when compared to those who did not. With these results in mind however, it is important to note that study design characteristics often influence study findings. Wong et al. (2016) found that studies using stronger research designs did not show evidence that programs were effective at reducing recidivism.

More recent RJ research is also encouraging and shows that restorative justice interventions may not need to be extensive to be effective. Kennedy et al. (2019) found that a single 8-hour RJ intervention designed to help offenders understand the impact of their crimes influenced recidivism, while Calhoun and Pelech (2010), in their analysis of the Calgary Community Conferencing program, found evidence of the potential long-term benefits of RJ. They found that the program had beneficial long-term outcomes, i.e. reductions in recidivism, and when compared to the traditional justice process, participation in RJ was associated with more positive intermediate outcomes. As RJ interventions continue to grow, research on other outcomes have shown that restorative justice may also be appropriate for sexual offences, and can increase offender empathy, self-understanding, and stress reduction (Rye et al., 2018). In situations of domestic assault RJ can improve offender empathy, give victims a voice and contribute to feelings of empowerment (Miller & Iovanni, 2013; Gaarder, 2015).

By emphasizing the victim, RJ often sidesteps the traditional criminal justice systems main priority of offender punishment, which has the effect of placing victims needs as secondary (Wemmers, 2002). Restorative justice advocates often claim that because the traditional criminal justice system is predicated on confrontation and vengeance, the needs of the victim cannot be met leading them to feel excluded from the justice process. Of special concern for RJ are the needs of the victims of crime that are not being adequately met by the criminal justice system

(Zehr & Gohar, 2003). As a victim-centered form of justice, the satisfaction of victims in the restorative process is a key measure of success.

Studies have found that restorative justice does provide more victim satisfaction when compared to traditional criminal justice approaches (Latimer et al., 2005). RJ can increase victim satisfaction because the restorative process can fulfil victim's needs, which the traditional justice system is often unable to do (Armstrong, 2014). RJ also has the potential benefit of mending relationships, provide insight into offending behaviour and empower victims, offenders, their families and communities (Bidois, 2016). RJ acts as a means of providing insight into offending by giving offenders an opportunity to hear how their offending impacts the victim personally and allows victims to give personal stories about how the offending affected those involved (Bidois, 2016).

Researchers have found that restorative justice does meet victim's needs, even in cases where crimes are particularly serious. For example Bolitho (2015) argues that it is possible for a safe and useful practice of victim-oriented restorative justice for adult offenders convicted of serious crimes including murder, manslaughter, driving offences leading to death, and sexual offences. Bolitho (2015) found that the majority of unmet victim justice needs in the traditional system were addressed throughout this process, and participants were positive and satisfied with the experience in the short and long term. This suggests that victim focused RJ processes, even after serious crimes, provide victims, offenders and their families with a deeper sense of justice. Wemmers (2002) notes that a primary need of the victim after a crime is a need for information, and not just speculation or legally constrained information that comes from a trial or plea agreement. This often requires direct or indirect access to offenders who hold this information (Zehr & Gohar, 2003). Victims also require some type of compensation, emotional needs, a need

for participation, protection and practical needs i.e. needs that are required to be handled immediately after a crime, like repair to a house after a break-in.

Further, victims often have a need for empowerment when they feel like control has been taken away from them by the offender. Involvement in their own case as it goes through the justice process provides an avenue to return a sense of control to them (Zehr & Gohar, 2003). Victims often feel like they should have a role in the justice process and have the ability to voice their views and opinions, mainly at sentencing, and are seeking some type of input (Wemmers & Cyr, 2004). Wemmers (2002) notes however, that RJ programs are often less equipped to help address victim's practical needs and can have an adverse effect on the victims need for security and protection by creating contact with the offender. Policy makers and those implementing programs need to be cognizant of victim's circumstances and ensure that they feel safe and well-informed throughout the entire RJ process.

Researchers have found that, generally, victims understand RJ, and their understanding is based on its value of equal involvement and treatment of all stakeholders involved in the justice process. Gavrielides (2017) found that victims saw RJ as a means to get involved with their own case, to see how it was managed, and what to do about those who harmed them. It seems that victims generally want to take part in RJ, but there are factors that can stop them from meeting their offenders. Victims are concerned about their own physical safety, the sincerity of the process, problems with the referral agency and practitioners, as certain gatekeepers can get in the way of the restorative process (Gavrielides, 2017). Time and commitment to the victims involved in RJ is an important factor, as well as a neutral agreeable space for any victim/offender interaction to take place. Ultimately, it appears that victim's value the choice to be involved in the RJ process and do not want to feel like the decision has been made for them (Gavrielides,

2017). Scholars have noted that with the increase in RJ, the needs of the victims of crime is now the primary discourse of restorative justice, rather than their interest, rights or entitlements, which showcases a paradigm shift from the idea that a crime is an injury to the state, to the personalization of crime as an offence against a material victim (Maglione, 2017). In RJ, victims are often represented as a cohesive, united ensemble of people with symbolic and emotional needs. Victims are portrayed as dis-empowered, in search of participation, acknowledgment, empathy, healing, empowerment, transformation, and looking to regain control in their lives. Maglione (2017) notes that even though victims of RJ are often presented as such, they still have the capacity to positively react to the victimization, showing a unique quality of resilience.

Restorative Justice Principles

Reintegrative shaming theory (RST) has generally been interpreted as providing a theoretical explanation for why RJ should be a more effective response to crime than traditional criminal justice proceedings (Harris, 2006). Braithwaite (1996) argues that the criminal justice system has been by and large a failure, often ignoring the importance of social disapproval, and rather than correcting or deterring future behaviour it often makes things worse rather than better. The primary goal of RST is to communicate shame effectively to an offender in a way that encourages them to desist from further criminal behaviour. RST posits that the failures within the criminal justice system can be overcome by communicating the shame associated with criminal conduct and argues that societies would have lower crimes rates if this occurred (Braithwaite, 2000). RST is defined as "shaming that is respectful of the person, is terminated by forgiveness, does not label the person as evil, nor allows condemnation to result in a master status trait" (Harris, 2006, p. 328). Brathwaite (2000) explains that RST communicates disapproval to an offender within a continuum of respect for them; the offender is treated as a

good person who has done something bad. Authors have found that components of reintegrative shaming are present throughout restorative justice processes by increasing offender's perceptions of their ability to pay back the victim and society (Kim & Gerber, 2012).

RJ generally relies on several core principles: (i) offender accountability, such that "the offender having acknowledged that the offence has occurred and having taken at least some responsibility for having committed the offence" (Shapland et al., 2006, p. 507); (ii) early intervention; compassion, empowerment, and addressing the needs of primary victims, community members and offenders (Alarid & Monetmayor, 2012); (iii) seeing problems of crime in their social context, and; (iv) looking at a flexible, forward looking problem solving orientation (Marshall, 1999). Adoption of these principles should result in a sense of closure for those involved in the crime (Gal, 2016). RJ is not primarily about forgiveness or reconciliation as victims may perceive that they are being coerced into forgiving or reconciling with the offender. Restorative justice is primarily focused on the needs and the roles of victims, offenders and the community that are implicit in crimes (Zehr & Gohar, 2003).

Bazemore and Maruna (2009) group the principles of RJ into three broad categories: the principle of repair, the principle of stakeholder involvement, and the principle of transformation in community and government roles and relationships. Braithwaite (2002) provides an overall framework of these values and principles within all three levels of restorative justice "standards." These three levels are constraining standards, maximizing standards, and emergent or enabling standards, which he argues should manifest differently across a restorative justice process. He notes that constraining standards are ideals that must be honoured and enforced as constraints; the maximizing standards are what RJ advocates should actively encourage in the restorative justice process; and the emergent standards should not be urged on participants to manifest,

rather they are the emergent properties of a successful process. While some standards or values

of RJ can be seen as vague, standards must often be "if we are to avert legalistic regulation of

restorative justice that is at odds with the philosophy of restorative justice" (Braithwaite, 2002, p.

571).

Restorative Justice and Police

Braithwaite (1996) notes that it is important for focus on how restorative justice can

transform state criminal justice. There must be reliance on state reformers such as police officers

to act as a catalyst of restorative justice. In areas with the least social support, the gains from RJ

can be the greatest. Braithwaite (1996) argues that if a police officer with a restorative justice

ethos arrests a youth from a tight knit community, with a strong, loving family, and available

social supports, the youth is probably not likely to do any better or worse than if they were

arrested by an officer that does not have a restorative justice ethos. The difference is when an

officer with the same RJ ethos arrests a youth who does not have the same supports, and who is

measurably worse off than someone who does, the restorative police officer can have more

impact compared to a retributive one. The adoption of RJ in policing can be viewed as a natural

progression from a variety of community or problem-oriented policing reforms (Bazemore &

Griffiths, 2003; Paterson & Clamp, 2012), and can be understood as attempts to repair the harms

of a crime, modernize the use of police discretion, encourage informal resolution of crimes,

enhance public confidence in the police, and reduce costs (Paterson & Clamp, 2012). Police roles

and responsibilities in RJ can vary but Bazemore and Griffiths (2003) assert that restorative

justice acts as a set of tools or "levers" (p. 337) for police, building social capital and efficacy

around the responses to crimes and conflicts. RJ allows police to change the way they are

involved with mitigating crime in communities, and by applying restorative principles police can

act at the case level in a decision-making role for informal sanctions in situations where crimes would usually be forwarded to courts. Police can become involved as a facilitator or mediator and can dictate how crimes should be resolved by working with the victim, offender and community. While some question the role of police in RJ, Bazemore and Griffiths (2003) argue that at some level, there should be police involvement in the restorative justice process if it is to truly work and resolve conflicts in the community. Consider the current WPS Restorative Justice Diversion Program where officers are responsible for the diversion of offenders into community RJ programs not run by the WPS. The police in this situation take a rather hands-off approach where they simply direct offenders into programming without participating in the programs themselves. There are examples of other initiatives where police can sponsor RJ programs inside agencies: they can either act or not act as facilitators; officers can convene or participate in conferences facilitated by others, and; they can focus on managing other in-house restorative justice programs (Bazemore & Griffiths, 2003).

The deficiency in the current literature exists in the examination of the effects police culture has on the implementation of RJ initiatives. Researchers have noted that the understandings of police organisational culture rely predominantly on older ethnographic studies, and often predates many significant transformations in policing, such as RJ (Brough et al., 2016). Stockdale (2015) has provided some insight into the interaction between RJ and police culture and how police rank affects officer understanding of RJ. She found that police understandings of RJ varied, with officers in different ranks being focused on different aspects of the restorative justice process. These differences may be impacted by different understandings of police culture; officers at different positions may act according to how they perceive police culture at their organizational level, making decisions pursuant to their own understanding. Investigators note

that because of these variations in cultural understandings, philosophical change within an organization can be quite problematic. Alarid and Montemayor (2012) indicate that when trying to implement change within a police department, the context of organizational structure and police subculture should be considered, including the beliefs, values, attitudes, informal rules, and occupational practices police have as they work together. Other researchers have suggested that implementing change within police services depends on ways of integrating realities and experiences of frontline officers and suggest that reducing the power of the subculture must occur to move away from traditional thinking (Wood et al., 2008). Moving away from this traditional way of thinking can be difficult, McCold (2003) found that the lack of significant change to police culture marginalizes initiatives like RJ and notes that factors like traditional police norms, police organizational and subcultural resistance, lack of support by middle management all represent obstacles for the system wide implementation of restorative justice. This marginalization of RJ presents issues for agencies who are trying to implement such initiatives, as researchers have noted that simply implementing RJ without trying to first address these barriers has led to the program having no significant overall impact on changing overall police attitudes towards police activities or their roles as officers. However, there is evidence to suggest that addressing these barriers to implementation and putting more emphasis on RJ in policing, change can be made. According to McCold (2003) in his study of police led RJ conferences, changes do occur for those who are exposed to restorative justice the most; officers who knew more about conferencing and had conducted conferences showed increases in their perception of community cooperation and a decrease in their orientation towards the use of force. However, McCold (2003) suggested that the effect of conferencing may have caused a few officers who were positively disposed to it to become more supportive of it.

Barriers to implementation often manifest in traditional ways of thinking that are linked to the principles of the formal criminal justice system which promotes punishment, retribution, deterrence, rehabilitation, and accountability, compared to RJ that promotes victim, offender, and community participation. The differences between the traditional justice system and restorative justice has raised questions and concerns regarding the ability of criminal justice practitioners (particularly police) to balance the competing goals of RJ and the traditional criminal justice system (Crocker, 2016). However, it appears that frontline officers generally view restorative justice as a viable option for both youth and adult offenders (Crocker, 2013; Stockdale, 2015), while earlier studies have found that police often did not have a clear understanding of RJ philosophies, and viewed it as appropriate for first time, less serious, non-violent offenders (Abramson, 2003). Throughout their duties, frontline officers consider discretionary factors that are available to them when making decisions regarding RJ. Officers are often more likely to think certain offences are more appropriate for RJ compared to others, often believing that property and minor offences involving institutions are more appropriate for RJ compared to violent or more serious offences involving an actual person as a victim (Crocker, 2013). Officers are also likely to take certain characteristics of the offender into consideration when deciding whether to use RJ. Officers often think offenders with no prior contact with the criminal justice system are more appropriate for diversion compared to offenders that had prior contact. These discretionary decisions regarding RJ may be due to police understanding (or lack thereof) of restorative justice, or the officer's adherence to certain aspects of police culture which may be dependent on officer rank. Research has shown that lower ranking officers often have a different understanding of RJ compared to higher ranking officers (Stockdale, 2015).

Lower ranking frontline officers, have been found to show a more concrete knowledge of restorative justice, meaning that frontline officers are more concerned with the practical realities of RJ and when it should or should not be used (Stockdale, 2015). The implementation of RJ in police departments can be difficult because the principles of policing are at odds with the principles of RJ, putting officers in a position of mediator, rather than a crime fighter. Police officers have been found to dominate restorative justice exchanges, and dominate discussions, while asking questions in the form of judgemental statements or moral lectures. In some cases, officers can use RJ as an opportunity to reinvestigate old crimes and ask questions in order to gather criminal intelligence (Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016). Research has shown that many frontline officers see the implementation of RJ in policing as impractical, while officers in middle and upper management positions viewed restorative justice differently (Stockdale, 2015). Officers can often view RJ as an extra task which interferes with their ability to patrol and respond to calls for service (McCold, 2003). Compared to frontline officers, middle managers appear to be more concerned with the implementation process, rather than the practical realities of conducting RJ (Stockdale, 2015). If supervisors are unfamiliar with or lack the necessary knowledge of RJ, they can put up barriers to the use of RJ if they are unwilling to give frontline officers adequate time for restorative justice processes (McCold, 2003), which can create implementation issues as frontline officers may feel pressured or challenged by middle management. Officers in top level management positions are often not responsible for the implementation of programs like restorative justice, but they often have the most nuanced understanding of RJ theories and philosophies. This divide in knowledge can be further exacerbated by police culture, whereby aspects of police culture are strongly associated with organization factors among frontline officers. There is evidence to suggest that there is a cultural divide between frontline officers and

supervisors, which substantiates the "us versus them" mentality of traditional police culture; officers in management positions are less likely to endorse the traditional police culture when compared to frontline officers and less likely to support the use of force (Silver et al., 2017). This dichotomy of understanding and acceptance between policing initiatives like RJ, and police culture can present issues when trying to implement new initiatives. When tasked with making decisions regarding RJ, while also not fully understanding it, frontline officers may rely more on their cultural knowledge to solve problems.

Restorative Justice in Canada

Restorative justice has experienced a general acceptance and expansion over the last 30 year likely due to the increased research interest and socio-cultural influences that include communitarianism, emancipation movements of Indigenous people, victims' movements, feminist approaches to crime, and critical criminology (Walgrave, 2003). RJ began in Canada in Ontario in the mid-1970's (Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003), starting with low level vandalism crime, and spearheaded by probation officers and members of the Mennonite community. Since then, RJ has progressively grown to the point that some advocates are calling on it to replace the traditional justice system. RJ is often cited as being a revival of older forms of justice rooted in tribal traditions, with Indigenous forms of justice often operating on the premise of restorative justice. Traditional forms of justice were often focused on healing, reintegration and bringing together victims, offenders and their supporters (Mirsky, 2004). The focus on communities in modern forms of RJ is heavily influenced by these traditional practices, where community and relationships are central to Indigenous worldviews (Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003). Braithwaite (1996) argues that due to the reliance on a variety of principles that prioritize the victims of crime and community, RJ is culturally universal. While that is not to say that all cultures do not

also value retributive approaches, RJ principles are universal because they are vital to our emotional survival and crucial to the possibility of surviving without being in a constant state of fear.

Criminal Code Amendments. RJ in Canada has continued to grow, and in the mid-1990's amendments made to the *Criminal Code* outlined how RJ principles should be used in the criminal justice system. In 1996 Bill-C41, or *An Act to Amend the Criminal Code (Sentencing) and Other Acts in Consequence* outlined how RJ principles should be present in sentencing, and the Supreme Court of Canada in their decision in *R. v. Gladue* determined that Bill-C41 had two purposes: to reduce the prison population, and to expand the use of RJ principles in sentencing, effectively codifying restorative justice into the principles of sentencing in Canada. Now at the federal level in Canada, the *Criminal Code* and the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA) enable the use of RJ processes to occur. Section 717 of the *Criminal Code* provides that alternative sanctions can be used if the offender accepts responsibility for their offence, which is a major cornerstone of RJ. The sentencing principles in ss.718(e) and (f) are also particularly relevant whereby s.718(e) outlines how sentencing should provide reparations to the victims or the community for harms done, and s.718(f) aims to promote a sense of responsibility in offenders with the acknowledgement of the harm done to victims and the community (Department of Justice Canada [DOJC], 2017). Several sections in the YCJA outline for young offenders the use of RJ principles in sentencing, extrajudicial measures, restorative justice conferences and youth sentences. Further, the *Victims Bill of Rights Act* and the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* make reference to the use of RJ, whereby victims of crime have a right to receive information about restorative justice if they request it (DOJC, 2017).

Restorative Justice in Manitoba

Manitoba has incorporated more RJ measures as many began to question the provincial government's established model of criminal justice. The model is largely centered on the traditional criminal justice system which is focused on courts, convictions and sentencing. This has led to criticism as many point to problems of effectiveness in the way that traditional criminal justice is administered. These criticisms encouraged the development of new ways of thinking, including the emergence of restorative justice (Courtemanche, 2015). In the spring of 2014, the province of Manitoba introduced Bill 60, the Restorative Justice Act [RJA], which aims to promote the development and use of RJ programs in Manitoba and enhance community-based solutions to crime by providing a framework for expanding RJ solutions. The RJA in s.2(1) broadly defines restorative justice as:

> 2 (1) An approach to addressing unlawful conduct outside the traditional criminal prosecution process that involves one of both of the following:
>
> (a) providing an opportunity for the offender and the victim of the unlawful conduct or other community representatives to seek a resolution that repairs the harm caused by the unlawful conduct and allows the offender to make amends to the victim or the wider community;
>
> (b) requiring the offender to obtain treatment or counselling to address underlying mental health conditions, addictions or other behavioural issues.

Bill 60 sets out four broad directives concerning restorative justice in Manitoba (Courtmanche, 2015). First, Bill 60 authorizes the Department of Justice to develop RJ programs pursuant to section 717 of the *Criminal Code* or section 10 of the *Youth Criminal Justice Act.* Second, Bill 60 requires the Department of Justice to develop policies about the use of RJ programs which

considers how the victim or offender would request the resolution of their circumstances by utilizing restorative programming. Third, Bill 60 created the Manitoba Restorative Justice Advisory Council, and defined its roles. However, subsequent to its creation this council was eliminated by the provincial government (Solilak, 2017). Lastly, Bill 60 made amendments to *The Victims Bill of Rights*, adding references to restorative justice in several clauses where it was not previously mentioned, with the intention to encourage victim involvement in the RJ process (Courtmanche, 2015). Since the implementation of Bill 60, Manitoba has continued to emphasize the use of RJ. In their Criminal Justice System Modernization Strategy (CJSMS). One of the Manitoba governments' primary objectives is to use RJ more effectively to improve public safety, reduce court delays and to reduce reliance on incarceration, especially for Indigenous offenders (Manitoba Justice, 2018). This may be a difficult task as Manitoba continues to have one of the highest adult incarceration rates of any province in the country. In 2017/2018 Manitoba had an incarceration rate of 231 adults per 100,000; well over the national provincial average of 83 adults per 100,000 and one of the highest remand populations in the country (69%) (Malakieh, 2019). Even with heightened public and professional awareness of Indigenous overrepresentation and the increased commitment to using RJ to address these issues in the criminal justice system, these problems are persistent and have been worsening over the years. It appears that more modest approaches to confronting Indigenous overrepresentation are failing to achieve any change (Roberts & Reid, 2017). Manitoba has a long history of high Indigenous incarceration. As recently as 2017/2018 Indigenous adults represented 75% of the admissions to provincial custody, a proportion which has increased over time. Between 2007/2008 and 2017/2018 there has been a 60% increase in the incarceration of Indigenous males, and a 219% in the admission of Indigenous females in Manitoba (Malakieh, 2019). In their effort to

modernize and address problems of Indigenous overrepresentation in the criminal justice system, the Province of Manitoba has stipulated that it will increase collaboration with police, Indigenous leadership and other community partners in an effort to fully incorporate RJ options in hopes of improving outcomes for victims and offenders and reducing court backlogs.

It is important to note that the increased emphasis on restorative justice is not limited to Winnipeg. Currently in Manitoba, there are approximately 20 restorative justice programs, with 9 being in and around Winnipeg. Many of these programs range in their structure, objectives and goals and work with a number of different populations and eligible offences (Department of Justice, 2018). Programs in the Winnipeg area include agencies like Onashowewin Justice Circle which looks to provide culturally based restorative justice practices to those in conflict with the law, while focusing on healing for those that were harmed, and reducing recidivism (Onashowewin Justice Circle, n.d.). Onashowewin works in partnership with Justice Canada and Manitoba Justice and increasingly the WPS, providing primarily diversion services for the Manitoba Crown Attorney's Office. The First Nations Justice Strategy (FNJS) is another culturally based restorative justice program in Winnipeg. Functioning under the Southern Chiefs' Organization [SCO], this program seeks to reclaim traditional Indigenous practices of justice, reduce the number of individuals involved in the justice system, while also recognizing that this justice strategy operates within the traditional criminal justice system (SCO, 2019). The FNJS works with community justice workers in five Manitoba Indigenous communities and is focused on repairing harms done to victims and their families, as well as maintaining and facilitating community justice committees. Other agencies in Winnipeg conduct RJ measures, but do not focus specifically on the inclusion of Indigenous practices. Mediation Services runs the Restorative Justice Action Centre which works with victims and offenders, receiving anywhere

from 300-500 court referrals a year (Mediation Services, n.d.). The Restorative Action Centre focuses on bringing together the victim and offender in a safe, structured environment, to find a resolution to the crime. Mediation Services offers three approaches to RJ interventions including face to face meetings guided by a facilitator, restorative action meetings with a community facilitator and community justice forums (Mediation Services, n.d.).

Diversion

Diversion is a community corrections practice that looks to move offenders away from the formal criminal justice. Diversion is not a new concept and has become increasingly popular as an attempt to minimize pre-trial detention and incarceration rates. Our current conception of diversion strategies dates back to the mid-1960's, and provide an alternative to the traditional criminal justice system, and represent a less punitive and intrusive way of dealing with offenders (Ibarra & Erez, 2005; McGrath, 2008). Diversion can take place from any part of the criminal justice system including prison, probation, courts, and pre-trial diversion by police (Taxman, 2010). The main advantage of diversion being that it is an option for offenders to avoid more serious punishment like incarceration and, in some cases, a criminal record. Police led diversion often means recording of contacts that follow the offender and can be subsequently used to obtain more severe sanctions (Bonta, 1998). Diversion programs are often focused more on low risk cases, first-time offenders, persons with only minor previous offences, young offenders and those with mental health or substance abuse issues (Ibarra & Erez, 2005).

Diversion programs attempt to meet a range of goals including providing services and assistance to offenders, minimizing unnecessary social control, reducing recidivism, decreasing the cost of justice administration and to minimize the number of people in detention (Ibarra & Erez, 2005). Diversion programs tend to be theoretically driven, centering on a theory of

behavioural change, and labelling theory (Taxman, 2010; McGrath, 2008). In many cases diversion focuses on addressing substance abuse or mental health issues, or dealing with offending through an RJ framework. Diversion using RJ framework varies, for example it may involve face-to-face meetings between the victim and offender, or other types of mediation typically conducted by a police officer or a mediation professional (Taxman, 2010). RJ diversion can occur "in house", involving police officers who conduct mediation between the victim and offender, or officers may otherwise divert offenders to external agencies that are a part of their restorative justice program.

Police Culture

The study of police culture came into focus with the development of police as an academic subject which stemmed from increasing concerns regarding police violence and citizen's rights (Prenzler, 1997). Much of the police culture research stems from ethnographic accounts of police working styles from the 1960's with James Q. Wilson's 1968 book *Varieties of Police Behaviour* often being cited as the major work that sparked this research trend. This research identified three distinct policing styles: the legalistic, the watchman, and service-oriented styles. Other researchers have since identified different working styles based on officer's attitudinal similarities and differences. Paoline (2004) identified seven different groups of officers: traditionalists, law enforcers, old pros, peacekeepers, law-lows, anti-organizational street-cops, and dirty harry enforcers. Different policing styles or police groups represent subculture differences, showing that different policing styles represent adherence to different aspects of the police culture. The relationship between the assumptions of police culture and police working styles is not exactly clear, however, this relationship is often summarized with a casual model whereby the perceived internal and external stress of police work results in a

culture that has an impact on the working styles of patrol officers. This causal model of police culture is mediated by several background factors including but not limited to the officer's position in the police organization, their work environment, their length of service, and age (Terpstra & Schaap, 2013; Carlson, 2019).

Police culture is more dynamic and multifaceted than previously thought, with variations between police agencies, workgroups, and even the culture itself being continuously interpreted and constructed by officers (Bellingham, 2000; Ingram et al. 2013 & 2018; Campeau, 2015; Campeau 2018). It has been distilled over time and encompasses a complex system of values and attitudes that define the social world of police (Campeau, 2015). Police culture is an occupational culture, which is "a product of various situations and problems which all vocational members confront and to which they equally respond" (Paoline, 2003, p. 200). Occupational cultures are reduced, selective and task-based, that are shaped by "the socially relevant worlds of the occupation" (Gottschal & Gudmindsen, 2008, p. 171). Embedded in these occupational cultures are accepted practices, rules, and traditions that are applied in a variety of situations and are repeated and incorporated into routines in various degrees, producing a set of attitudes and explanatory structures of beliefs (Gottschal & Gudmindsen, 2008).

Police culture has traditionally been thought to include elements such as: disregard and disdain for rules and procedures, especially in the treatment of subjects; disregard for due process as a result of the dominant crime control model of policing; cynicism, isolation and intolerance, and; solidarity in being a police officer (Prenzler, 1997). Police culture often includes a variety of coping mechanisms that work to minimize stress and anxiety created by their work environments (Paoline, 2003; Caplan, 2003). Coping mechanisms can include suspiciousness or looking for signs of the "unusual," "maintaining the edge," "laying low" and

adherence to the image of the crime fighter. Maintaining the edge helps officers deal with the dangers of police work whereby officers believe they can maintain control and display their authority by being prepared to one-up citizens, while laying low refers to a coping mechanism used by officers to bring less attention to themselves and actions. Others have found the recurring themes of police culture to include: the police family; trust, loyalty, and protection; control; an us vs. them mentality; masculinity; sense of mission, and; subcultural differences (Brough et al., 2016; Waddington, 1999; Brown et al., 2019). Also the willingness to use force; engaging in informal working practices; social isolation; displaying solidarity with their colleagues; holding a conservative outlook; cynicism and pessimism; and an often simplistic understanding of criminality (Loftus, 2010; Fekjær et al., 2014). These recurring themes, especially suspiciousness, are governed by working rules of officers that influence their decisions regarding whether to intervene in situations; ultimately determining whether the citizen gets processed into the criminal justice system. Police have been found to create schemes and working rules that typify people, places, and situations that allow them to hone in on specific cues that arouse suspicion at different times, during different encounters (Stronshine et al., 2008).

Officers may be more likely to adhere to these coping mechanisms to make their jobs easier when deciding whether to use RJ. They may persuade officers to avoid making decisions regarding RJ that may reflect poorly on them, bring them to the attention of their supervisors, or make their jobs more difficult. In the hierarchical paramilitary organization of police departments frontline officers often face considerable scrutiny from their supervisors and often feel that they receive more attention for their mistakes rather than being noticed for good work (Silver et al., 2017). This scrutiny then fosters negative attitudes towards citizens and upper

management, leading to an "us versus them" mentality, with tension being exacerbated by the tendency for supervisors to focus on procedural rules and guidelines. Research suggests that officers deal with these ambiguities in their role by focusing on crime fighting activity, resulting in positive attitudes towards aggressive policing tactics (Paoline, 2004), but they may become more suspicious and distrustful of citizens as a result (Silver et al., 2017). This might be why many policing initiatives end up failing; police are skeptical about programs developed by citizens, partly as a matter of police culture. The dominant "us versus them" mentality leads officers to be hostile towards programs that involve civilians evaluating their performance, with officer resistance being due to their reluctance to change old ways of doing their job for new initiatives (Skogan, 2008).

Research has found evidence of police culture and its influence on patrol officer behaviour. For example, Terrill et al. (2003) set out to examine coercion by the police, and whether the use of coercion varies depending on the ways in which officers adhere to the traditional police culture. The authors found that officers' differences in attitudes towards traditional police cultural values produces differences in coercive actions towards suspects. Those who embody more values of the traditional police culture were likely to take coercive actions towards subjects, and those with mixed views were still more likely to use coercion when compared to those who held no cultural views. Given that research has shown that police culture can affect officer's decisions and actions, it is reasonable to project that this perspective can affect frontline officers' decision to use RJ.

There is a baseline of validity to the idea of the monolithic police culture meaning that some officers endorse the attitudes of the monolithic version of police culture, however there does appear to be a meaningful diversity among officers (Paoline & Gau, 2018). More recently

38

the study of police culture has expanded to address this diversity among officers, examining how culture is applied and used (Campeau, 2018). Police officers are no longer thought to immediately accept all the norms and values held by police agencies, rather it appears that officers decide whether they accept or reject elements of the police culture (Fekjær et al., 2014; Campeau, 2019). The demands and occupational pressures of police work are mediated by individual experiences, and the study of police culture should recognize the active roles of officers in structuring their understanding of the organization and its environment (Chan, 1996). Police culture can be viewed as a resource deployed by officers to make sense of experiences, their social position in a hierarchy, daily routines, or a changing environment (Campeau, 2019) rather than earlier typology work that tried to fit officers neatly into categories. Police are not passive in their use of police culture, rather they interact with this culture in various ways within institutional spaces. Despite these changes in the conception of police culture, it is important to study its effects because culture still exerts a considerable influence on the ways officers think and interact with the public, and this culture can also undermine police reforms (Loftus, 2010). Despite increased oversight, more diversity in police agencies, increased officer education and, more generally, greater internal and external pressures for reform, old-school sentiments about the best way to police remain, condoning illicit methods that "get things done." Officers employ various cultural resources to help them justify their actions, and often use informal, or old-school myths of police culture (Campeau, 2019).

The influence of police culture can create and perpetuate certain institutional myths, which are widespread understandings of a certain social reality which possess qualities of "truth" and are often used to justify ways of doing things (Campeau, 2019). Campeau (2019) refers to these as formal and informal myths of police agencies, while others have referred to these as the

working rules of police culture (Stroshine et al., 2008). This perspective does not view police culture as a static, linear, or monolithic, but rather as a culture that is routinely shaped by the various conditions present in policing (Aston et al., 2019). These myths or working rules may be influenced by generational differences between officers which can create "old" and "new" cultural scripts (Campeau, 2019), adopted by officers relating to shifting demographics and policy reforms, or through officers work environments (Campeau, 2018; Carlson, 2019). Old-school officers often construct symbolic boundaries and use formal and informal myths to maintain the status quo in which they are familiar. New officers who are looking for promotion in these agencies often must cross these boundaries and may find it necessary to draw on old police cultural myths, whether they adhere to them or not, in order to align themselves better with other officers (Campeau, 2019). While new generations of police officers may not attach as much importance to traditional myths, if they produce new boundaries and distinguish themselves too sharply from the old-school mentality, this can firmly plant them in an inferior position in the police hierarchy.

Police as a Working Group/Multilevel Work Group

Ingram et al. (2013) point out that while useful, the police culture typologies literature is limited because it has treated police culture as an individual-level concept. They argue that culture consists of a set of shared attitudes that establishes it as a collective concept, and that culture can be measured as attitudes at an individual officer level and should not be treated solely as an individual level characteristic. Another limitation of grouping officers into specific typological categories is that these classes do not reflect how strongly group members share culture and fail to address the shared nature of culture. Researchers typically address police culture as an attribute of individual officers, rather than as collective property (Ingram et al.,

2018). Campeau (2015) also points out several limitations of the typologies literature. First, the rigidly defined attitudinal dimensions to measure culture arranges officers into static categories, and second this approach abandons the unifying facets of culture. Most notably Chan (1996) critiques the limiting factors of the typologies perspective, arguing that this thinking fails to consider internal differentiation and jurisdictional differences, while also assuming the passivity of police officers in the acculturation process. Officers are not passive in their acceptance or rebuttal of aspects of the police culture, they are responsible for accommodating or resisting its influence. Further, this conception of police culture assumes that it is insulated from social, political, legal and organizational contexts which does not appear to be the case. Finally, considering all three previous criticisms, a single homogenous police culture leaves little chance or hope of change (Marier & Moule, 2019).

Ingram et al. (2013) note that while police culture research has found important variations between officers, an explanation for these differences has not been fully identified. While police culture is typically defined as a set of shared attitudes there is currently no threshold for assessing officer agreement. To address this issue Ingram and colleagues (2013; 2018) draw on the multilevel framework to create a theoretical framework to examine police culture structurally, rather than by examining typologies of police culture. This framework draws on the multilevel approach of organizational psychology and uses a structural approach to identify workgroups as organizational entities that influence police culture (Ingram et al., 2013). This framework conceptualizes police workgroups as patrol officers assigned to the same squad, schedule, shift, or patrol area. For example, officers working together on an evening shift would be a workgroup while officers working on a day shift would be another. These workgroups provide an immediate environment in which the officers' work is carried out, and determines the

boundaries within the formal police organization, and structures the officers' experiences. Workgroups operates at a lower level of socialization than the monolithic accounts of culture but at a higher level than individual adaptions (Ingram et al., 2013). This brings micro and macro perspectives into a single theoretical framework, and assumes that constructs are tied to, and affected by different levels of organizational systems. This framework recognizes the importance of structural boundaries within police culture; organizational boundaries within police organizations function as these structural boundaries.

Ingram et al. (2013) outline three ways in which this multilevel framework applies to frontline officers. First, officers are embedded within a broader environment that should exert similar influences on group members. Officers assigned to these workgroups experience the same type of work situations and share similar attitudes and beliefs to problems that they encounter. Second, officers in the same workgroup rely on each other to perform similar tasks and accomplish goals. Third, officers' attitudes are patterned at the squad level, meaning that officers working in the same squad routinely interact with one another compared to other officers. By using this framework to examine police culture and restorative justice, this research can push past the boundaries of the typology research and examine how specific workgroups in the WPS may act as a barrier to RJ. Police workgroups are a reasonable starting point to examine the influence of formal organizations on police culture as others have found that the police workgroups can influence police culture. For example, Fekjær et al. (2014) found that recent graduates of a police academy showed a gradual slide to more autonomous police practices with increased work experience, regardless of certain contextual and background factors. The authors argue that this is because of the influence of colleagues on recruits' attitudes. They note that the

workgroup influences recruits adherence to police culture so that they too can become members of the workgroup for their own safety, as well as to learn the "craft" of police work.

Issues with Policy Implementation

Police organizations are often called upon to change their structures to better align with the new realities of their policing environment and RJ represents one of these new realities (Duxbury et al., 2018). Public policy is understood to be much more complex than had been previously recognized, where the factors that influence policy implementation are more intricate, multifaceted, multileveled and can vary in time according to local context (Hudson et al., 2019). This shift in policing focus can bring about concerns regarding implementation, leading researchers to caution others to mind the "implementation gap" (Terpstra & Fyfe, 2015) between what policies promise they will accomplish and what they produce. This gap is often due to too many stakeholders, each having their own interests and views that may or may not be in line with the policy mandate. The implementation process is made more difficult by being driven from the top-down and from outside the organization, moving slowly, with visible changes being too small, difficult, and risky (Duxbury et al., 2018), with change often being subject to organizational and cultural barriers (Alaid & Montemayor, 2012; Bellingham, 2000). Changes within police departments to policy or internal rules are often not enough; changes to police culture must be made for reforms to meet expectations.

Resistance to policies by frontline officers that maintain an occupational subculture can increase differences between management objectives and practitioners views. This is particularly true when officers maintain a preoccupation with crime, making officers seek work which is considered thrilling, or "real police work" that can shape policies to become more traditional in their outlook (Gundhus, 2012; Chan, 2007). Bellingham (2000, p. 37) argues that "formal rules

must be tightened since it is the permissiveness of these rules that creates the space for occupational culture to flourish and foster its resistance to change." In some instances, officers may understand the need for change and what they are being asked to do, but when it is perceived as being imposed by senior management or enforced from outside of the police agency, then change is unlikely to be viewed as fair and officers will often struggle with adopting the practice in any meaningful way (Aston et al., 2019). By failing to change the police culture to adapt to new policy initiatives, officers can perceive new initiatives as a "self-inflicted bureaucratic burden" (Aston et al., 2019, p. 11). This might be why many policing initiatives end up failing; officers are skeptical about programs developed by citizens, a noted feature of police culture. An "us versus them" mentality leads officers to be hostile towards programs that involve civilians evaluating their performance, with officer resistance being due to their reluctance to change old ways of doing their job for new initiatives (Chan, 2007; Skogan, 2008).

Changes in policing cannot occur through policy alone; policy appears to be just one formal institutional myth which is loosely coupled with routine practices (Campeau, 2019). Police organizations are subject to strong "inertial forces" (p.70) and these organizations and their members are often slow to react to changes within their environments. If these inertial forces in organizations become routine and institutionalised, traditional arrangements will consistently be defended. While changes within police agencies are difficult, they are not impossible. With on-going training, police officers can balance the competing goals of restorative justice and criminal justice (McCold, 2003). This leaves some researchers to conclude that the argument against police-led restorative justice programs are not possible should be laid to rest (Crocker, 2016; McCold, 2003). When trying to implement new policies into police organizations, agencies must be cognizant not to revert to a "business as usual" mentality. Police

agencies may have administrative support for implementing new policies like restorative justice, but if there is a lack of involvement, or lack of understanding on the part of supervisors who oversee the day-to-day duties of frontline officers, these polices will fail. Frontline officers will have a lack of guidance and exposure to these initiatives, leading back to the business as usual mentality (McCold, 2003; Wills & Mastrofski, 2017).

Implementation is difficult for police agencies, so they need to be cautious not to revert to old ways of thinking when RJ programs are implemented. However, it does appear that police agencies do tend to do this. For example, Hoyle and Rosenblatt (2016) examined a type of RJ "cautioning" initiative ran by police in the UK, which involved referral of a young offender to community member panels that determined the types of reparations and programs the offender must follow. Over the course of the program the researchers noted that many shortcomings became evident, leading to the program moving away from the underlying principles upon which it was based. These shortcomings included limited reparations being made, restitution being mostly symbolic, or one-size-fits-all outcomes that were not proportionate to the offence. The researchers also identified poor victim involvement, which was maintained over time, and situations where surrogate victims or "produced" victims were used in situations of "victimless crimes." There was also a lack of wider community involvement in the process, where panel meetings were typically attended by the same people and lacked any actual community members (Hoyle and Rosenblatt, 2016). The researchers also identified a failure to establish a culture shift, with officers being reluctant to move away from entrenched justice principles and culture to embrace new restorative principles. Changes to the traditional police culture are needed to change officers' pro-arrest mindsets to successfully implement diversion programs (Baberi & Taxman, 2019).

Research Context: Policing in the North End of Winnipeg

The City of Winnipeg is divided in 4 police districts: North, West, East, and Central. The WPS Restorative Justice Diversion Program operated in the North District of Winnipeg, an area typically defined by high-crime rates, poverty, and to a considerable extent racialized poverty due to various processes like globalization, suburbanization, internal migration, and immigration (Comack & Silver, 2006). Drugs, gangs, and violence are major problems and cause for concern in Winnipeg's inner city which makes determining the proper police response difficult (Comack & Silver, 2006). In some cases, the response is unbalanced for many Indigenous people who live in these areas and who are often the first to experience the disproportionate impact of increased policing (Smirl, 2019). More specifically, the last several years in Winnipeg have been marked by the the increased use of methamphetamine and startling increase in opioid overdoses and deaths. The increase in illicit drug use disproportionality effects North End communities because of issues relating to income inequality, unemployment and lower levels of educational attainment, colonialism, over-policing, child welfare, housing inequality, enclosure of public spaces, and austerity agendas (Smirl, 2019).

According to the WPS 2019 Annual Crime Report, the North End area is second only to the Central district (i.e. the city center) in violent offences. In 2019 Winnipeg saw double the amount of homicides from 2018, going from 22 to 44, with the North End experiencing the highest number of homicides at 18. The North End area of Winnipeg also experienced an increase in the number of common assaults, assault against a peace officer, assault with a weapon, and aggravated assaults over the previous year. Violent crime and property crimes are both trending upwards in Winnipeg, while the total crime rate per 100,000 in Winnipeg substantially outpaces the rest of Canada (WPS, 2019b). The increase in crime rates is often cited

as a by-product of the increase in use of methamphetamine in Winnipeg (WPS, 2018) and is happening at a time where the WPS are experiencing increased calls for service, and a decrease in the number of authorized police officers (WPS, 2019b). Due to increases in crime rates, violent crimes and especially the number of homicides in Winnipeg in 2019, the WPS had to make adjustments to several police units, which included the reassignment of officers from major crimes, station duty, and community relations units (Pindera, 2019). The research context for this project is important, at the time in which this research was being conducted Winnipeg was experiencing a violent crime year, having the second highest crime severity index in Canada, and the highest violent crime severity index in the country (Moreau et al., 2019). During this time frontline officers in the WPS were still actively using the RJ diversion program in the North End.

The Winnipeg Police Service Restorative Justice Diversion Program

In 2016, the WPS introduced their Restorative Justice Diversion Program which focuses on the pre-charge diversion of offenders who have committed eligible offences to several RJ programs. In their Strategic Action Plan 2019 update, the WPS indicated that they will continue to focus on and increase the use of RJ and diversion programs to contribute to their overarching goals of less crime and victimization. This includes increasing their focus on policy directions to frontline officers to determine when referrals to RJ programs are appropriate, diversion of criminal matters to resources that provide programming focused on mitigating criminal activity, addressing underlying causes of criminal behaviour, and an increased emphasis on community mobilization efforts (WPS, 2019a).

The WPS Restorative Justice Diversion Program offers frontline officers a great deal of discretion in their decision to divert offenders or not, as there is currently little oversight from middle or upper-level management regarding the types of offenders that are diverted. The WPS

does have a framework for officers to follow when deciding whether or not to divert offenders, which includes a number of eligible and exceptional offences that can be considered for diversion. The designation of these offences varies depending on the seriousness of the offence; eligible offences are less serious, while exceptional offences are considered more serious and need supervisor approval. Officers then must determine the process by which they will divert offenders: Process A or Process B. Process A involves the offender being diverted back into the court process should they not complete their programming, while in Process B offenders are not diverted back into the court process because there are other factors that are contributing to their offending such as mental health, substance abuse or behavioural conditions.

Despite the diversion framework, frontline officers have considerable discretion regarding who they choose to divert. After it was uncovered that many eligible offenders were passed over for diversion (Broschuk & Weinrath, 2018), some middle management stakeholders expressed the possibility that police culture is affecting the use of restorative justice. Many of the principles of restorative justice run counter to that of policing; patrol officers are being placed in more of a mediator position instead of a crime fighting one. This has the potential to lead to confusion, especially since officers in middle management positions often have different expectations of RJ, and frontline officers have difficulty implementing these types of initiatives (Stockdale, 2015). Frontline officers may not want to divert offenders because they view themselves more as crime fighters, rather than practitioners of RJ. They may be more concerned with sending the "bad guy to jail," rather than diverting them into a restorative justice program.

Chapter 3 - Research Methods

Research Questions

The primary research question driving this project is: what is the effect of police culture on patrol officer attitudes towards restorative justice? Attitudes inform behaviour, which in turn influence officers' decisions to refer or not refer offenders to RJ programs. The quantitative portion of this study will operationalize police culture by drawing from Paoline's (2003) monolithic model, and others who have established recurring themes. This research will not look to fit officers neatly into specific typologies, but rather establish the broad context in which police culture operates in the WPS. Other researchers have found utility in this type of model to establish the context of police culture in police agencies (e.g. Terpstra & Schaap, 2013). Since this is an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, later qualitative research questions will build on the quantitative data analysis, and ask more general questions to provide a nuanced understanding of police culture and its influence on attitudes towards restorative justice. Responses to the qualitative portion of this study will explore how police culture is used as a tool by frontline officers in their duties, and how this can vary among officers within workgroups. While final questions will be built from the initial survey results, examples of possible subsidiary questions are: how do frontline officer understand police culture? How do frontline officers understand restorative justice? How do frontline officers understand their role as a police officer, and how does this understanding influence decisions around the use or non-use of restorative justice referrals? By understanding that police culture is more multifaceted than previously thought different officers may have varied opinions about these topics, but qualitative questions will aim to uncover common themes among officers to better understand the interaction between police culture and restorative justice.

Mixed Methods Approach

Mixed methods research involves integrating both qualitative and quantitative data in a research design. Mixed methods research is "philosophically grounded where an intentional mixture of both qualitative and quantitative approaches is used in a single research study" (Shannon-Baker, 2016, p. 321) which provides a complex understanding of a phenomenon. This research uses an explanatory sequential research design that involves two phases of data collection: quantitative and qualitative. This sequential two stage approach offers more flexibility, and allows the researcher to adapt the second stage of the research from the first stage (Feilzer, 2009), and complement each other while allowing for a more robust analysis by taking advantage of the strengths of each method (Ivankova et al., 2006). Researchers point out that survey instrument responses are typically thought of as unambiguous, and respondents are thought able to comprehend the questions posed to them, and are willing to share their opinions with the interviewer, this perspective lacks the ability for researchers to take into consideration the "unwanted noise" (Feilzer, 2009, p. 11) in the survey process. By choosing to ignore this noise throughout the quantitative research process researchers are essentially committing to a positivist paradigm. Given that RJ has been found to be difficult to operationalize and conceptualize within police forces (Stockdale, 2015), and police culture is not as simple to understand as once thought, it is important to take any possible indication of confusion or difference into consideration.

An explanatory sequential design begins with a distinct quantitative data collection phase. In this design the researcher firsts collects and analyzes the quantitative data, while qualitative data is collected and analysed second to help explain, or elaborate on, the quantitative results from the first phase (Ivankova et al., 2006). The rationale for this approach is that quantitative

data and subsequent analysis provides a general understanding of the research problem, while the qualitative data and its analysis allows for more refinement and explanation of statistical results by exploring participants thoughts in-depth (Ivankova et al., 2006).

This study involved the creation of a quantitative Likert-style survey which was distributed to an initial sample of 111 frontline officers. Following the explanatory sequential approach, the survey data was collected and coded before being entered into SPSS, where it was then analysed. The semi-structured interview for the second qualitative phase was built directly from the quantitative results (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In sequential designs the quantitative and qualitative study strands are typically connected while choosing participants for qualitative follow-up interviews or observations to better understand the results of the initial statistical tests (Ivankova, 2014). The quantitative results can also inform the development of qualitative data collection protocols and shape the emergent qualitative research questions. The advantage to using this type of design is that it is relatively straightforward (Doyle et al., 2016).

Mixed Methods Criteria for Quality

Issues of criteria for quality in mixed methods research have become increasingly prominent, and whereas the quality for criteria for quantitative research is widely accepted, this is not the case for qualitative research (Bryman et al., 2008). However, the growing rise in qualitative research has brought about a growing interest in the criteria for quality in qualitative studies. Tracy's (2010) "big tent" criteria for quality in qualitative research provides the framework for quality in the qualitative portion of this study. This criteria offers a way to cut through some of the redundant and duplicated terms in qualitative inquiry criteria and offers a common language for qualitative researchers. These criteria include: a worthy topic, rich rigor, sincerity, credibility, resonance, significant contribution, ethics, and meaningful coherence.

Bridging criteria like Tracy's (2010) can connect or bridge across paradigms, providing a flexible criteria that unifies qualitative work, while being sensitive to the diversity within and between different paradigms and methodological approaches (Ravenek & Rudman, 2013). Tracy (2010) notes that researchers are fallible, which includes falling short of their research goals, having to make compromises in their research, and not accomplishing everything all the time. Researchers should acknowledge these short comings and aim to be truthful with themselves and readers. This is why this research will strive for certain criteria including: a worthy topic, significant contribution, credibility, and rich rigor.

A worthy topic is one that is relevant, timely, significant, interesting or provocative, points out surprises and alters common sense assumptions about the subject (Tracy, 2010). Worthy topics can be established by a third party when researchers act in a consultant role, when research is commissioned, or when there are sudden shifts in the researcher's personal life, or societal landscape (Tracy & Hinrichs, 2017). This research is a worthy topic because it examines possible implementation issues and barriers to RJ as it becomes more common in policing, helps determine ways that these barriers can be overcome, and contribute to both the police culture and RJ literature. By pushing the examination of police culture and restorative justice to include mixed methods research, more complex themes and concepts can be examined. Significant research contributions can stem from a worthy topic. Research that makes a significant contribution engages the current climate of knowledge, and practice and asks specific questions about how the study extends knowledge, improves practice, generates ongoing research, and has the potential to empower (Tracy, 2010). Qualitative research can provide a significant contribution through theoretical, heuristic, methodological, or practical contributions.

Credibility in qualitative research refers to the trustworthiness and plausibility of the findings; readers feel like they can trust the research, and use it to make decisions (Tracy, 2010). Credible research relies on several key processes: thick description, triangulation or crystallization, multivocality and partiality. Triangulation is a validity procedure where researchers base their categories and conclusions on different sources of information; the more categories and conclusions that are confirmed by observations, the more valid the results, the reduced chances of biases, and the increased confidence in interpretations (Lub, 2015). The process of triangulation in this study will occur during the integration process of explanatory sequential design, where the two different data sources will provide more context for the conclusions made from this research. A study with rich rigor is marked by its complexity, and Tracy (2010) notes that researchers should be focused on collecting enough data to support their claims, spending enough time gathering interesting and significant data using appropriate samples that reflect the goals of the study, and using appropriate procedures. Good quality qualitative data is rich in its descriptions and interpretations, providing nuance and complexity in the research that adds to the aesthetic quality of research (Saville Young, 2016).

Rigorous researchers push themselves past convenience and opportunism, and carefully consider how to collect enough data and to use proper data analysis techniques. This is typically reflected in the description of data collection and analysis where the researcher details the amount of data collected, the duration of time spent in the field (Tracy & Hinrichs, 2017), reviewing numbers of pages of fields notes, the time gap between the fieldwork and development of field notes, and whether they were able to show a learned understanding or participant observations and field note writing practices (Tracy, 2010). Rigorous data analysis provides readers with a description of how raw data was transformed and organized and is marked by

transparency regarding the process of sorting, choosing and organizing data (Tracy, 2010). Rich rigor is reflected in this research by the complexity related to mixed methods research, and the various data analysis techniques used throughout this project.

Operationalization of Variables

The survey distributed to frontline officers was separated into 3 categories of inquiry: restorative justice understanding; restorative justice attitudes; and frontline officer perceptions of police culture. The items within these categories are all central features of the restorative justice and police culture literature and were all measured on a 5-point Likert scale.

Restorative justice understanding consists of 7 items that determine officers understanding of the primary characteristics of RJ. Participants were asked how strongly they agree or disagree with 1 item regarding community cohesion and transformation ("RJ has the ability to provide community cohesion and transformation"; Wood, 2015), 2 items about victim and offender involvement in RJ ("I think victims of crime should have as much, or as little, involvement in the CJ process as they want," and; "I believe that offenders should have as much or as little involvement in the CJ process as they want"), 1 item about the ability of RJ to empower victims, offenders, and communities ("RJ is an empowering process"; Bolitho, 2015), 1 iteam about the ability of RJ to repair relationships ("I believe that RJ has the ability to repair relationships between victims, offenders, and the community"), 1 item about RJ's ability to provide closure ("I believe that RJ provides more closure for victims of crime than the traditional CJS"), and 1 item regarding RJ's ability to take into account the victims of crime ("RJ appropriately takes into account the needs of the victims of crime"). Restorative justice understanding was later made into a single summated scale variable. There were initially 7 items that made up of the RJ understanding variable, but after initially reliability analysis was ran it

was found that 2 items were not highly correlated with others, creating a lower Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The 2 items that were removed were: "I think that victims of crime should have as much, or as little involvement in the CJ process (i.e. the entire time from arrest to sentencing) as they want," and "I believe that offenders should have as much or as little involvement in the CJ process (i.e. the entire time from arrest to sentencing) as they want." After the removal of these two measures, the RJ understanding scale achieved an acceptable alpha (α = .802).

The second category, restorative justice attitudes, consists of 16 items and examines frontline officer's attitudes towards the use of RJ in the criminal justice system and officer's general acceptance of RJ. Frontline officers play an important role in deciding who gets diverted to RJ programs, and studies have found that officers have relatively consistent opinions on the use of restorative justice (Stockdale, 2015; Crocker, 2013; Abramson, 2003). Two items measure officers attitudes towards diversion ("Diversion of some offenders away from the CJS is a good idea," and; "I believe that we should be diverting as many offenders as we can away from the CJS), 1 item determines whether officers believe RJ is an important change to the criminal justice system ("I think that RJ is an important change to our current CJS"), 2 items ask officers about the types of offences that should be applicable for RJ ("I think that RJ can be used for a broad array of offences than it is right now, including administrative offences," and; "RJ should not be available for any violent crimes, including any kind of assault"). Four items measure officers' attitudes towards the types of offenders that should have access to RJ ("I believe RJ should only apply to first time offenders"; "There are offenders that commit crimes that are eligible for RJ, but there are other factors that make me hesitant to do so"; "I often find that the attitude of the offender makes me question if they are appropriate for RJ diversion" and; "There are often situational factors that I take into consideration when deciding to divert

offenders"). Four items examine officer's opinions on their own involvement in restorative justice, and at what point in the criminal justice process do they believe that RJ is the most appropriate ("RJ should always be post-charge i.e. the Crown should be responsible for the decision to divert offenders"; "I believe that it is my responsibility as a PO to divert offenders to RJ programs"; "I think that RJ diversion gets in the way of my duties as a police officer" and; I think that asking police to be involved in RJ is asking too much of them"), 2 items measure officers opinions on the impact RJ will have on the CJS ("I think that RJ will have a lasting impact on our CJS" and; I believe that RJ can only work through partnerships within our CJS"). Finally, 1 item determines officers understanding of RJ ("I feel that I have a good understanding as to what RJ is"). Restorative justice attitudes was also made into a single summated scale variable. After running an initial reliability analysis, 6 measures were reverse coded to be more logically consistent with the remaining measures. Measures that were reverse coded were: "I believe that restorative justice should only apply to first time offenders"; "Restorative justice should not be available for any violent crimes, including any kind of assault"; "Restorative justice should always be post-charge, i.e. the Crown should be responsible for the decision to divert offenders"; "I think that asking police to be involved in restorative justice is asking too much of them"; "I often find that the attitude of the offender makes me question if they are appropriate for restorative justice diversion," and; " I think that restorative justice diversion gets in the way of my duties as a police officer." Once measures were reversed coded, the RJ attitude scale reached an acceptable alpha ($\alpha = .785$).

The third category, police culture, surveys on how much frontline officers agree or disagree with different aspects of police culture. This category examined some of the more "traditional" aspects of police culture by drawing from Paoline's (2003; 2004) work that

showcases enduring police culture characteristics. These variables included: us vs. them; loyalty; suspiciousness; masculinity; management; social isolation; control-legalistic; and crime fighting. There are enduring aspects of police culture (Loftus, 2010) and while the idea of a monolithic police culture has been questioned and shown to be changing (Campeau, 2019), it is important to recognize that officers do share some of the socialization experiences and cultural attitudes and values (Paoline, 2003). The us vs. them scale consisted of 3 items ("I believe that those outside of policing have an important role in assisting police to perform their duties"; "I have a positive attitude towards citizens" and; "I often find that I do not trust the general public when I attend calls for service"), loyalty consisted of 6 items ("I trust my immediate peers more than I trust my supervisors"; "I feel a strong loyalty to my fellow officers"; "I think that other officers share the same opinions about policing as I do"; "I will always back up my fellow officer"; "I get the most support from my fellow officers because they know what I am going through"; and "I find that I can trust the officers I work with every day the most). Suspiciousness consisted of 2 items ("I am often suspicious of the people I come into contact with" and; "I find that it takes me a while to begin to trust new recruits"), masculinity consisted of 1 item ("Being a PO requires me to act tough around my fellow officers when I am performing my duties"), while the management scale consisted of 5 items ("I often try to avoid any actions that will make my supervisor notice me"; "I find that there are differences between what I think is right, versus what my supervisors think is right"; "I often find that procedural guidelines restrictive when it comes to my day-to-day duties"; "I feel that I am more likely to be recognized for poor performance than good performance by my supervisors" and; "I feel that upper management puts realistic expectations on frontline officers). Social isolation consisted of 2 items ("I have trouble relating to people who are not police officers" and; "I feel that I can relate better to fellow PO's compared to

people who are not"), while crime fighting ("The most important part of my job is to fight crime"; and I believe that tough on crime policing tactics are the most effective"), and control legalistic variables ("I believe that there are too many systems of control in place by WPS management that impede my performance as a PO" and; "Sometimes I think that my job would be easier if I could take matters into my own hands") both consisted of 2 items.

Each of the police culture indicators were transformed into scale variables. The us vs. them scale consisted of 2 items, one of which was reverse coded to be more logically consistent ("I often find that I do not trust the general public when I attend calls for service"), while the third item "I believe that those outside of policing have an important role in assisting police to perform their duties," was dropped from analysis because it was not consistent with the other items. The loyalty scale had two items removed, "I will always back up my fellow officer," and "I trust my immediate peers more than I trust my supervisors." The loyalty scale is now a 4 item scale instead of a 6. The management scale consists of 5 items, with one item, "I feel that upper management puts realistic expectations on frontline officers," reverse coded to maintain consistency. The suspiciousness, social isolation, control-legalistic and crime fighting scales all consisted of 2 items.

Ethics Procedure

The quantitative survey and procedure was first approved by the University of Winnipeg's Research and Ethics Board (REB). The survey distribution procedure was established after a discussion with two high ranking officers in this division. During this meeting it was determined that the most effective way to distribute surveys was at the beginning of each shift, during the pre-shift brief. This is when officers gather in a meeting room and discuss business relating to the shift. Once this procedure was established, the two officers introduced

me and my project to the different shift supervisors that were going to be on duty during this research. After being introduced to them, I was then introduced to each shift through the shift supervisor. Prior to any surveys being conducted, respondents were provided with both a subject information sheet and a subject consent form which outlined their role as a participant, the research purpose and procedure, any potential risks and benefits of the study, privacy and confidentiality procedures, how the results of the study are likely to be disseminated and contact information if the participants had any questions following the completion of the survey. Prior to beginning the survey, participants were reminded that the study was completely voluntary and anonymous and if they wished to not participate in the study they could simply not fill in the survey or any specific questions that they did not feel like answering, and that they could withdrawal their participation at any time. Efforts were made to keep officers separated as much as possible and to limit their interaction during group administration. Participants were given the option to provide their contact information if they wished to participate in the later semi-structured interviews. Questions developed from the survey and then made into open-ended questions for the qualitative portion of the study were again approved by the REB prior to qualitative interviews commencing.

Quantitative Data Collection Procedure

Surveys were distributed to frontline officers in Division 13 of the WPS. This division was the first to implement the Restorative Justice and Diversion Program, and frontline officers are those who typically come into contact with individuals who would be diverted to RJ programming and are often responsible for the decision to divert offenders. Research indicates that officers at the frontline level have different understandings of what restorative justice is and when and how it should be used compared to higher ranking officers (Stockdale, 2015; Crocker,

2013). Surveys were distributed at Division 13 headquarters during officers working hours so that the officers did not incur any overtime, as per the requirements of the WPS. The survey was pretested by distributing it to one shift and then running a preliminary analysis on the results. It was determined after the pretest that no changes were needed to be made to the survey, so the data that was already collected was valid. Once preliminary analysis was complete, surveys were distributed to the remaining 5 shifts in the division. This involved going to Division 13 headquarters one day once in the morning, late afternoon and evening, and then on the final day once in the morning and in the evening. Going to the headquarters during the afternoon on the second day was not required because that shift was used to pretest the survey.

One hundred and eleven (111) surveys were distributed to frontline officers during their pre-shift briefing, of these available officers, 105 completed the survey, while 6 officers chose not to participate. This is a response rate of approximately 95%. There was anywhere from 12-20 officers in the room taking the survey at one time. Some shifts had more officers because officers from the community safety unit were brought in to participate in the survey. These officers participated in the study because they work in the same geographical area as frontline officers in Division 13, but unlike frontline officers, they do not have traditional patrol duties. Each time the survey was distributed, the research purpose, information letter and consent form were presented, and officers were given time to read over the documents. Officers were informed that their responses would be anonymous and confidential, and that responses would be presented in the aggregate to avoid any possible indicators. Officers were then given a separate information letter and the survey with the attached consent forms.

Quantitative Data Analytical Plan

After survey results were collected and entered into SPSS descriptive statistics were run to determine the characteristics of the officers working in Division 13. Frequencies were obtained for the survey questions and the mean, valid percentage and frequency were displayed for these variables. In order to make the analysis more efficient, questions on RJ attitudes were made into a summed scale variable, whereby 6 measures were reverse coded after an initial reliability analysis in order to provide a better Cronbach's alpha, and to be more logically consistent with the remaining measures. A reliability analysis was run for the RJ understanding scale variable where it was determined that two variables that were not highly correlated with the other variables were removed from the analysis. Police culture measures were transformed into 5 scale variables: us vs. them; loyalty; suspiciousness' masculinity' management; social isolation; control-legalistic; and crime fighting. Cronbach's alpha was run for all 10 variables in order to determine internal consistency.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with a Bonferroni estimate was run to determine the mean differences between each shift and whether there was any significant differences between the opinions of each shift regarding restorative justice and police culture. Pearson Product Movement correlations were calculated to determine whether restorative justice understanding and attitudes were correlated with aspects of police culture. Ordinary least squares regressions (OLS) were run using RJ attitudes as a dependent variables with demographics, police culture and RJ understanding as independent variables.

Qualitative Data Collection Procedure

The qualitative phase of an explanatory sequential mixed methods design aims to build on quantitative findings, including extreme outliers, significant predictors, significant results

relating to variables, or even demographics. Creswell and Creswell (2018) recommend that researchers using this approach should follow up with individuals that were in the initial quantitative sample because the intent of this design is to build on the quantitative results and explore them more in depth. Semi-structured interviews were used with the follow-up sample. The small size of the qualitative sample was not a significant concern because of the largely homogenous nature of police forces; common questions are expected to elicit common themes across the relatively small sample (Hagaman & Wutich, 2017).

During the distribution of the quantitative survey, officers were notified of the interview portion of this research and were given the opportunity to provide their contact information if they wished to participate in an interview at a later date. All 111 officers that were provided a survey had the same opportunity to provide their contact information to be contacted for a follow up interview. Seventeen officers provided their contact information and were sent a standardized recruitment email to determine if they were still interested in participating in an interview. Several follow up emails were sent to officers if they did not respond to the initial recruitment email; of the 17 officers that provided their contact information, 7 agreed to participate in an interview, 3 declined to participate citing other time commitments, and the remaining 7 officers did not respond to the initial and follow up recruitment emails. Interviews were conducted across March and April 2020. In person interviews were initially planned, but due to the circumstances surrounding the Covid-19 pandemic this method of data collection became unrealistic, therefore interviews were conducted over the phone with participating officers. Interviews lasted between 45 minutes to an hour depending on the length of the participant's responses and whether or not they wished to clarify earlier responses or had questions following the interview. An interview protocol was established for the qualitative interviews which included a script that was read prior

to every interview that informed participants of the research process and their informed consent, as well as a list of qualitative questions and sub-questions. Interview questions looked to provide an in-depth examination of the officer's perception of police culture and RJ, and to further dissect this relationship using open-ended questions based on the study's central focus. This protocol was created to serve as a guide and foundation for the interviews, but also allow for flexibility (Knox & Burkard, 2009). Interviews were recorded after the participants provided their consent and then transcribed verbatim. Confidentiality was maintained by the use of pseudonyms in place of officers real names, and interviews were conducted without recording any specific identifiers. Verbatim quotes were edited for clarity by taking out repetitive and filler words. Readability and understanding of quotes is easier if some of the everyday hesitations and repetitive speech are taken out of direct quotes to avoid them looking random and incoherent (Corden & Sainsbury, 2006).

Qualitative Data Analytical Plan

Thematic analysis (TA) was used to analyze qualitative data. TA involves systematically identifying, organizing, and offering insight into patterns of meanings (themes) across a data set. TA provides an accessible form of analysis that minimally organizes and describes data in rich detail while not being rooted in any pre-existing theoretical framework (Braun & Clarke, 2006). TA is best thought of as a method of data analysis, rather than an approach to conducting qualitative research (Braun & Clarke, 2012). By focusing on the themes across a data set, TA allows the researcher to see and make sense of collective or shared meanings and experiences (Braun & Clarke, 2012), and provides researchers with more theoretical freedom by providing a highly flexible approach that can be modify and adapted to different studies, providing the

research with rich, detailed and complex data (Nowell et al., 2017). TA is the process of finding meaning across a data set in order to find repeated patterns of meaning.

TA is a 6-phase approach to qualitative data analysis which requires the researcher in the first phase to familiarize themselves with the data. This involves the researcher immersing themselves in the data through repeated readings of transcribed data in an active way by taking notes and searching for patterns and meaning. Phase 2 involves generating initial codes from the data and then collating the data extracts together within each code, before moving on to phase 3 which involves searching for themes. This phase focuses on the broader level of themes rather than codes and involves sorting the different codes in potential themes. Phase 4 involves reviewing candidate themes and refining them, first reviewing themes at the level of coded data extracts then reviewing themes in relation to the entire data set. Phase 5 involves the further refinement of the themes that will be presented in the analysis and begin to analyze the data within them. This involves considering the themes themselves while also in relation to the other themes in order to determine whether any themes have sub themes. Phase 6 is producing the report, and includes providing a sufficient amount of evidence of the prevalence of themes while also providing an embedded analytical narrative beyond the description of the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). TA is useful for examining the different perspectives of research participants, highlighting similarities and differences, and generating unanticipated insights (Nowell et al., 2017). This approach will allow for the examination of themes of police culture and restorative justice, and how they interact. Braun and Clarke (2012) note that the patterns and meanings that TA finds allows the researcher to identify what is important in relation to the particular topic and research question being explored; TA then produces the answer to that question. While numerous answers can be identified across a dataset, the purpose of the analysis is to identify relevant

answers to the research question. TA is an approach to qualitative analysis that allows researchers the flexibility to focus on data in a number of different ways. Braun and Clarke (2012) posit that this allows researchers to examine meaning across an entire data set, examine one particular aspect of a phenomenon, report the obvious or semantic meanings within the data set, or examine more latent meanings within the text. TA adds credibility to this research because it permits the examination of how the perspectives of officers are different or not, allowing for thick descriptions of the interaction between restorative justice and police culture, as well as adding a layer of rigor to this research by outlining the complexities of police culture and restorative justice.

Quantitative and Qualitative Data Integration

Integration in mixed methods designs refers to the process of bringing together quantitative and qualitative approaches such that their combination leads to a greater understanding of the topic (McCrudden & McTigue, 2019). Using Fetters et al. (2013) approach to integration in mixed methods research, integration will take place across 3 levels: design, methods, and interpretation and reporting. Integration at the design level can take place through the 3 basic mixed methods designs including exploratory sequential, explanatory sequential, and convergent designs. As this research takes an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, quantitative and qualitative databases are analysed separately. Data integration occurs at the end of this process, where the two databases are combined by a process Creswell and Creswell (2018) refer to as connecting the quantitative results with the qualitative data collection. The second stage of integration, integration through methods, in this project will use what Fetters et al. (2013) call "building". This process occurs when the results from one data collection procedure informs the other, in the case of this project survey data will inform the types of

questions that are asked to frontline officers during the semi-structured interview stage. The third stage, integration at the interpretation and reporting level, involves the integration of the data collected. Fetters et al. (2013) note several ways in which this could be accomplished, but for this project the best way in which to achieve data integration would be integration through data transformation. By using TA to uncover common themes throughout the semi-structured interviews with frontline officers, qualitative data will be codified. This codification of qualitative data lends itself well to this process because this type of integration involves the conversion of one type of data into another, and then integrating the transformed data with the data that have not been transformed.

One of the challenges related to a mixed method design is the debate regarding when quantitative and qualitative data should be integrated (Doyle et al., 2016). Mixed methods research should be thought of as more than merely mixing quantitative and qualitative data, but rather mixing quantitative and qualitative components (Doyle et al., 2016). This issue of integration will be addressed by following the explanatory sequential mixed methods process where components of quantitative methods are combined with qualitative methods after quantitative analysis. This process combines more than just data by using the data to build the qualitative phase, which allows the interviews to explore divergence in the findings, or interesting themes. Another challenge to using mixed methods research is what to do with divergent findings (Doyle, et al., 2016). However, there is a requirement that mixed methods researchers attempt to explain any divergent findings in their data. These problems can be addressed by providing rich and thick descriptions of the phenomenon in order to give context to any divergent or unexpected findings.

Chapter 4 - Quantitative Results

Introduction

It is important to take stock of how frontline officers understand and perceive the policies and tools they use in their day-to-day work. The implementation of new programs and policies in policing is not always easy, researchers have noted the slow moving, often tedious top down nature of policy implementation in policing (Terpstra & Fyfe, 2015; Duxbury et al., 2018). Police culture is often cited as a possible barrier to policy implementation (Knaak et al., 2019; Gottschalk & Gudmundsen, 2008; Alaid & Montemayor, 2012; Bellingham, 2000; Gundhus, 2012), whereby frontline officers are reluctant to use these new policies in their day to day work due to their feelings or adherence to aspects of police culture. While RJ across Canada and internationally has enjoyed an unconditional acceptance as the solution to many of the problems in the traditional justice system, researchers have noted there are issues of RJ programs on the front line.

This chapter explores how frontline officers perceive and understand restorative justice and police culture in the North End district of Winnipeg, a high crime, and low income district. This section is important for providing a general understanding of the primary research question guiding this work: what is the effect of police culture on patrol officer's attitudes towards restorative justice? While the results from this survey are meant to provide a general understanding of the research questions, the quantitative portion of this study is important because it provides a framework for the development of qualitative interview questions following an explanatory sequential mixed methods design.

This chapter begins by outlining the descriptive characteristics of the police officers active in this district, providing a general outline of their age, gender, education and years of

service in the WPS. Second, I will discuss officers understanding of the main corner stones of restorative justice including victim and offender involvement, closure for the victims of crime, and the presence of the community in the restorative justice process. Following this discussion, this chapter examines officer's attitudes to the use of RJ, including their opinions on the types of offences that RJ should be used from, the use of RJ in their day-to-day duties and its perceived impact in the criminal justice system. The chapter's analyses will explore how officers view their role as police and their adherence to different aspects of police culture. The chapter will conclude by linking findings to past literature and raising questions that the qualitative inquiry will look to answer.

Descriptive Findings

Of the 105 participants, most officers were male (84.8%), while only a few were female (15.2%, Table 1). A total of 89 officers reported their years of service while 16 officers did not respond to this question. Of the officers that did respond, 25.8% had worked 5 years or less, while 28% of officers had worked 6-10 years. Thirty-one officers (34.9%) had between 11-15 years of service, while the remaining 10 officers had been with the WPS 16 or more years. The average number of years of service was 9.8 years.

Officers were generally well educated, with approximately 89% of the sample having some form of post-secondary education. Seven officers (6.7%) had a graduate degree, while 30 (28.6%) reported having an undergraduate degree, 25 (23.8%) a college diploma, and 31 (29.5%) had at least some post-secondary education. The remaining 12 officers (11.4%) had a high school education, the minimum qualifications for applying for a constable position.

Table 1

Division 13 Survey Respondent Demographics and Experience: Gender, Years as Police Officer, and Education Level

Variable	N	Valid %
Gender		
Male	89	84.8%
Female	16	15.2%
Total	105	100.0%
Years as Police Officer		
Mean	9.80	-
Standard Deviation	5.442	-
Range	24	-
0-5	23	25.8%
6-10	25	28.1%
11-15	31	34.9%
16-25+	10	11.2%
Total	89	100.0%
Missing	16	15.2%
Education Level		
High School	12	11.4%
Some Post-Secondary	31	29.5%
College Diploma	25	23.8%
Undergraduate Degree	30	28.6%
Graduate Degree	7	6.7%
Total	105	100.0%

Attitudes and Understanding of Restorative Justice and Police Culture Responses

The survey distributed to frontline officers was separated into 3 categories: frontline officer understanding of restorative justice; attitude towards restorative justice; and perception towards police culture.

Restorative Justice Understanding

Table 2 shows how frontline officers responded to questions about RJ understanding. When asked if officers believed that restorative justice appropriately takes into account the needs of victims of crimes, about half (49.5%) of respondents reported that they neither agreed nor disagreed, while 39 (37.5%) officers reported that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed. This disagreement with one of the core principles of restorative justice may be because officers lack the understanding RJ, or it may be due to the type of RJ being conducted by the WPS. The

WPS is primarily concerned with the diversion of offenders to restorative justice programs, and are not concerned with reaching out to victims to seek their involvement in the RJ process. By lacking victim involvement, frontline officers may never actually see the needs of victims of crime being taken into consideration which might alter their opinions. Half of respondents (49.5%) reported that they neither agree nor disagree that RJ provides more closure, while 40.4% actually disagree or strongly disagree that it does. Most officers (56.2%) also neither agreed nor disagreed with RJ being an empowering process. Again, more officers (26.7%) were more likely to either disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement, than agree or strongly agree (17.2%). These findings are important to note because it appears that frontline officers have a different understanding as to what RJ can accomplish based on their experience, compared to what the current literature on restorative justice is saying. Studies have found that victim oriented RJ practices have the ability to meet the unmet needs of victims, with the victims feeling more positive and satisfied in both the short and long term (Bolitho, 2015), and provides a means of victim involvement in their own criminal case (Gavrielides, 2017). Others have also shown that the informal restorative justice process, which is a marked departure from the formal, often rigid criminal justice process, offers victims the opportunity to participate and share their feelings which contributes to victims feelings of justice and belief in the justice system (Miller & Hefner, 2015).

Table 2

Frontline Officer Restorative Justice Understanding Survey Responses

	Restorative Justice Understanding			
	RJ has the ability to provide community cohesion and transformation		**I think victims of crime should have as much, or as little, involvement in the CJ process (i.e. the entire time from arrest to sentencing) as they want**	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.38	-	3.63	-
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0%	1	1.0%
Disagree	12	11.5%	20	19.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	39	37.5%	15	14.4%
Agree	51	49.0%	49	47.1%
Strongly Agree	1	1.0%	19	18.3%
Total	104	100.0%	104	100.0%
Missing	1	-	1	-
	I believe that offenders should have as much, or as little, involvement in the CJ process (i.e. the entire time from arrest to sentencing) as they want		**I believe that RJ has the ability to repair relationships between victims, offenders, and their communities**	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.33	-	3.14	-
Strongly Disagree	23	22.1	4	3.8%
Disagree	49	47.1%	13	12.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	13	12.5%	53	50.5%
Agree	13	12.5%	34	32.4%
Strongly Agree	6	5.8%	1	1.0%
Total	104	100.0%	105	100.0%
Missing	1	-	-	-
	RJ is an empowering process		**I believe that RJ provides more closure for victims of crime than the traditional CJS**	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.87	-	2.63	-
Strongly Disagree	5	4.8%	9	8.7%
Disagree	23	21.9%	33	31.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	59	56.2%	52	50.0%
Agree	17	16.2%	8	7.7%
Strongly Agree	1	1.0%	2	1.9%
Total	105	100.0%	104	100.0%
Missing	-	-	1	-
	RJ appropriately takes into account the needs of victims of crime			
	Frequency	Valid %		
Mean	2.66	-		
Strongly Disagree	10	9.6%		
Disagree	29	27.9%		
Neither Agree nor Disagree	52	50.0%		
Agree	12	11.5%		
Strongly Agree	1	1.0%		
Total	104	100.0%		
Missing	1	-		

Restorative Justice Attitudes

Table 3 outlines officer's attitudes towards RJ. Almost half of officers surveyed (45.8%) believe that restorative justice is an important change to the current criminal justice system, and 72.4% agree or strongly agree that they have a good understanding of RJ. Most officers (84.8) either agree or strongly agree that RJ can only work through partnership within the criminal justice system. It appears that frontline officers see themselves as an important part of this partnership because almost half (48.1%) disagreed that having police involved in RJ is asking too much of them, while only 15 (14.4%) officers did agree or strongly agree, while the remaining 39 officers (37.5%) neither agreed nor disagreed. This sentiment appears to be consistent, as a similar number of officers (53 or 50.9%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that RJ gets in the way of their regular police duties. Only 9 officers (8.7%) agree that RJ got in the way of their duties.

Overall, findings show that police are relatively accepting of RJ as it relates to lower level offences and offenders, and it appears that they consider themselves an important part of the process. The majority of officers surveyed (85.6%) either agreed or strongly agreed that the diversion of some offenders from the criminal justice system is a good idea. However, only 21% of officers agreed or strongly agreed that the police and others in the criminal justice system should be diverting as many offenders as we can away from the criminal justice system. Half of officers (50.5%) actually disagree or strongly disagree with this statement. This shows that while officers believe that diverting offenders away from the criminal justice system using RJ measures is good for some offenders, they believe that it should not be used for all. This is not surprising since 57.1% of officers either agree or strongly agree that RJ should only apply to first time offenders; only 21% of officers disagreed that restorative justice should only apply to first

time offenders. Sixty-four officers (61%) either agree or strongly agree that restorative justice should not be available for any violent crimes, including any kind of assault. Currently, the WPS diversion program does have provisions for the referral of lower level assault charges. It appears that officers take situational factors into consideration when assessing an offender for diversion. Seventy-one officers (67.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that there are often other factors that make them hesitant to divert offenders when the arrestee has committed an offence that is eligible for diversion. The majority of officers (91, or 87.5%) also agreed that the attitudes of offenders they are considering for diversion often makes them question if they are appropriate for RJ.

Table 3

Frontline Officer Restorative Justice Attitude Survey Responses

	Restorative Justice Attitudes			
	Diversion of some offenders from the CJS is a good idea		I believe that we should be diverting as many offenders as we can away from the CJS	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.89	-	2.63	-
Strongly Disagree	4	3.8%	9	8.6%
Disagree	6	5.8%	44	41.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	4.8%	30	28.6%
Agree	71	68.3%	21	20.0%
Strongly Agree	18	17.3%	1	1.0%
Total	104	100.0%	105	100.0%
Missing	1	-	-	-
	I think RJ is an important change to our current CJS		I believe RJ should only apply to first time offenders	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.26	-	3.46	-
Strongly Disagree	2	1.9%	1	1.0%
Disagree	18	17.1%	22	21.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	37	35.2%	22	21.0%
Agree	48	45.7%	48	45.7%
Strongly Agree	12	11.4%	12	11.4%
Total	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Missing	-	-	-	-
	I think that RJ can be used for a broad array of offences than it is right now, including administrative offences (e.g. probation)		RJ should not be available for any violent crimes, including any kind of assault	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.90	-	3.59	-
Strongly Disagree	6	5.7%	3	2.9%
Disagree	38	36.2%	24	22.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	22	21.0%	14	13.3%
Agree	38	36.2%	36	34.3%
Strongly Agree	1	1.0%	28	26.7%
Total	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Missing	-	-	-	-
	RJ should always be post-charge, i.e. the Crown should be responsible for the decision to divert offenders		There are often offenders that commit crimes that are eligible for RJ, but there are other factors that make me hesitant to do so	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.11	-	3.73	-
Strongly Disagree	4	3.8%	-	-
Disagree	31	29.5%	5	4.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	30	28.6%	28	26.9%
Agree	29	27.6%	61	58.7%
Strongly Agree	11	10.5%	10	9.6%
Total	105	100.0%	104	100.0%
Missing	-	-	1	-

	I feel that I have a good understanding as to what RJ is		I believe that it is my responsibility as a PO to divert offenders to RJ programs	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.65	-	2.73	-
Strongly Disagree	2	1.9%	9	8.6%
Disagree	10	9.5%	35	33.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	17	16.2%	37	35.2%
Agree	70	66.7%	23	21.9%
Strongly Agree	6	5.7%	1	1.0%
Total	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Missing	-	-	-	-

	I think that RJ will have a lasting impact on our CJS		I believe that RJ can only work through partnerships within our CJS	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.05	-	3.94	-
Strongly Disagree	5	4.8%	-	-
Disagree	15	14.3%	1	1.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	55	52.4%	15	14.3%
Agree	30	28.6%	78	74.3%
Strongly Agree	-	-	11	10.5%
Total	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Missing	-	-	-	-

	I think that asking police to be involved in RJ is asking too much of them		I often find that the attitude of the offender makes me question if they are appropriate for RJ diversion	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.66	-	4.09	-
Strongly Disagree	8	7.7%	-	-
Disagree	42	40.4%	2	1.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	39	37.5%	11	10.6%
Agree	7	6.7%	67	64.4%
Strongly Agree	8	7.7%	24	23.1%
Total	104	100.0%	104	100.0%
Missing	1	-	1	-

	I think that RJ diversion gets in the way of my duties as a police officers		There are often situational factors that I take into consideration when deciding to divert offenders	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.54	-	3.88	-
Strongly Disagree	7	6.7%	-	-
Disagree	46	44.2%	-	-
Neither Agree nor Disagree	42	40.4%	25	24.0%
Agree	6	5.8%	67	64.4%
Strongly Agree	3	2.9%	12	11.5%
Total	104	100.0%	104	100.0%
Missing	1	-	1	-

Police Culture

The majority of officers surveyed (76%) agreed that those outside of policing have an important role in assisting police in performing their duties, and most officers (82.6%) reported that they hold a positive attitude towards citizens. Despite most officers holding a favourable view of citizens, 29.4% of officers reported that they do not trust the general public when they respond to calls for service. The remaining officers either disagree with this statement (35.3%) or

neither agree nor disagree (35.3%). Generally, most officers held a strong loyalty to their fellow officers (82.4%), with only 2 officers strongly disagreeing with this statement. Three quarters of officers (74.2%) agreed that they think that other officers share the same opinions on policing that they do, and a similar proportion of respondents (76.2%) reported that they would always back up their fellow officers. The majority of those surveyed (68.4%) also reported that they trust the officer they work with every day the most.

When asked if officers trust their immediate peers more than they trust their supervisors, almost half of officers (47.1%) reported that they neither agreed nor disagreed, the remaining officers were split, 27 (26.4%) officers agreed, and 27 (26.4%) disagreed with this statement. Overall, respondents did not feel that their job required them to act tough around fellow officers and when they are performing their duties. Only 6 officers (5.9%) agreed that they felt that policing required them to act tough, while 72 officers (70.6%) disagreed that they felt this way. The majority of officers (71 or 69.6%) disagreed that they avoid taking actions that will make their supervisors notice them. However, responses to whether officers felt they are more likely to be recognized for poor performance then good performance, were more evenly distributed with 36.2% of officers disagreeing, and 35.2% agreeing. Over half of officers (53.9%) also reported that they do not believe that there is a difference between what they think is right versus what their supervisors believe is right, and there was little agreement on whether officers believed that procedural guidelines were restrictive on their day-to-day duties. Forty-seven officers (46.1%) neither agreed nor disagreed, while 24 (23.5%) disagreed, and 31 (30.4%) agreed. When asked whether officers believe that upper management puts realistic expectations on officers, 66.7% disagreed, with only 14.7% of officers agreeing with that statement.

The majority of officers (72.6%) disagreed that they have trouble relating to people who are not police officers, with only 7 (6.9%) officers agreeing that they do. However, when asked whether officers relate better to other officers than to those who are not, 34.3% of respondents agreed, while 29.4% disagreed, and 36.3% neither agreeing nor disagreeing. There was some agreement among officers that there are too many systems of control in place by WPS management that impeded frontline officers work performance: 44.6% of officers agreed that this was the case, while only 15.9% disagreed. However, the majority of officers (61.4%) disagreed that their job would be easier if they could take matters into their own hands, with only 15 (14.9%) officers agreeing that it would. Approximately half of officers (49.5%) agreed that the most important part of their job was crime fighting, with 22 officers (21.8%) reporting that they disagreed with this statement and 29 (28.7%) neither agreeing nor disagreeing. Officers also tended to agreed more with tough on crime policing tactics. When asked if officers believe that tough on crime policing tactics are the most effective, 54 (52.9%) officers either agree or strongly agree, with only 12 (11.8%) officers disagreeing. The remaining 36 (35.3%) of officers neither agree nor disagree.

Table 4

Frontline Officer Police Culture Survey Responses

	Police Culture Responses			
	I believe those outside of policing have an important role in assisting police to perform their duties		**I often find that I do not trust the general public when I attend calls for service**	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.82	-	2.95	-
Strongly Disagree	2	1.9%	5	4.9%
Disagree	6	5.8%	31	30.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	17	16.3%	36	35.3%
Agree	63	60.6%	24	23.5%
Strongly Agree	16	15.4%	6	5.9%
Total	104	100.0%	102	100.0%
Missing	1	-	3	-
	I hold a positive attitude towards citizens		**I trust my immediate peers more than I trust my supervisors**	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.90	-	3.05	-
Strongly Disagree	2	1.9%	3	2.9%
Disagree	5	4.8%	24	23.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11	10.6%	48	47.1%
Agree	69	66.3%	19	18.6%
Strongly Agree	17	16.3%	8	7.8%
Total	104	100.0%	102	100.0%
Missing	1	-	3	-
	I feel a strongly loyalty to my fellow officers		**I think that other officers share the same opinions about policing that I do**	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.99	-	3.77	-
Strongly Disagree	2	2.0%	2	2.0%
Disagree	-	-	-	-
Neither Agree nor Disagree	16	15.7%	24	23.8%
Agree	63	61.8%	68	67.3%
Strongly Agree	21	20.6%	7	6.9%
Total	102	100.0%	101	100.0%
Missing	3	-	4	-
	I will always back up a fellow officer		**I get the most support from my fellow officers because they know what I am going through**	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	4.18	-	3.42	-
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0%	3	2.9%
Disagree	7	6.9%	10	9.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	16	15.8%	35	34.3%
Agree	26	25.7%	49	48.0%
Strongly Agree	51	50.5%	5	4.9%
Total	101	100.0%	102	100.0%
Missing	4	-	3	-

I find that I can trust the officers I work with every day the most

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.78	-
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0%
Disagree	2	2.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	29	28.7%
Agree	55	54.5%
Strongly Agree	14	13.9%
Total	101	100.0
Missing	4	-

I find that it takes me a while to trust new recruits

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.99	-
Strongly Disagree	2	1.9%
Disagree	30	29.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	41	39.8%
Agree	27	26.2%
Strongly Agree	3	2.9%
Total	103	100.0%
Missing	2	-

I am often suspicious of the people I come into contact with

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.34	-
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0%
Disagree	18	17.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	37	36.3%
Agree	37	36.3%
Strongly Agree	9	8.8%
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

Being a PO requires me to act tough around my fellow officers and when I am performing my duties

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.23	-
Strongly Disagree	14	13.7%
Disagree	58	56.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	24	23.5%
Agree	5	4.9%
Strongly Agree	1	1.0%
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

I often try to avoid any actions that will make my supervisors notice me

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.23	-
Strongly Disagree	15	14.7%
Disagree	56	54.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	24	23.5%
Agree	7	6.9%
Strongly Agree	-	-
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

I find that there are differences between when I think is right, versus what my supervisors think is right

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.48	-
Strongly Disagree	13	12.7%
Disagree	42	41.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	32	31.4%
Agree	15	14.7%
Strongly Agree	-	-
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

I often find procedural guidelines restrictive when it comes to my day-to-day duties

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.09	-
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0%
Disagree	23	22.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	47	46.1%
Agree	28	27.5%
Strongly Agree	3	2.9%
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

I feel that I am more likely to get recognized for poor performance than good performance by my supervisors

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.99	-
Strongly Disagree	8	7.8%
Disagree	30	29.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	27	26.5%
Agree	29	28.4%
Strongly Agree	8	7.8%
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

I feel that upper management puts realistic expectations on frontline officers

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.25	-
Strongly Disagree	28	27.5%
Disagree	40	39.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	19	18.6%
Agree	11	10.8%
Strongly Agree	4	3.9%
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

I have trouble relating to people who are not police officers

	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.19	-
Strongly Disagree	17	16.7%
Disagree	57	55.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	21	20.6%
Agree	6	5.9%
Strongly Agree	1	1.0%
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

	I feel that I can relate better to fellow PO compared to people who are not		I believe that there are too many systems of control in place by WPS management that impede my performance as a PO	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.05	-	3.38	-
Strongly Disagree	4	3.8%	2	2.0%
Disagree	26	25.5%	14	13.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	37	36.3%	40	39.6%
Agree	31	30.4%	34	33.7%
Strongly Agree	4	3.9%	11	10.9%
Total	102	100.0%	101	100.0%
Missing	3	-	4	-

	Sometimes I think that my job would be easier if I could take matters into my own hands		The most important part of my job is to fight crime	
	Frequency	Valid %	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	2.46	-	3.40	-
Strongly Disagree	11	10.9%	-	-
Disagree	51	50.5%	22	21.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	24	23.8%	29	28.7%
Agree	12	11.9%	38	37.6%
Strongly Agree	3	3.0%	12	11.9%
Total	101	100.0%	101	100.0%
Missing	4	-	4	-

	I believe that tough on crime policing tactics are the most effective	
	Frequency	Valid %
Mean	3.50	-
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0%
Disagree	11	10.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	36	35.3%
Agree	44	43.1%
Strongly Agree	10	9.8%
Total	102	100.0%
Missing	3	-

Restorative Justice Understanding, Attitudes, and Police Culture Scale Variables

To make analysis more efficient, questions on restorative justice attitudes were made into a summated scale variable. After running an initial reliability analysis, 6 measures were reverse coded to provide a more efficient Cronbach's alpha, and to be more logically consistent with the remaining measures. Variables that were reverse coded were: "I believe that restorative justice should only apply to first time offenders"; "restorative justice should not be available for any violent crimes, including any kind of assault"; "restorative justice should always be post-charge, i.e. the Crown should be responsible for the decision to divert offenders"; "I think that asking police to be involved in restorative justice is asking too much of them"; "I often find that the

attitude of the offender makes me question if they are appropriate for restorative justice diversion", and; "I think that restorative justice diversion gets in the way of my duties as a police officer."

There were 7 measures that initially made up the items for an RJ understanding scale. When initial reliability analysis was run, it was found that the two measures were not highly correlated with others creating a lower Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The 2 measures removed from analysis were: "I think that victims of crime should have as much, or as little, involvement in the CJ process (i.e. the entire time from arrest to sentencing) as they want"; and "I believe that offenders should have as much or as little involvement in the CJ process (i.e. the entire time from arrest to sentencing) as they want." The restorative justice understanding scale achieved an acceptable alpha ($\alpha = .802$).

Police culture measures were transformed into 5 scales: us vs. them; loyalty; suspiciousness; masculinity; management; social isolation; control-legalistic; and crime fighting. The us vs. them scale consists of two variables, one of which was reverse coded to be more logically consistent. The third variable "I believe that those outside of policing have an important role in assisting police to perform their duties," was dropped from analysis because it was not consistent with other measures, as shown in a reduced Cronbach's alpha coefficient when it was included. The police culture loyalty scale showed acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .691$), but this was due to two variables being removed, "I will always back up my fellow officer," and "I trust my immediate peers more than I trust my supervisors." The police loyalty scale is a 4 variable scale instead of 6. The management scale consists of 5 variables, one variable, "I feel that upper management puts realistic expectations on frontline officers" was reverse coded to maintain consistency with the other measures.

The police culture suspiciousness, social isolation, control-legalistic, and crime-fighting scales all consisted of only 2 items. The social isolation variable consisted of the items "I have trouble relating to people who are not police officers"; and, "I feel that I can relate better to fellow police officers compared to people who are not." The control-legalistic scale consisted of the 2 items, "I believe that there are too many systems of control in place by WPS management that impeded my performance as a PO"; and, "sometimes I think that my job would be easier if I could take matters into my own hands." The crime-fighting scale consisted of the items: "I believe that tough on crime policing tactics are the most effective", and; "the most important part of my job is to fight crime." The police culture masculinity measure was measured with one item.

Table 5

Restorative Justice and Police Culture Scale Means, Variation and Reliability Coefficients

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
RJ Attitude	3.147	.434	.785
RJ Understanding	2.938	.593	.802
Us vs. Them	3.466	.732	.520
Loyalty	3.743	.541	.691
Management	2.908	.579	.592
Suspiciousness	3.167	.726	.496
Social Isolation	2.620	.752	.636
Control-Legalistic	2.920	.781	.555
Crime Fighting	3.451	.747	.519
Masculinity[1]	2.226	.782	-

Mean Differences between Frontline General Patrol Shifts

Shifts were compared to determine the importance of organizationally derived understandings of police culture and RJ. Patrol workgroups act as a starting point for this inquiry because they are expected to have the most immediate effect on police culture. Officers within

---

[1] The Masculinity police culture variable is measured with one question and is not a scale variable.

these workgroups are exposed to similar experiences, and common environments during their shifts, leading to similar attitudinal orientations among officers (Ingram et al., 2013). If there are significant differences between shifts in Division 13 in their attitudes and understanding of RJ or their perception of police culture, according to the multilevel workgroup framework, the officers workgroup, or shift, can provide an explanation for these differences.

Although differences were found between shifts, many of them were not substantive or statistically significant, showing that the officer's shift may not have a substantial effect on officers understanding and perceptions of restorative justice and police culture. The range of differences that were found between different shifts was narrow. One of the smallest mean differences was between Community Safety Officers (CSO) and Shift A1 in their restorative justice attitude measure, with a difference of only -.008. The largest mean differences were between shifts A2 and CSO in the control legalistic variable, with a difference of 35% (1.214). Results are not shown but available on request.

Table 6 shows two shifts that had the most number of statistically significant mean differences (although it was only two in total). The Management and Control-Legalistic scales had a statistically significant mean difference at the p<.05 level. The mean difference between shifts A2 and A3 for the Management scale was .717, and the mean difference between the shifts for the Control-Legalistic variable was .923. However, despite having the most statistically significant differences, most of the variables between the two shifts did not achieve differences significant at the p<.05 level. Percent differences ranged from 0.023% for restorative justice attitudes between shifts A2 and A3 to the statistically significant, but small difference of 9.7% between the two shifts control-legalistic responses. The lack of substantive or statistically significant differences may indicate that the officer's shifts do not have as big of an effect on

their attitudes towards restorative justice and police culture as hypothesized and suggested by previous research. These findings show a consistency among officers in Division 13; rather than showing differences among the shifts as a workgroup, officers in the Division showed a uniformity, which suggests that officers may think of the division rather than their individual shift as a cohesive work group.

While the survey results found that frontline officers were relatively consistent in their opinions of police culture and restorative justice, shifts appeared to have different personalities when respondents were observed during the distribution of the survey. Each shift appeared to have their own dynamic which officers contributed to in different ways. For example, during one shift one officer looked over the shoulder of another officer and yelled to the entire shift "you don't trust your fellow officers? I'll get you some cheese," while the rest of the room laughed. In comparison, other shifts were much more quite with no officers commenting on the survey, or talking to one another throughout the process, while others were not talking to each other but were commenting on the survey saying that the questions were "weird."

Table 6

Mean, Percent, t-value, and p-value Differences between Shifts A2 and A3 Restorative Justice Understanding, Attitudes and Police Culture Variables

Variable	Shift A2 (mean)	Shift A3 (mean)	Mean Difference	Difference %	t	p value
RJ Attitude	3.150	3.103	.047	.023%	.352	.728
RJ Understanding	2.947	2.985	-.038	.016%	-.206	.839
Us vs. Them	3.433	3.542	-.108	.096%	-.428	.672
Loyalty	3.635	3.958	-.324	.729%	-1.664	.110
Management	3.133	2.417	.717*	-6.8%	3.588	.001
Suspiciousness	3.133	2.792	.342	-1.3%	1.180	.249
Social Isolation	2.767	2.333	.433	-2.9%	1.643	.113
Control-Legalistic	3.464	2.542	.923*	-9. 7%	2.970	.007
Crime Fighting Masculinity	3.464	3.250	.214	-.408%	.836	.412

*p<.05 level

Bivariate Correlation

Pearson correlations were calculated to see whether restorative justice understanding and attitudes were correlated with police culture (Table 7). Much like the mean differences between shifts, correlations were in the expected direction, but few reached statistical significance. RJ understanding and the us vs. them scales had small positive correlations ($r_{(102)} = .177$, $p = .038$) and were statistically significant. RJ understanding and the management scale had a statistically significant moderate negative correlation ($r_{(102)} = -.273$, $p = .003$), while there was a small negative correlation between restorative justice understanding and control legalistic that reached statistical significance ($r_{(100)} = -.214$, $p = .016$). The only police culture scale that was significantly correlated to RJ attitudes was social isolation, which showed a small negative correlation ($r_{(100)} = -.194$, $p = .026$).

Table 7

Bivariate Correlations between Restorative Justice Understanding, Attitudes and Police Culture Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. RJ Understanding	1.000	.643**	.177*	.030	-.273**	-.020	-.143	-.214*	-.152	.017
2. RJ Attitudes	.643**	1.000	.115	.018	-.165	.053	-.194*	-.124	-.165	.072
3. Us vs. them	.177*	.115	1.000	-.013	-.360**	-.488**	-.213*	-.311*	-.130	-.185*
4. Loyalty	.030	.018	-.013	1.000	-.054	-.004	.145	.134	.373**	-.062
5. Management	-.273**	-.165	-.360**	-.054	1.000	.270**	.314**	.536**	.192*	.322**
6. Suspiciousness	-.020	.053	-.488**	-.004	.270**	1.000	.363**	.333**	.208*	.308**
7. Social Isolation	-.143	-.194*	-.213*	.145	.314**	.363**	1.000	.562**	.112	.367**
8. Control Legalistic	-.214*	-.124	-.311*	.134	.536**	.333**	.562**	1.000	.247**	.374**
9. Crime Fighting	-.152	-.165	-.130	.373**	.192*	.208*	.112	.247**	1.000	.027
10. Masculinity	.017	.072	-.185*	-.062	.322**	.308**	.367**	.374**	.027	1.000

* Correlation is significant at the p<.05 level (1-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the p<.01 level (1-tailed)

Multiple Regression

Ordinary least squares multiple regressions were run using RJ attitudes as a dependent variable with demographics, police culture and RJ understanding as independent variables. Most predictors were not significant, so two short form equations were estimated including only substantive predictors at least close to statistical significance at p<.05. Table 8 presents two multiple regression equations run first with the two most substantive police culture predictors; social isolation and masculinity, and then run with RJ understanding. The two police culture predictors explained only 4.3% of the variance in RJ attitudes. It is likely that variables like crime fighting would have been statistically significant if there was a larger sample size. The second column explores the same predictors but with the RJ understanding variable introduced. When RJ understanding was introduced these three predictors explained 42.3% of the variance in RJ attitude and both social isolation and masculinity had a smaller beta value indicating that the police culture variables had a weaker effect on the dependent variable RJ attitudes. It should not be a surprise when interpreting these statistics that the independent variable restorative justice

understanding had the strongest effect on the dependent variable RJ attitudes. This is consistent with other research findings that suggest that increased understanding of RJ increased officer perceptions of community cooperation and decreased orientations towards use of force and a significant decrease in their orientation toward a crime control approach to policing (McCold, 2003). Other scholars have noted the importance of education and experience in policing, and the effect they have at influencing officer's decision making (Paoline & Terrill, 2007). Officer training heightens both education and experience and has been shown to have a positive impact on improving frontline officer's knowledge and understanding of RJ. More training on RJ means that officers become more familiar with RJ and when officers are more familiar with the concept they are more confident in their ability to use it (Gavin & MacVean, 2018), which suggests that the more a frontline officer understands RJ, the more positive they perceive it.

Table 8

OLS Regression of RJ Attitudes on Social Isolation, Masculinity and RJ Understanding

Variable	B (SE)	Beta	B (SE)	Beta
Constant	3.332 (.167)		1.887 (.221)	
Social Isolation	-.146** (.060)	-.258	-.090* (.047)	-.159
Masculinity	.093 (.058)	.169	.142* (.045)	.142
RJ Understanding			.451*** (.056)	.622
adjR^2	.043		.423	
N	99		99	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.
Note: *Standard errors are in parentheses.*

Discussion

According to bivariate and multiple regression analysis, some police culture variables showed a relationship to RJ attitudes and understanding. However, the majority of variables were not associated with police culture indicators, and even demographic attributes like age and gender, and work factors such as years of police service did not have much of an impact. It is not uncommon to see that descriptive variables for police officers do not affect their support or opinions towards RJ. Winfree (2004) found similar results when examining officers support for RJ in New Zealand, noting that gender, race, length of service, branch, service location, and specialized training yielded few insights. Winfree (2004) reported that officers did not differ in any significant way in terms of measures associated with RJ, and that throughout general service, all staff had the same general adherence to selected RJ-related values and perceptions of the workplace. It seems that it is common for frontline officers to hold the same, or very similar attitudes towards RJ regardless of gender, experience, or ethnicity. This may be due to the standardized training that police, especially frontline officers, go through. These results show that agreement among frontline officers is relatively split on core restorative justice principles and are more focused on tough on crime policing. Survey results show that relationships between variables were generally weak, but there were several relationships observed between the WPS shifts and police culture concepts. The results of the survey show that between shifts there was little difference between RJ attitudes, RJ understanding, and police culture; the magnitude of effects were small and only a few reached statistical significance.

Shifts varied little in their understanding and attitudes of RJ and police culture. These findings are consistent with other scholars who have noted that frontline officers often share strong within group agreement (Ingram, et al., 2013), especially for perceptions of police culture.

However, other researchers have also noted that there are often substantive differences between some police workgroups. Findings reported here are not consistent with Ingram et al., (2013) who did find between group differences across workgroups, but it is helpful in this study to consider the likely influence of the local context or work environment. There are several reasons why the nature of police work in the patrol area of Division 13 may have had a more immediate impact on officer attitudes. Considering that it is a relatively small police division, it is in the high crime North End area of Winnipeg and officers seek to be transferred to this division to pursue their interest in "real" police work (WPS officer, personal communication, 2019). Thus, the consistency in attitudes may reflect a selection effect in recruiting; officers with similar attitudes will be more likely to apply to work and to stay in Division 13.

The consistency among police officers on a shift is not surprising because although there are significant internal divisions between police jurisdictions and agencies, the core elements of police sub-culture and the socialization process remain almost unchanged (Waddington, 1999; Loftus, 2010). Officers will maintain the status quo in attitudes, whereby "old-school" officers will construct symbolic boundaries, and use institutional myths to preserve the existing conditions of police work, while new officers in order to advance in their work, are required to align themselves with this kind of thinking (Campeau, 2019). Myers and McPhee (2006) suggest that in order for individuals to assimilate into workgroups, it is common for them to mimic and adapt their individual behaviours to fit into the already established group behaviour, which in turn can help enhance physical coordination, problem solving, decision making and trust. The influence of workgroups on member assimilation may be particularly acute in highly interdependent groups such as police departments because they must work with high reliability to avoid accidents, coordinate activities, develop trust, and rely on each other in order to perform

essential aspects of their jobs (Myers & McPhee, 2006). The highly interdependent nature of policing may explain why there was little differences found across police work groups in this study. The lack of variance between shifts in the survey may indicate how officers perceive and adapt to their institutional environment. Rather than speak out or hold noticeably different opinions than other officers within their division, officers may adjust their thinking closer to prevailing institutional myths, in order to make their work environment easier on themselves.

Officers generally agreed that diversion of some offenders from the CJS was a good idea but were reluctant to agree that we should be diverting as many offenders as we can away from the CJS. The majority of officers agreed that RJ was only appropriate for first time, non-violent offenders. Officers appeared to agree that RJ was important, and that it was an important part of their day-to-day police work. It seems that on the one hand, police want to be a part of RJ measures, which they consider it police work, while on the other hand police are hesitant to use RJ except for low risk, minor offenders. This is generally consistent across the literature, where police officers believe that restorative justice programs are only appropriate for first time, less serious, non-violent offenders (Abramson, 2003). Crocker (2013) found similar results, indicating that while police view RJ as a viable alternative to the criminal justice system, with officers showing a high level of support for RJ, officers were more likely to deem property offence (i.e. less serious offences) as viable for restorative justice compared to violent offences. O'Mahony and Doak (2004) in their study of an RJ pilot project, found that younger offenders who committed less serious crimes were more likely to receive informal police warnings, while older offenders who committed more serious crimes were formally cautioned by police officers, and the most serious offences were generally prosecuted. The literature shows that officers typically think of RJ as a viable alternative for only low level offences, these thoughts however,

may not be due only to frontline officer's lack of understanding of restorative justice, but also the types of policies that guide their decisions. This reluctance to use RJ for anything but serious crimes goes against what scholars truly believe RJ is and what it could be. Zehr and Gohar (2003) argue that RJ is not intended exclusively for minor offences or first time offenders. While it is easier to support these cases for RJ, they make the argument that RJ has the greatest impact in more severe cases when the principles of RJ are taken seriously. This runs counter to what officers appear to agree with; they seem to agree that RJ is best used exclusively for first time or less serious offenders. This may be due to a number of reasons; less serious offenders or offences provide a relatively clean cut case for diversion, while more serious offences or offenders may be somewhat daunting to officers if they are unfamiliar with RJ. While the majority of participants in the survey agreed that they have a good understanding of RJ, in actuality they may only have a good understanding of their own policies and procedures, and not a firm understanding of RJ itself. Officers surveyed were relatively spilt on their agreement with RJ principles which shows a lack of education surrounding some principles.

In the case of the WPS Restorative Justice Diversion Program, officers are limited to diverting offenders based on the relevant policy which outlines specific eligible and exceptional offences, and additional criteria that must be met before an offender can be diverted. Officers may see the focus on low level crime set out by official policies and determine that it is in their best interest to only divert offenders that meet this lower threshold even though there is criteria for more exceptional cases. RJ is limited to a modest set of crimes by policy makers due to its perceived "softness" on offenders (Brooks, 2017), which can consequently increase net-widening and great state encroachment into the lives of communities (Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016). People may have little confidence in RJ's ability to reach the common goals of deterrence that many

think of when they think of justice, especially for more serious offence (Brooks, 2017). Study findings show that RJ is only palatable for officers if it is used for low level offences, while tough on crime approaches are viewed as most effective for more serious crimes. This outcome speaks to the larger philosophical change that is necessary for RJ to effectively take root. For RJ programs to be effective, there has to be a continued shifting of focus in the justice system from punishing to promoting accountability for the harms done (Gerkin et al., 2017). This requires stakeholders to look at crime through a different lens, one which they may only have a cursory familiarity with at best (Gerkin et al., 2017). This shift not only requires a reimagining of roles, but also reordering priorities.

Frontline officers' agreement with a limited application of RJ may be due to how officers view their roles as police officers which in turn may influence their decisions to use diversion. Approximately half of officers reported that the most important part of their job was to fight crime (49.5%), and believed tough on crime policing tactics were the most effective (52.9%). This may influence officer's decisions regarding whether or not they use RJ referrals for offenders who are not extremely suitable candidates. It appears that while many officers agree with the use of RJ, in the end they will align themselves with a more traditional police role. This may present issues for the implementation of RJ within the WPS because officers are being asked to use a less "tough on crime" approach, but their beliefs adhere to the notion that tough on crime policies are the most effective, especially in a high crime area of the city. This may become increasingly difficult as officers are increasingly being asked to balance competing roles, new tasks, public demands, strategies, technology, accountability and resources (Bayley, 2016). Officers may continue to have difficulties balancing competing roles due to the nature of police culture and its preoccupation towards crime fighting, tough on crime approaches, a sense of

mission, and the willingness of officers to seek out what they consider to be "real police work" which may explain why programs like RJ may become more traditional in their outlook (Gundhus, 2012). In the case of the WPS, this seemingly simultaneous support for RJ and tough on crime policing may reduce the overall number of referrals because police are more likely to want to arrest and process someone rather than divert them. Resistance to implementation of RJ can lead to other problems in its use. Authors refer to these issues as "problems of institutionalization" (Wood & Suzuki, 2016), whereby the increasing institutionalization of RJ, leads to issues of co-option of restorative justice goals. Policing priorities can lead to a de-emphasis on original RJ principles. This can lead to changes like the removal of the community from restorative justice, and the increased inclusion of gatekeepers like police (i.e., no court or crown referrals), which can impede the RJ process further, given their reluctance to use it (Wood & Suzuki, 2016).

Another important finding from the surveys was the contradictory nature of officers understanding of RJ. Officers reported that they have a good understanding of RJ, however officers seemed to disagree with some of the core principles of RJ. It appears that frontline officers lack a foundational understanding of RJ and are more focused on the practical application according to their policies. For example, RJ relies on the involvement of both the victims and offenders, and should be an empowering process while taking into consideration the needs of victims (Braithwaite, 1996). However results show, counterintuitively, that most officers' report that they have a good understanding of RJ (72.4%), but many still disagreed with the core concepts of victim and offender involvement and empowerment. This lack of understanding by frontline officers is not totally surprising and has been found by other scholars. Stockdale (2015) found that frontline officers often lack a nuanced, theoretical understanding of

RJ and more focused on its practical application, while higher ranked officers had a more nuanced understanding of RJ theoretical concepts, values and beliefs. It appears that frontline officers may overestimate their knowledge of restorative justice.

These findings point to issues of practical implementation of RJ programming and recurring shortcomings of police lead RJ programs. This can be problematic for victims of crime as Hoyle and Rosenblatt (2016) outline how these issues can lead to a lack of focus on victims in RJ which can include the inability to take into account the victims needs when considering reparations, low victim attendance in restorative conferences, and a failure to try and make restorative conferences easily assessable to victims. In this study, as well as in the literature, it appears that police officers have a tendency to forget, or minimize the role of the victim in RJ. The findings from this study suggest that frontline officers may not have a fully fleshed out understanding of RJ principles which according to the literature this is not uncommon. While officers maintain that they have a firm understanding of RJ based on relevant policies and procedures it appears that they do not have a good theoretical understanding. This lack of understanding by frontline officers may speak more to the inconsistencies within RJ itself, rather than a failing on police officers to understand the concept. An officer's understanding is dependent on the training that they are provided, but the overall perception of RJ programs may suffer from the commonly cited critiques. For instance, the term restorative justice is often used interchangeably with other diversion options (Gavrielides, 2008), leading to problems of definition (Wood & Suzuki, 2016). RJ may mean different things to different people, with different definitions and different policies. The WPS Restorative Justice Diversion Program is a diversionary program whereby officers move eligible offenders away from the criminal justice system into RJ programs, however police are not responsible for conducting conferencing or any

type of cautioning as part of this program. Due to the lack of internal consistency within RJ, it may be difficult for frontline officers to know the true goals of RJ, when the term is being constantly applied to a variety of programs and procedures.

Conclusion

The results of the quantitative survey provide a foundation for the creation of qualitative questions in an explanatory sequential mixed methods design. The second qualitative phases is meant to help explain and elaborate on these quantitative results (Ivankova et al., 2006) which provide a general understanding of the research problem. The first phase of this research was conducted to examine the effect of police culture on patrol officer attitudes, in particular towards the use of RJ. There is support for the notion that police culture can act as a barrier to policy implementation and changes within policing (Alarid & Montemayor, 2012; Gottschalk & Gudmundsen, 2008; Barberi & Taxman, 2019), and how entrenched police practices can lead to police officers dominating RJ exchanges (Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016). It is this type of nuanced relationship between these concepts that can be explored and explained further through qualitative analysis. The benefit of an explanatory sequential design is that questions can be asked as to why these relationships exist, or why these relationships were not represented in the survey results.

Chapter 5 – Qualitative Results

Introduction

In the previous chapter survey results showed that there was little difference between police officer shifts and their attitudes and understanding towards restorative justice and police culture. The findings in the last chapter also showed the consistency between frontline officers in Division 13 and the wider literature, with officers recognising the importance of restorative justice and its significance in police work, but data also showed a reluctance to use RJ for more serious crimes (O'Mahony & Doak, 2004; Stockdale, 2015, Abramson, 2003; Crocker, 2013). Using an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, the goal of this chapter is to examine the quantitative results more in depth using qualitative procedures. The findings from the previous chapter provide a general understanding of the overarching research problem i.e. what is the effect of police culture on patrol officer's attitudes towards restorative justice. This section looks to further examine how frontline officers conceptualized restorative justice, what they think their primary duties as an officer are, how they balance tough on crime policies and a crime fighting mentality with RJ goals, their opinions towards upper management and handling expectations, whether or not RJ adds to these expectations, their opinions on the victims of crime, the presence of a police culture, and their thoughts on how RJ is currently implemented in the WPS and policing in general. These questions set out to answer the overarching research question: what is the effect of police culture on patrol officer's attitudes towards restorative justice? The qualitative data and analysis allows for further refinement of the previous quantitative data by examining responses and participants views more in depth. This chapter presents the qualitative interview findings that were collected through 7 semi-structured interviews with frontline officer working in Division 13.

Qualitative Data Collection

Building on the data collected from 105 quantitative surveys that took place in November 2019, semi-structured interviews were conducted to further examine officers thinking about restorative justice and police culture. An initial list of 25 interview questions was developed and following the interview protocol refinement (IPR) framework outlined by Castillo-Montoya (2016) this list of 25 interview questions was distilled into an interview protocol containing 9 core interview questions with 7 sub-questions. The IPR ensured that interview questions aligned with the research questions and the protocol elicited an inquiry based conversation with the interview questions being written differently from the research questions, while following the social rules of an ordinary conversation with a variety of questions as well as follow-up and prompting questions. Following the IPR framework a matrix was developed to determine the most relevant interview questions that could provide insight into the research questions. The interview questions focused on why officers chose policing as a career, what they believed to be their primary duties as a police officer, what RJ means to them as a frontline officer, how they balance the priorities of a frontline officer, their opinions regarding police culture, and how they believe that RJ is currently implemented in policing.

Results

Several key themes emerged from the frontline officers interviews, and while a "key" theme is not necessarily dependent on quantifiable measures, the themes that emerged in this study were all important in relation to the overall research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). An inductive approach was used whereby the themes that emerged are strongly linked to the dataset, meaning that the data was coded without trying to fit it into a pre-existing coding frame, and themes were coded at a semantic level of meaning which identified codes at an explicit or

surface level. What emerged from these interviews were 4 themes: *restorative justice has a place in frontline work; restorative justice is another option (for less serious offenders); barriers to restorative justice* which consisted of two sub-themes: *circumstantial barriers, and occupational barriers*; and *police culture: it's one big team.*

Restorative justice has a place in frontline work

Restorative justice has been implemented into frontline policing whether officers like it or not. The WPS Restorative Justice Diversion Program allows officers to divert offenders to RJ agencies if they determine that the offender meets the diversion criteria. This theme is characterised by frontline officer's acknowledgment that RJ has a place in frontline policing. According to officers, restorative justice has a place in policing as a dispositional tool that they can use at their discretion on a case-by-case basis if they deem the situation to be appropriate. According to officers interviewed, it does not add more work to their duties or sets unrealistic expectations for officers to follow, neither does RJ interfere with officers other frontline duties, but the situations that officers come into contact with on their shifts are dynamic and different from call to call, which requires frontline officers to balance their pre-existing duties while considering RJ on a case by case basis.

Participants noted that restorative justice for frontline officers is a tool that they can use when they believe the situation is appropriate ("I think it's just another tool to be used," P04). Generally it appears that officers view it as more of a positive tool rather than a negative one:

> *P03: I think it's more a positive tool to have, I mean I know from dealing with situations where before there was much knowledge or even the you know process of the RJ stuff that we're seeing now, where you would be dealing with someone, and you know you're*

98

arresting them and processing them and your forcing them to go to court, and it's like,

they had a really, they had a bad day to be honest.

Officers appeared to have an understanding that there is not necessarily any pressure to use RJ, but rather they tend to keep it in the back of their minds or around their tool belts as a "dispositional tool" (P03). Alarid and Montemayor (2012) argue that this way of thinking is actually the most appropriate for officers. They argue that officers must not perceive RJ as an attempt to remove traditional arrest and peace-keeping functions away from police, or as anti-law enforcement, rather if it is viewed as a tool for the right situation, and officers are trained to recognize the situations that are most appropriate for restorative justice, they will be more likely to embrace it. Based on the survey responses and interviews, it appears that officers are already of this opinion and do not view RJ as an attempt to lessen their police powers, but rather as another option for them to use. The issue then is that officers do not always recognize the appropriate situations to use RJ.

According to participants, the restorative justice has a place in policing if the circumstances are what they deem to be appropriate. Officers frequently noted that the fluid nature of their jobs leaves them often unaware of what each situation brings ("I feel like a lot of situations we do come into contact with are so dynamic and so complex," P07). Officers rely on their judgement, experience and discretion when they get to a call to make the most appropriate decision, which may or may not be restorative justice. One officer described this as problem solving:

P05: ... primarily the job is problem solving, going to peoples calls they're calling us

for, getting a picture of what it is and then trying to figure out what the best solution is, I

mean we're dealing with a lot of the time its people just need to be separated cause

99

they're arguing or they're intoxicated or you know kind of mundane things where I guess

we're just mediating the situation and then, and then you'll have the scenarios you go to

where it is more serious and very clear offence has occurred and you have to use your

judgement to make an arrest

Survey responses from officers found that many officers agree that an important part of their job was crime fighting, but also reported that RJ was also an important part of their work. When asked about this contradiction, one respondent acknowledged that use of RJ involves taking into consideration the many "variables" of the situation and weighing those variables based on the totality of the circumstances, requiring officers to perform a type of balancing act with their duties:

> *P02: ... there has to be a balancing act between not ignoring crime but not treating every*
>
> *crime like the crime of the century right, if I'm hearing it right, like there has to be a bit*
>
> *of, you have to assess things on an individual basis and not just kind of you know, go with*
>
> *what you know, or what we always do because that's what we always do, cause each*
>
> *situation is different and dictate, might dictate a different outcome right, whether its RJ,*
>
> *whether it's you know arresting and charging someone, whether it's not, whatever the*
>
> *case is right.*

This participant maintained this sentiment and went on to say that the situations that police encounter are very different and require different approaches, of which RJ may be one depending on the variables of the situation:

> *BB: ... so how does this get balanced out when considering RJ, which is not really*
>
> *considered to be a tough on crime approach?*

P02: ... I think you really have to look at the situation and I think there's a lot of variables like obviously the involved parties, the nature of the crime, their criminal history or lack of, any like you know, the outcome of the crime if it's physical thing right, if someone's in the hospital versus someone getting you know a small cut on their hand right, you have to, I think the way to balance it out would be look at the totality of the circumstances.

Officers revealed that due to the nature of frontline policing, they are faced with vastly different situations from call to call, and they must handle every situation as something new and unique, because there is not a single catch all approach to dealing with the types of situations they encounter. This means that officers are responsible for balancing the priorities of their job and considering RJ when it is appropriate; taking a case by case approach regarding restorative justice, because there is not a blanket RJ option for offenders. This was reflected on by an officer that acknowledged that RJ options should be tailored more to the offender's individual needs, and can be a different option for offenders rather than just jail time or parole:

P06: I think in some circumstances like obviously a bit more case to case, but taking into consideration the case and not just like a blanket sort of punishment of whatever it is if its jail time or parole or probation but just having a bit more tailored response to the certain circumstances of the offender and taking into consideration the victim as well, just a bit more personalised which I think could be a lot more effective because it's actually addressing the issues and not just a one size fits all punishment.

It is important that officers acknowledge the individual nature of RJ interventions, and how it should not be considered a simple one size fits all type of intervention, rather RJ should rely on a collaborative effort from all stakeholders involved (Zehr & Gohar, 2003). According to

participants, RJ has a place in policing depending on the situation the officer's encounter, which requires them to balance the totality of the circumstances. While this may sound like an extra step or hurdle that frontline officers are required to take in order to use restorative justice, this does not appear the case. Officers noted that RJ has a place in policing because they do not consider it any more work ("… like when I think about the dealings we have had with restorative justice it's when you know we've already arrested someone, they're in the station, we're already typing up reports so at that moment it actually doesn't make that big of a difference to us," P06). It appears that officers are able to balance the priorities of their jobs based on the situations that they encounter, and when RJ is considered to be the appropriate option, they do not believe it is any more or less work for them. Participant JR reflected on this sentiment:

> BB: … would you say that a lot officers use RJ? Or they're kind of hesitant to divert offenders using RJ?

> P03: I wouldn't say they're hesitant I think that it's, it's there I mean it's still maybe you know new for some people, once you know, once you've done it once or twice you really realize that it's not anymore work and I think if that's the case you'd see people that aren't hesitant to use it all but yeah I mean it's not like, I haven't heard someone you know trashing it saying it's useless and it's too much work or anything like that …

This shows that although officers are often inundated with policies, procedures and paper work, RJ processes are not perceived to put an extra burden on officers in terms of the amount of work that they are required to do. Restorative justice is viewed as having a place in frontline policing because officers are not required to gain additional technical expertise, do extra work or substantively change their outlook on how policing is done ("… I've assisted in arrests where they ended up doing it so I don't know, I learnt all the ways that the paper work goes, but from

my understanding it's not a whole lot different than releasing someone on an undertaking or something like that," P05). Further, restorative justice does not interfere with other policing duties. When officers were asked how they balanced their crime fighting duties with restorative justice, participants noted that crime fighting can occur with restorative justice; it is not an approach contrary to RJ. For example, P04 provided this insight after being asked their opinion on how officers balance crime fighting and restorative justice:

> *P04: um I think it goes back to the person that you know, you're still helping the victim out by giving, you're stilling arresting that person and still fighting crime, you're just giving them the RJ and if they don't comply with that their still being held accountable and taken to court so I think they kind of do go hand in hand cause you're still labeling it as crime fighting cause you're still making the arrest under the RJ program, that how I would … [overlapping]*
>
> *BB: okay [overlapping]*
>
> *P04: it's still a stat in other words, you still went there, you dealt with the call and you still arrested somebody under it so, under RJ, whether they comply with it or not, it's still I say chalked up as a good arrest in their eyes*
>
> *BB: okay so it kind of comes back to that safety you think that officers still think that they're still providing that community safety even if they do take a RJ approach?*
>
> *P04: yeup, I would say so, you deal with a lot of people that just want somebody that's held accountable for the act, their actions, they don't want to just be like oh the police did nothing you know, when we did do something, so they're more pleased with the result whether they don't maybe necessarily understand what RJ is but in their eyes that people*

that stole something from them, hit them, or what not, they see that RJ, to them it's been

solved in their eyes.

It appears that officers view RJ use as a criminal justice mechanism much like Daly
(2016) describes as a justice response, process, activity, measure, or practice. While it may not
be a conventional justice mechanism such as the standard approaches to prosecution and trials, it
is an innovative mechanism that does not rely solely on the standard tool kit of criminal
procedures, justice practices, or legal processes (Daly, 2016). Officers do not draw much of a
distinction between conventional and innovative justice mechanisms, viewing RJ as something
that happens as a by-product or an arrest, but officers are able to recognize that RJ offers an
individual response to crime, or something that the court system does not offer. This may be a
reason why officers are accepting of the concept of RJ but place it in the background of the other
parts of their work; officers are preoccupied with conventional mechanisms, and are not
concerned about exploring innovative ones. Other scholars have noted this balance of
conventional criminal justice and restorative justice; RJ usually acknowledges a place for
adversarial approaches and the important role criminal justice professionals and the state play in
this process (Zehr & Gohar, 2003). Officers also reported that RJ does not take away from their
primary crime fighting role because police can still defuse the situation, make an arrest, and can
help victims of crime:

> *P03: ... it's not like using RJ is stopping us from fighting crime right, like it's, we're still,*
> *we're still dealing with the accused at least at that beginning step that we always do, the*
> *same ways we always do, it's just that you know our disposition is you know changed*
> *maybe at the end where instead of it going to court, it's just doing a RJ route instead*

which you know is beneficial in its ways so yeah I think that, I think that they, they can go

hand in hand, they don't have to be at odds.

Another participant also shared a similar sentiment, noting that the way that RJ works may be a more beneficial way of crime fighting compared to just arresting and processing someone:

P06: ... in more my opinion that these officers would have to understand that RJ is a like it's just a different way of fighting crime, that if that ends up being a more effective way to empower victims and sort of deal with offenders then in the long run if that's more effective that's going to be preventing crime from even happening, so I mean that's kind of how I think about it anyways that those kind of go hand in hand that if we want, if we as officers want to actually fight crime to me that actually just means preventing as much crime from happening as we can and if that means taking a different approach to it than the traditional system which would you know as RJ would be an example of that, then I think that's what we need to do

While the majority of officers in the survey maintained a tough on crime attitude and a crime fighting mentality, the officers interviewed acknowledged that RJ has a place in frontline policing although this place is seemingly limited. Across all interviews officers did not perceive RJ as something completely different than traditional criminal justice approaches, but rather as another criminal justice tool at their disposal, there was really no distinction made between RJ and traditional criminal justice approaches. According to officers this dispositional tool was not to be used for every situation, but rather only in the right situation. It is up to the officers to determine the appropriate time to use RJ but officers are also quick to describe the dynamic nature of the situations that they encounter and how this requires them to make decisions based on the totality of the circumstances. Due to the dynamic nature of policing, officers'

conceptualized RJ as another tool for them to use to mediate situations, and as became apparent throughout the next theme, officers are only willing to use this tool for less serious offenders and situations.

Restorative justice is another option (for less serious offenders)

The first theme outlined emphasized the conceptualization of RJ within the existing criminal justice model of enforcement. In this second theme, officers reinforced that restorative justice offered another option for them to use, while also giving offenders an option that was different from the traditional court system. Officers cited that this "other option" provided people who made a mistake or less serious offenders who accepted responsibility for their actions a break in some situations and a form of lesser punishment, while still being beneficial for both the victim and offender. Officers acknowledge that for less serious crimes, the traditional court system does not always make sense, and may end up trapping people who do not necessarily have to be there:

> *P05: … it seems as though it's you know in almost like in a scenario where its someone that doesn't have a big long history of anything and maybe it's a one-time thing and they've been caught and they admit that they did it that we can find some way to quickly resolve it by not burdening the courts by having to get lawyers involved and give them court dates for 6 months to 2 years later and getting them kind of stuck on that um, in that hamster wheel*

Participants acknowledged the practical understanding that by having offenders avoid going to court, the criminal justice system saves money ("I forget what the line is they use that like oh you know it saves the courts like $10,000 every time you know someone gets restorative justice instead of going through the court system," P05). This appears consistent among officers

106

as the majority of the frontline officers surveyed (85.6%) agreed that the diversion of some offenders from the criminal justice system was a good idea, but were hesitant to agree that as many offenders as possible should be diverted away from the criminal justice system. Other officers expressed that it is often not necessary to have offenders and victims attending court, as this can be detrimental to their wellbeing, especially in cases that involve assault:

> *P03: ... no I mean I think that as long as it's something that's there and established and like you know a lot of people don't need to be going to court to deal with their stuff a lot of times it's not necessary for us to go to court you know to deal with this stuff if it can be diverted and I think most people would kind of agree that if they're not being forced to go to court or force the victim to go to court and sort of chase this big process then I think that's a good thing.*

Officers also expressed that RJ can provide offenders with an avenue to address the factors that may have contributed to their behaviour while at the same time being held responsible for their actions:

> *P02:... is that we are trying to I guess, deal with some of these accused in other ways besides the court system, so you know they could do rehabilitation programming or volunteer stuff in, volunteer type work in the community that could, I don't know if that's true or not, basically trying to keep people out of jails and them you know accepting ownership for their actions and as such being granted a lesser penalty and in some not even having a full criminal record*

This outlook appears to conflate RJ and rehabilitation as being one in the same, and while rehabilitation is a likely feature of restorative justice, it is not the primary purpose (Moss et al.,

2019). RJ and rehabilitation models are distinct, and although they occasionally overlap, they are individual normative frameworks and have different domains of application within the criminal justice system; trying to blend them together in any meaningful way can become problematic (Ward & Langlands, 2009). This is due to the goals of each model. RJ has two primary goals, first to provide victims and communities the opportunity to redress the harm they have incurred, and second for offenders to be given the opportunity to redeem themselves and to reintegrate back into society (Moss et al., 2019). The primary goal of rehabilitation is to restore the offenders psychological functioning and well-being (Ward & Langlands, 2009). The inability to separate RJ and rehabilitation may speak to the larger issues of a lack of a well-accepted definition, and practice, the proliferation of programs that are labelled as RJ, and the oversimplification of RJ.

Officers appear to believe that RJ gives people who made a mistake "another option" other than the court system and gives them a break by giving them a lesser punishment ("but if they get into our car and say hey yup I'm 100% at fault for this I was having a bad day this is what happened then that definitely does affect our attitude and we'll try to look at other options," P07). Officers acknowledged that sometimes people do make mistakes and if they do not have a history or even a long history of offending or officers try their best to assist them:

> P07: *we only kind of think that way if you pull this person up and it seems to be a one off*
>
> BB: *like a one off offence you mean?*
>
> P07: *yeah, like it was just maybe they had a stressful circumstance or situation that push them to do this one particular act and it's not really how they normally act right?*

In terms of individuals "making a mistake" officers noted that they would be more likely to consider individuals for RJ if they do not have a criminal record ("…we'll kind of consider that more for people that obviously have no record" P07), or offenders with a limited record, i.e., committed a less serious crime:

> BB: ... what kind of characteristics of offenders you know do you look for in considering them for restorative justice and does an offenders' attitude or demeanor ever effect your decision on whether or not to use restorative justice?

> P06: ... I think the biggest thing is, and I even think this is in our policies but just sort of the history of offending like if it's a first time offence for certain things then I think that's huge I think ... yeah I think that's the biggest thing for me is their history of, like obviously if this is the 15th time they've done it then maybe RJ isn't the most effective thing but if they're a first time offender or its only been a few times or if it's something, if its nonviolent crime too that that's going to be a big one or even the circumstances of the violence. I know recently we've extended um RJ into domestic situations as well which obviously can get a little ... people get a little ... up in arms about that because we've taken a very tough on domestic approach but I know I've seen certain situations of ... domestics that might just be you know considered violent because maybe it's an assault but it's not, it's not egregious and it's their first time offending you know it's a 60 year old that pushed their wife out of the way and its maybe not it's not as serious obviously as someone knocking out their girlfriend or boyfriend and it's the fourth time they've done it and you know it that that's kind of how I see it.

Officers indicated that often times when they determine that someone made a mistake, they are willing to give that person a "break" by suggesting a RJ option because restorative

justice allows the person to avoid a criminal record, and does not have the same effect on their life that jail time would:

> *P03: yunno I'm all for making sure that the people who are repeat criminals yunno learn a lesson somehow and if that's yunno through the court being tough on them, that's the way it should be, but in situations where its yunno a guy who maybe doesn't have any kind of extensive involvement and now he's getting yunno a, an easier way of dealing with stuff that doesn't matter necessarily change all his access to work and to travel and to whatever then I think that's a good stuff, or a good way of looking at it anyways.*

In comparison, officers noted how they would not consider RJ for someone with a lengthy criminal record because they do not believe offenders could benefit from it, compared to a first time offender even if that offender did something violent. In this case, P06 pointed out that in some situations where it may be considered an assault, even if the assault was not very serious, RJ can be beneficial in these situations where there is a less violent, less serious offender. This sentiment shared by officers mirrors that which was uncovered throughout the quantitative survey, with the majority of officers expressing how diversion of some offenders, but not all, away from the criminal justice system was a good idea, and how RJ should only apply to first time offenders. This sentiment among police officers is also well established in the literature (Crocker, 2013; Stockdale, 2015; Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016).

Officers also reported that the RJ option can only occur if offenders accept responsibility for their actions:

BB: ... what kind of characteristics of an offender do you look for when considering them for diversion and does an offender's attitude or demeanour have an effect on your decision to divert somebody?

P04: yes it does absolutely, someone that's calm and cooperative and you know they have to admit their wrong doing and what not and their criminal record isn't pages long that's who I would be looking to qualify, then there's obviously the policy and what we can't qualify people under for those certain things.

It is important to note the limitations that are put on officers' ability to use RJ. Officers repeatedly acknowledged the limitations of RJ, and their inability to step outside of procedural guidelines. So while it appears that officer agree that RJ should be made available for less serious or first time offenders, in some situations where they believe RJ would be a good fit, it is unavailable to them because of existing policies. This severally limits the application of RJ initiatives especially in high crime areas like the North End, and immediately excludes individuals who do not fit into this narrow framework. Unfortunately given the demographics of this area many Indigenous offenders are excluded from RJ programs based solely on their criminal history alone although these programs are often touted as a culturally sensitive avenue of redress. In this case, it is important to note that while frontline officers do hold a considerable amount of discretion, they do not hold the same level of discretion as a crown prosecutor, judge or justice would when deciding the charging or sentencing options for an offender.

Despite the survey results showing that many officers do not think that RJ appropriately takes the victims of crime into consideration, the officers interviewed provided a more informative perspective of the role that victims can have in restorative justice and how it can be beneficial for them. For example, P06 provided this explanation of how RJ can be advantageous:

P06: ... I mean the thing I think I appreciate the most is the empowering of the victim and involving the victim which I think the traditional criminal justice system can ignore that sometimes, so I think having the victim having a lot of say in it I think is more like maybe gives the victim a bit more closure or a bit more empowerment in the process, and then having they're say in it but then also taking into consideration like learning a bit more about the circumstances of the offences depending on what it is and the background of the offender, taking that into consideration and then coming up with a punishment, if you want to call it that, of something that the victim feels comfortable with but also that's understood that's actually going to help the offender and ultimately reduce that situation happening again in more of permanent way than just like a deterrent of a punishment.

This shows that some officers appear to have a more nuanced understanding of RJ; the insight provided by P06 acknowledges the potential effects RJ may have on both the victims and offenders, which is encouraging because RJ aims to not only help the victims of crime but also the offender. Acknowledging the victims throughout the RJ process is important because some scholars have noted that when officers are involved in RJ, there can be a tendency for them to overlook the victims of crime (Hill, 2002; Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2015). Another officer observed that in some situations, having victims avoid the court system with an RJ option can be more beneficial because it avoids causing them further trauma or hardships:

P03: ... a lot of times when you're dealing with victims of crime ... I would say some of them, depending on who you're dealing with, there could be hesitancy to even want to go through with the court process cause it's not fun, like it's not fun for anyone, even victims to have to yunno be subpoenaed to court and have to go there and have to retell their story and be seen yunno but in circumstances where like someone might not want to go to

court yeah if they're willing, if they understand what's being asked with the RJ stuff and

they're willing to do it, I then I think it it's serving their needs for sure

Officers remained consistent in their opinions that RJ is best for less serious crimes or first-time offenders, with many expressing that a lengthy criminal record will immediately negate someone from RJ because officers do not believe that that person can change. It is also important to note that despite survey findings showing that most officers do not believe that RJ can have any meaningful impact on the victims of crime, the officers interviewed expressed that RJ can provide another option for victims to avoid the traditional justice system.

Barriers to the use of restorative justice

Officers recognized that RJ has a place in frontline policing and acknowledged that RJ did not add an additional time commitment or burden to their duties and could be a legitimate tool given the appropriate circumstances. However, that is not to say that they did not identify any barriers to the use of RJ in their day-to-day work. Within the *barriers to the use of restorative justice* there are two sub-themes; *circumstantial barriers* and *occupational barriers*. Circumstantial barriers are impediments that frontline officers cannot control, these centre on the reality that the North End of Winnipeg is a high crime area, where officers often come into contact with serious offenders with long criminal histories who have committed serious offences. The officers interviewed did not see the high crime rate as amenable to change. In contrast, occupational barriers were the blockages that police officers can change, but they seemed to exist at the frontline level. Occupational barriers consisted of general lack of education and understanding among police officers of RJ which prevented some officers from taking it seriously, putting restorative justice on the "back burner" of their decision making.

Circumstantial barriers. Officers continually expressed that in most cases that they come across in the North End offenders simply did not fit into the necessary criteria for RJ diversions: it is "tricky and rare at work in the North End" (P05). Even though officers were accepting of the use of RJ, the situations they encountered immediately put up barriers in front of referral ("I would use it more if I had the opportunity with some of the arrests but I haven't," P04). One participant outlined the circumstances officers face while working in the North End:

> *P01: yeah so that's a high crime, like that's a high call for services, it's probably the busiest next to downtown*
>
> *BB: right*
>
> *P01: they're the two busiest districts, and obviously you have a lot of repeat offenders in those areas so a lot of the charges coming out of you know District 13 or 3 we call them is you know probably more serious, there's a lot of homicides and violent offences that occur in there so I think each area is gonna be different for opinions and stuff then District 3 too*
>
> *BB: right*
>
> *P01: right, you have District 2 in the suburbs you have probably a lot more offences that would fall under restorative justice or diversions versus being in the core area with the amount of crime that's so high right*

Participant P01 made a notable distinction between District 2 and District 3, noting that because District 2 is in the suburbs there is potentially more opportunities for officers to use RJ based on the types of people and offences that they are most likely to encounter. This may affect officers opinions of RJ, further supporting the finding that the officers working environment

limits their ability to use RJ. Officers made this distinction clearer by outlining their inability to use RJ and shared that while arresting someone often puts them on a bad path towards more involvement in the justice system, they were often left with no other option due to the nature of the offence:

> *P07: I think a lot of the time we do convict people it just sets them on a bad path anyways but where I work in the North End I feel like that's not always an opportunity we can give people just cause everyone does have such lengthy criminal records that we do come into contact with so.*

> *P04: … I think it's just another tool to be used but in our District I don't think it's something that we see people enough people arrested that we could use it on.*

> *P01: I don't know if the numbers are as high in certain areas, because they're trying in District 3 for diversions, and it almost seems like it's very rare that you'll encounter someone with the right criteria to fit that path too, so it's not a really popular method just because of the offences right…*

The criminal records and types of offences that are committed often preclude someone from meeting the criteria that would make them eligible for RJ. One participant noted the frequency that they come into contact with offenders in the North End who are intoxicated, and due to their intoxication are unable to meet the necessary criteria for RJ:

> *P04: I've personally only used RJ once or twice in the last probably, since it been rolled out, and that's just due to like intoxication of people, you can't really give them the RJ. I'd say the amount I have arrested are 90% of the time intoxicated on something or the other 10% they just don't qualify because of the charge.*

Officers feel that they are required to meet very specific criteria. This is not uncommon for frontline officers to be oriented towards concrete practices. Stockdale (2015) found that when considering RJ frontline officers were concerned with concrete knowledge, the practice of carrying out RJ and what is expected of them. It appears that officers in the study are also concerned with what is expected of them, and how they can best follow policies and procedures; they are more concerned with the practical realities of using RJ in their day-to-day work. Participant, P02, related that officers must "check certain boxes and if those aren't being checked then they're just not eligible..." Officers noted that an offender's history of offending will exclude them from consideration:

> *P05: ... I think um working in the North End it's rare that we kind of find, like I'm sure, that it obviously exists where there's those scenarios but I think with what we get kind of wrapped up in RJ rarely suits the situations we deal with because obviously, it ends up usually being someone with a lengthy record or it's a violent incident and yunno it's not often that it comes up where it's like the clear option*

> *P06: um I think the biggest thing is, and I even think this is in our policies but just sort of the um history of offending like if it's a first-time offence for certain things then I think that's huge I think ... yeah I think that's the biggest thing for me is their history of, like obviously if this is the 15th time they've done it then maybe RJ isn't the most effective thing.*

Officers also expressed that due to the high crime nature of the North End they often come into contact with uncooperative offenders who had committed violent offences, and that

this made them less likely to bring forward RJ due to their safety concerns for the victim. For example, in the case of domestic abuse situations, one participant noted:

> *P07: I don't think so, I think we're kind of on the, we all have the same train of thought, like we don't, I guess you could say that we don't always think the people with the lengthy criminal record, they haven't shown that they want to right their wrong doings, they just continue on this path and I understand that a lot of them have backgrounds and lifestyles that don't really give them opportunities to do anything else but at the same time we also see the violent side of what happens on the street so we have less understanding if we're going into a house and we see somebody or somebody really hurt because of their actions so it's really difficult for us to walk that balance of having sympathy or understanding for the criminal when you're seeing the state of the victim …*

Occupational barriers*.* The second sub-theme of the barriers to RJ use has to do with the officers themselves, rather than the situations that they encounter. Participants expressed that frontline officers may neglect to consider RJ options because it is too far in the back of their minds due to the nature of the frontend position of the police in the criminal justice system. Police officers are often creatures of habit and are sometimes unwilling to step "outside of the box". Due to their position officers often do not see the results of any restorative justice program, and it simply ends for them once an offender is diverted. Officers also noted a lack of the education necessary to consider RJ for more situations, and how this may have led to some colleagues not taking restorative justice seriously.

The nature of modern police requires officers to be familiar with a vast number of policies and procedures. In an era of increased accountable, frontline officers have become accustomed to these policies and procedures, and when police agencies try to implement new

programs like RJ, officers may be reluctant to use them because they are already familiar with the old policies and accepted practices that may take precedent over restorative justice. Several officers reflected on this aspect of their jobs:

> *P07: ...the restorative justice route is not frequently taken from my experience, at least not on my shift, that's not usually an option that we even have in our minds like we're so used to and trained in this way of, okay this guy committed and offence, do we have evidence, can we prove it, k we charge them, and let the justice system handle it from there*

> *P06: ...we are still kind of given the option like if these things exist you can choose to do restorative but you don't have to and I think that a lot of people still just aren't because I just don't know if, you know, because its given the option and maybe they don't agree with it or understand it so they just stick with what they know*

> *P02: ... I'll be the first to say that I'm guilty of that too right, like it's easy to go with what you know and just say like ah this person has been arrested a bunch of times, which maybe they don't meet the criteria, but if you're getting someone that's maybe a little bit of a lesser crime and someone's who's not a frequent flyer then it would be on the officers to at least explore that option a little bit right*

Officers have to balance restorative justice with their other duties and adopting something new can be more difficult than doing something that is more familiar to them. As stated earlier, the survey results show that officers do have a generally positive outlook on RJ, and as uncovered through the interviews, officers believe that restorative justice does have a place in frontline policing. However, it appears that there are occupational barriers to the use of RJ,

which include the fact that officers appear to be unfamiliar with its use, as well as the fact that RJ often takes a back seat to other policies that take precedent. One metaphor aptly used to describe the process of implementing RJ in policing, is to "dangle the carrot" in front of officers, or in other words there has to be a benefit for the officer in order for them to use RJ. The "carrot" in this case is often a reduction in the amount of work an officer has to complete in relation to RJ, for example a reduction in paperwork required that the officers have to complete to process an RJ diversion. It appears that officers maintain an "if it fits, it fits" mentality, as opposed to being open to actively implementing a new strategy such as RJ. The fact that RJ is often left on the "back burner" for frontline officers speaks to the issues surrounding its implementation.

It became apparent throughout the interviews that officers rely on what they are most familiar with because they lacked adequate education, experience and understanding related to restorative justice. While officers had training on RJ and were given short seminars and refresher courses prior to their shifts, they lacked a more thorough understanding of RJ principles and procedures ("well, we've had a very minimal education in the restorative justice field it's just when we're, this is going to sound kind of petty but we're so overwhelmed with paper work," P07). This is why it appears that RJ is often a secondary concern for many officers; it may not add any additional work, or burden to the officers, but they feel that they are already inundated with considerable paper work, thus restorative justice does not seem to be a priority. To outline the more general understanding frontline officers had, one participant expressed that they had studied criminal justice prior to becoming a police officer and felt that frontline officers often lacked more of an "academic" understanding of RJ:

> *BB: ... you would kind of say it's having the more academic understanding where you see the most differences between you and your peers?*

P06: I don't know I think so but I'm not even sure if it's just an academic understanding as more if it's just, I don't know that some of the like older officers have actually been explained what it is other than just here's our policy about it and I think from my perspective learning about it before I was a police officer I think doesn't maybe taint my view of it as much because I had a good understanding of it before coming into policing whereas a lot of these officers have had, they don't, they have had any education on it and they're just told like this is what we do and I don't think they really understanding the whole process other than just their involvement in it

Other officers expressed a similar opinion where some officers, especially older ones, lack the training and understanding of RJ:

BB: ... do you think that your understanding of RJ is different compared to your peers?

P04: uh [chuckles], that's a loaded question, I honestly can't speak for them, more so I would say it's a generational thing that would be the issue with that, so if you're a more seasoned officer you'll probably think that this won't work in a community, I think if you're new to policing then you kind of, it's just another option that you've been taught and trained but if you're a seasoned vet and yunno you've never had this before and then their throwing something new, is police officers don't like change like don't like it, so something new is added then they kind of stress about it and like don't understand it, don't grasp it, screw it not gonna do it, that kind of mentality, some of the senior guys, so I'd say its 50/50 like cause my shift is half junior half senior and I'll fall right in the middle in there ...

It became apparent across all interviews that overall frontline officers lacked adequate education and depth of knowledge regarding restorative justice:

> P01: ... that's something we've been trying to work on, like I've done a little bit more presentations to District 3 around Christmas time there on restorative justice just to try and educate them but yeah it's just the nature of their job, I don't think they really ... have much experience with RJ or diversions

> P02:, I just think no one, like, we have a RJ program through the WPS right, and I don't know, I know it wasn't, like it was explained to us, but I won't say it was thoroughly explained so I'm sure there's questions people have that maybe they just, I don't want to say they're afraid to ask but it's not super common in the district that I work in right

P02 went on to explain that officers do not fully understand what restorative justice is:

> P02: ... I would think that a lot of officers definitely don't fully understand, I think that some have maybe a grasp on it but I don't think that most officers fully understand

These findings were somewhat surprising when considered against the survey results. Approximately 70% of participants agreed that they have a firm understanding of RJ! This gap in understanding has been noted elsewhere in the literature. Stockdale (2015) found that when compared to middle and upper management officers, frontline officer had a different understanding of RJ. Frontline officers were concerned more with "doing restorative justice" and how RJ could be implemented in their day-to-day work, and the outcomes that were expected from it. Officers in this study held a similar sentiment, and expressed that they and their peers were concerned with the practical realities of "doing restorative justice". For example officers brought up issues of offenders not being suitable for RJ based on the offence they committed or

their criminal history, as well as offenders who did not meet the necessary criteria because of other issues like intoxication, or not taking responsibility for their actions. It appears that officers neglect of RJ revolves around their practical understanding of it and when and how to use it. Due to this understanding, officers have a tendency to stick with what they know, and become creatures of habit:

> *P02: ... I think that the average officer knows that it exists but I don't think that its maybe taken into consideration quite as often that it can be, and there's any number of reasons for that, whether it's the arresting officers, whether it's the supervisor, whether it's whatever, like people are just, they're, they just look at it as another arrest and they're gonna process it like they process anyone else cause of the element of repetition and you kinda become a robot and a slave to the policies and procedures right and thinking outside the box, or something different or uncomfortable, might, doesn't always seem like the easiest way, so I think that definitely gets in the way for sure*

This lack of education or understanding leaves restorative justice susceptible to being left as a secondary concern of police. Officers know that RJ is an option available to them, but it is important that they understand it fully to utilize it in their day-to-day work. One participant noted that due to the nature of policing in the North End, RJ rarely shows up on their "radar":

> *P07: because we're so busy being reactive because crime is just so prominent in the North End, like there's just so many calls and we're always behind the 8-ball thinking about how we can help the offenders is kind of like the last on our radar*

One participant also commented that due to the constantly changing nature of modern policing and the adaption of new policies, RJ can be forgotten by officers because they are focusing on a new policy or procedure that may have more pressure from superiors to follow:

> *P05: so I think maybe what happens with restorative justice is you know as we're always dealing with things changing maybe it gets overlooked or forgotten once in a while but I think it it's probably it should be up to the Sergeants to always suggest that if it's a useful tool for that situation.*

Several officers provided insight into why this might be the case and noted that due to the position of police officers in the criminal justice system, they very rarely get to see the outcomes of an RJ intervention, or even how restorative justice operates. This may cause officers to lose sight of restorative justice in their duties:

> *P06: I think a lot of the time officers are just seeing the initial contact of oh we can just send this person to restorative, but they don't know what that actually means and what that looks like all the way through the process*

> *P05: … I think the idea of RJ maybe it feels more kind of out of our hands because we don't know, you know other than what we deal with, that situation for those yunno either those 20 minutes to dealing with the accused for 6 hours or whatever it is, we don't see what the end result is and we don't know what, you know, sort of their outcome is …*

> *P03: … we're dealing with them, we're stopping the crime and then we're sending it off to the courts, so in like the long term picture we have a sort of a small part at the beginning anyway, and when it goes to court whether it's a trial or whether the Crown's deal with it as kind of a plea deal or whether it goes to RJ and that person is forced into*

programming and that programming yunno changes their opinion and behaviour on
things, it's sort of the same beginning for us right, like we're dealing with stopping the
incident from happening, stopping that crime keeping the peace, but how the courts deal
with it, or how the Crown deals with it or how yunno the RJ program deals with it is sort
of out of our hands once we're done with that person …

As outlined earlier, restorative justice exists to officers as an option for less serious crimes and offenders, and a tool that they can use when the situation meets the requirements. However, the officers interviewed emphasized that while RJ is accessible to them, other policies and procedures can and will take priority over RJ. Officers noted that there generally was not any top-down pressure to use RJ, P01 pointed out that Sergeants can have more of a role in bringing restorative justice to the attention of arresting officers when they are doing an investigation and processing an arrest:

P01: I think it definitely adds as an expectation because they have to be aware of it when
they're dealing with a call

BB: right

P01: Like, kind of like in the back of their mind that that this is an option

BB: right

P01: or as before we started to do any of that stuff the expectations on the officer was you
deal with the call you arrest them, charge them, and process them right

BB: right

P01: so now it's almost in the back of their mind when they're doing an investigation that they have to be open minded, is it possible or does this fit so that when they go up to their Sergeant they could get that other advice so it's yeah just being aware of it adds the expectation

Supervisors provide a link between upper management and frontline officers and their role in understanding, implementing, and guiding policies is important. Due to the nature of their position, supervisors interpret the operational meaning of policies and procedures, so when roles and rules are unclear, they have to have a clear vision they can support in order to make effective change (Skogan, 2008). However, when it comes to new programs, increased education and understanding for supervising officers is important because when programs are new, supervisors are new to it as well. They cannot draw on their own experience of how the policy works, and they have to learn new skills and new roles from the ground up (Skogan, 2008). As reflected on by participants, they rely on their supervisors for guidance in navigating new policies and procedures, which makes education and understanding even more important.

When there is no pressure to change, it appears that officers maintain the status quo, using policies and procedures that they are familiar with, not leaving their comfort zone. This appears to be detrimental for the use of RJ, the innovative potential of RJ is not being realized because it is simply a tool for officers that can be easily overshadowed by other priorities. Local governments, and the WPS have made an effort to support RJ and modernize the criminal justice system (WPS, 2018; Province of Manitoba, 2018), however what has become apparent is the implementation gaps between the policy promises and policy product that are established. Implementation is dependent on the joint actions of a number of semi-autonomous actors, each

with their own interests and agendas, and views that may or may not be in line with the policy mandate (Terpstra & Fyfe, 2015).

In this case, frontline officers and supervisors play an important role in the implementation process, and each bring their own views to the subject. Findings show that officers are not necessarily resistant to RJ, and state that it does have a place in frontline policing, but it is still rarely used among frontline officers. Managers have an important role in bringing RJ to the forefront of policing, as when pursuing change under existing norms the outcome is often a conflict in the norms themselves. Change within policing is not as simple as implementing new policies and procedures, it requires officers to be re-socialized into understanding their purpose (Cohen, 2017). In this case officers have to be socialized into understanding the importance of RJ, and the important role they play in its success, this may require officers to leave their comfort zone and bring RJ out of the back of their mind and into the forefront of policing, which would require them to shift their thinking about traditional police roles.

Police Culture: It's one big team

When asked about whether or not they believe that there is a police culture, all officers unequivocally said yes. This was not surprising since the survey responses show that officers tended to agree with many of the police culture variables. Officers described police culture as a team concept, where officers form a tight knit group and rely on one another to get through tough situations and give one another support because they feel they can relate better to other officers. This relationship that officers form with one another helps them to get through their work and another common police feeling: frustration. Officers noted a frustration with their superiors, administrative issues, the high number of calls for service, the criminal justice system whereby

they are arresting the same individuals for the same crime repeatedly without a different result and the increasing amount of work that they are being asked to do. One officer referred to this as officers seeing a "broken system":

> P01: right, so it's like we see the whatcha call the broken system again where you're re-arresting the same people you know time and time again and you get you know frustrated to see that people don't spend much time in custody anymore for severe offences, you do a lot of work to try and keep them in custody right so you know the culture is I think a lot of guys are you know frustrated and I guess disappointed that things haven't changed for the laws and punishments right for crime

Another participant went into depth to describe this "broken system" and acknowledged how this can lead to a "why bother culture":

> BB: okay so what you're saying is that officers might go out and try to obviously catch a criminal and they might perceive restorative justice as kind of an easy way out in some situations?

> P02: yeah, exactly, exactly, yeah and it's, and then it's kind of like the culture is why bother attitude if nothing's going to be done which kinda goes back to that negative culture, like we're gonna bust our butts and then it's not, nothing, it feels like you're just spinning your wheels right like nothings being done or

> BB: right

> P02: and I think some of that is valid right because if you arrest someone on your first day of work and then even if they get arrested and charged or if they, they get arrested and they're put through RJ program you could in theory be arresting them again

127

Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, your second, third, fourth day of working, that's for any human being there's a psychological element, like there's an element of frustration there right, like this again? Like we just did this yunno and, so I do understand that and that's real, probably not always the right way to think about things but it's definitely just a reality ... [overlapping]

BB: right [overlapping]

P02: ... of the job, and other factors whether it's the court system, whether it's whatever right like.

Another officer expressed this frustration with the criminal justice system by explaining that they believe the justice system does not provide enough support for victims while providing more support for offenders ("…the justice system caters more to the offender than the victims 100%" P07). It is not unusual for police officers to become cynical or frustrated with those they encounter in their daily work; they often see the ineffectiveness of laws that are made by those without any background in criminal justice policies or procedures, and view firsthand the unequal treatment many experience in the criminal justice system (Caplan, 2003; Loftus, 2010). The frustration that officers felt was not limited to the criminal justice system, but also extended to upper management and their own work. One officer noted the disconnect they often feel between themselves and upper management, where they believe administrators have a tendency to forget what it is like to work shift work, perform frontline policing duties, and the difficulties officers have with incorporating increasing amounts of administrative work into their jobs:

P07: ... where the problem lies is with our Staff Sergeants and our Inspectors because they've often been removed from the frontline situation for so long they forget what it's

like to work shift work and what it's like to be up a 4 o'clock in the morning and all of a

sudden get slammed with a drunk driving incident that that's like 10 forms of reports and

paper work usually drunk driving can often be 3 to 4 to 5 maybe even 6 hours of paper

work and you're doing this at 4 o clock in the morning, the Staff Sergeants and Inspectors

forget what it's like and they just keep pushing down more procedures and policies and

forms on us

This frustration expressed by frontline officers towards upper management is a type of organizational cynicism whereby there is mistrust towards the organization. The objectives of modern policing are difficult for frontline officers to carry out in ways that supervisors always expect. Frustration and cynicism are a by-product of this disconnection between administrative and public expectations on the one hand and the realities of policing on the other (Caplan, 2003; Bennett & Schmitt, 2002). Loftus (2010) identifies this as managing the expectations of policing, where there is an underlying tension between the expectations of what police work involves and its daily realities. This frustration seems to set a foundation of trust between officers, and strengthens the solidarity between them, where officers have a tendency to trust their peers more than others, and relate better to their fellow officers. One respondent expressed that other officers simply know what one another are going through and encounter similar situations, which leads officers to pull back from the rest of society and gravitate to other members of law enforcement. The nature of police work also draws police together, one officer expressed that officers understand the nature of shift work and how that can be difficult to form relationships outside of policing:

P06: I think on top of that working shift work and I mean in my experience it has put a

strain on relationships that aren't working shift work or even people that are working

shift work that are on opposite schedules as you, I mean part of that too is you know

having these people that are on the same schedule as you and understand you know that

when your Friday is a Tuesday that there's people that are available to kind of you know

go grab a drink together.

P06 went on to explain that these close connections police form with one another are often due to the nature of their jobs and acts as a type of coping mechanism for one another where they can vent their frustrations or experiences with one another without judgement:

P06: I mean people always talk about the dark humor and that's very real and it's just

something that we can sort of talk freely about you know what we did that week who we

saw that week without you know offending people or being too graphic with people

because we all live it so we all understand it and it's kind of no big deal to us, and then I

think you know it comes down to the kind of bond that you know we experience traumas

together and we also are each other's back up and were going into these situations

knowing that these people you know our shift mates are the ones that are going to come

help us when we need it and I think that that kind of creates a bond that you don't have

with you know people who aren't police officers

P04 acknowledged the role that police culture plays in providing support for officers:

P04: … I don't know if it's just because there's some things that other people just won't

understand of you, the dark humor for instance sometimes is used to kind of help you

survive on the street and the things that I've seen in my career I wouldn't want for my

kids to ever see so… at the same time I don't want to tell my husband things that I've seen

on, at work, but as a partner you can talk to your partner about so the people at work

they just get it so I, I'd say there's definitely a police culture and it's yeah it's pretty close and what not.

Police officers form a powerful relationship with one another that they use as a support mechanism because they can relate better to those who are similar to them: other officers. This type of camaraderie forms a team like atmosphere where officers are all on the same side and they are all working towards the same goal and making each other stronger. One officer provided this metaphor:

> *P03: I was kind of thinking that it's like, it's a team, right, we're all here working together, but instead of you know trying to beat another team or score the most points, our objectives here is to you know protect life and property*

One participant noted that the situations that officers see every day on the jobs and the nature of their work environment causes some officers to "pull back" from the rest of society, and gravitate to fellow officers in many social situations because they can relate better to each other:

> *P07: ... you tend to gravitate towards other police officers in more social aspects because you think the same way, you see the same things, you've experienced some of the same trauma and you just you trust other law enforcement you don't, after being at work and dealing with a bunch of crime or seeing some horrible things on your shift you don't want to go out in the public and deal with even in standing in line at a shopping center so you tend to, you pull back from the rest of society and like I said you gravitate to other law enforcement...*

Another officer noted that the solidarity between officers is often strengthened because they know that they can rely on other officers to be there for them in difficult situations and for "back

up" while those that are not in policing will have a difficult time understanding. The trust, loyalty and support for other officers are common cultural characteristics that officers rely on for safety. These cultural attitudes are a consequence of the potentially dangerous nature of the policing environment (Brough et al., 2016). This can develop a divide between officers and those outside of policing to the point that an officer may have a hard time developing relationships with anyone other than a fellow officer:

> *P06: we also are each other's back up and we're going into these situations knowing that these people you know our shift mates are the ones that are going to come help us when we need it and I think that that kind of creates a bit of a bond that you don't have with you know people who aren't police officers or a bit of an understanding that people that aren't police officers don't have which can kind of create a bit of a divide between officers and non-officers … I see it in a lot of people that don't really have friends outside the police service because it's with the different schedules and stuff it makes it harder to see these friends and I think people just kind of let those relationships go and then their whole life is just police cause they just have police friends and then they go to work with people and I think it's just yeah creates a bit more of a separation if its allowed to*

It is common for officers to develop and maintain relationships with fellow officers rather than non-police officers has been identified elsewhere in the literature. Paoline (2003) notes that due to the separation between the police and the public officers have a tendency to socialize exclusively with other officers. This contributes to a strengthening of the bond between police officers and facilitates a strong group loyalty. Solidarity between officers is a recurring theme of police culture and despite the changes in the police landscape, for example RJ, these elements of police culture remain steadfast (Loftus, 2010; Brough et al., 2016; Campeau, 2015). Group

loyalty among officers is robust, and at an organizational level is favourable because if produces a high degree of teamwork (Loftus, 2010). Officers in this study compared their relationships with their peers as a team, reinforcing the notion that solidarity among officers creates more teamwork.

While officer rely on the team aspect of police culture for support, it is important to acknowledge that some officers noted the trouble that generational difference and peer pressure can cause for other officers and in turn RJ; older officers may not take restorative justice seriously because it is something that they have seen before and are convinced it does not work. One officer pointed out that when compared to younger officers, older officers may not take restorative justice seriously:

> *P06: ... I'm a bit younger than a lot of the officers I work with, I did take criminal justice as well so I don't know if I just have a bit more of a like an academic understanding of it whereas I think a lot of my coworkers that are a bit older too just have a bit of an older mindset and don't really understand, I think they just see RJ as like getting off easy for some of these offenders when its, I understand it differently than that.*

As noted earlier this may be due to a lack of education on the part of some officers, and a lack of understanding of RJ. This frustration felt by officers presents a barrier to the use of RJ, if officers are frustrated with the CJS, and believe that it puts the interests of the offenders first they may be less inclined to use interventions that are often perceived to be soft on offenders like RJ. This frustration, and a "why bother," or "nothing works" mentality can be detrimental to the use of RJ because officers will not use something that they think is not useful. It is important to recognize that some officers expressed that there can be forms of peer pressure at work within the "police team". For example, when talking about how they consider police culture to be like a team, one

participant noted that some officers may "get on board" with what other officers are saying in order to feel part of the team:

> *P02: ...you get on board with yunno maybe what someone's saying about a subject or a person or a policy or whatever because you feel part of the team and that's you're kinda obligated to do that right...*

The lack of education among officers may have may lead some to simply follow the groups' thoughts and ideas of RJ which may be detrimental if the group does not have a positive outlook on initiatives like restorative justice. In organizations, dominant players wield power in ways that persuade subordinates to do things a certain way, even if they do not necessarily agree with them (Campeau, 2019). One officer brought this to light, and the potential effects that peer pressure among officers may influence their thinking regarding RJ:

> *P06: ... I think part of the sort of culture or even like peer pressure I see it as sometimes too is just like you know a lot of a lot of the mentality is one way and sometimes it's difficult to be thinking different then the majority of the group and you know there's people that are kind of old school and very conservative and don't even believe that to be an option and its I mean it's definitely hard to be the one that disagrees with that way of thinking so I do see it you know I think there's some people that maybe even like I was saying even some younger officers that maybe just don't understand RJ and that just sort of fall into what their peers are saying and just kind of believe that to be just how it is.*

The influence of older officers within a police culture may be detrimental to RJ because they are resistant towards the implementation of a significantly different programs like restorative justice. Older officers have a tendency to carry with them "old-school" cultural scripts to preserve the

status quo (Campeau, 2019), which can be problematic when we consider that the coordination of senior and junior officers may help teach police craft to less experienced peers in ways that official training cannot (Paoline & Teerrill, 2007). Newer officers who may be open to change and have more positive perceptions of restorative justice may look up to older officers for guidance and end up following their senior peers and take a more cautious or even negative view of diversion. It is important than to identify these "cultural carriers" (Paoline & Gau, 2018: 691) to address these barriers to RJ; a task that is most likely best suited for frontline supervisors who are responsible for the day-to-day monitoring of police activities.

Discussion

The WPS Restorative Justice Diversion Program relies on a great deal of frontline officer discretion, and knowledge of RJ and relevant policies and procedures to determine which offenders are best suited for diversion into RJ programming. Interviews with 7 frontline officers uncovered several key themes regarding officers understanding and perception of RJ and police culture: *restorative justice has a place in frontline work*; *restorative justice is another (for less serious offenders)*; *barriers to restorative justice* which consisted of two sub-themes: *circumstantial barriers*, and *occupational barriers*; and the final theme was *police culture: it's one big team*. Across these themes officers acknowledged that RJ has a place in frontline policing, were accepting of incorporating RJ into their work and acknowledged that it can be an effective tool that can be added to the police "tool belt." Officers expressed that there was often not any pressure to use RJ, but rather as something that is kept in the back of their minds to use in the most appropriate situations. Officers continually noted the dynamic and complex nature of their work, and how every call for service that they receive is different. Conceptualizing RJ as another tool in the tool belt seems to be effective for officers because in some situations RJ is not

the most appropriate response, while in others it is. According to Bazemore and Griffths (2003) this form of restorative policing offers a new hope for reform because officers do not have to rely solely on processing an offender to move them through the criminal justice system. Rather, this framework provides officers with new dispositional tools. It is reasonable for frontline officers to conceptualize RJ as a tool based on the nature of their work, where they are required to be a jack of all trades, master of none when it comes to policies and procedures. Frontline officers are often not required to have a solid theoretical foundation when it comes to the policies and procedures they use, they must simply know when and how to use them. Between frontline officers, middle and upper management, frontline officers are concerned with "doing" restorative justice within the context of their current operational practices, or in other words how best to use the tools at their disposal (Stockdale, 2015).

This practical understanding of RJ leads frontline officers to conceptualize RJ as more of a dispositional tool that they can use in appropriate situations, rather than as a different way of accomplishing justice. It is understandable that police might take this view of RJ because they are often inundated with other policies and procedures, and are governed by the structures of the criminal justice system. Conceptualizing RJ as a tool, according to Daly (2016) may actually be beneficial and a natural progression of the use of restorative justice. Daly (2016) argues that you cannot conceptualize RJ as a different form of justice; it is impractical to think that RJ can work outside of the traditional justice because RJ as a coherent system or type of justice does not exist. Restorative justice has no mechanism of fact finding, or ability to deal with people who refuse to participate in restorative justice processes, or do not take responsibility for their actions because RJ has no coercive power (Shapland, 2014). Rather, it is beneficial to think of RJ as an

innovative justice mechanism that does not operate in opposition to conventional justice mechanisms like standard approaches to criminal prosecution.

Restorative justice, and retributive justice operate under the umbrella of conventional justice, albeit away from one another. It appears that officers think, view, and use RJ as a mechanism in their daily work, not relying solely on the standard tool kit of criminal, justice or legal practices. To officers RJ can be applied in their day-to-day duties, but within the confines of traditional policing and the justice system. RJ is a different option that they can pursue and if in the end it is no longer appropriate, offenders simply get moved back into the court system. This "another tool in the tool belt" mentality, while not ideal, shows a progression in thinking towards a more restorative policing approach.

Some argue that restorative policing is simply the next logical step from community policing that offers both new tools and new principles of intervention to assist officers in their daily tasks of engaging community, forming partnerships and building community capacity (Bazemore & Griffiths, 2003). Paterson and Clamp (2012) explain that the two primary drivers behind restorative policing are a desire to increase community confidence in the police, and to acknowledge the limited capacity of formal state agencies to manage problems of crime and deviance. Officers acknowledged the limitations of more formal state agencies, expressing frustration that they often come into contact with offenders who had been released that they had previously arrested earlier in the week. So it appears that the acknowledgment by officers that RJ offers them a type of tool to use is in line with the conception of restorative policing, where officers are able to use their discretion to make decisions regarding restorative justice in an attempt to repair the harms caused by the offender, reinvigorate the use of police discretion,

encourage the informal resolution of community problems, enhance public confidence in the police and to reduce costs and policy issues (Paterson & Clamp, 2012).

The second key theme that emerged from the interviews, was *restorative justice is another option (for less serious offenders)*. While in the first theme, officers acknowledged that RJ has a place in frontline police work, in the second theme they clarified that RJ is another option for them to use, but for less serious offenders and offences, or for someone who according to officers had simply made a mistake. Officers noted that RJ cut people a "break" when they committed a crime that the officers considered to be out of the norm of the person based on their lack of criminal history. Officers acknowledged that they were more likely to consider RJ for someone if they were apologetic and accepted responsibility for their actions immediately after being picked up by police. It appears that in some situations sympathy was a driving factor for officers when they considered that an offender simply had a bad day and that led to their offending. In comparison, officers noted that they did not think RJ was acceptable for offenders with lengthy criminal records because they believed the offender had already shown that they could not benefit from the RJ process based on their past behaviour. Findings here were not surprising, the acceptance of RJ for less serious, non-violent offenders has been identified elsewhere in the literature (Stockdale, 2015; Crocker, 2013; Abramson, 2003; Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016). RJ was never intended, however, to be used for exclusively low-level offences, or lower level offences (Zehr & Gohar, 2003). Scholars have explored RJ application in more serious contexts like prisons (Crocker, 2015; Butler & Maruna, 2016), drunk driving (Joyce & Thompson, 2017), and in some cases even homicide (Barrile, 2015). Researchers continue to point to the relegation of RJ to the shallow end of the criminal justice system (Wood

& Suzuki, 2016), because the use of RJ for more serious adult offences remains controversial and rare across justice systems (Butler & Maruna, 2016).

This focus on first time and lesser offences may be a by-product of the institutionalization of RJ within the conventional criminal justice system itself. The institutionalization of RJ has led to its mainstream acceptance as an alternative sanction, for example consider how Manitoba and the WPS have symbolically embraced RJ practices. Manitoba passed the RJA in 2014, ostensibly as an alternative approach to addressing offending outside of the traditional justice system and to promote the development and use of RJ programs in the province. Manitoba further reinforced its institutionalization of RJ in their 2018 CJSMS which refocuses the justice system to the more effective use of RJ, among other things (Manitoba Justice, 2018). The WPS have since implanted their own RJ diversion referral program and have since extended the use of RJ to cases of domestic violence (Barghout & Levasseur, 2020). This program, however, may fall victim to the same problems of limited applicability beyond first time offenders. The use of RJ for domestic violence is limited to offenders who have no previous domestic violence charges in the past 5 years, no charges involving the same victim, while those charged with aggravated assault, firearm or sexual offences are not eligible ((Barghout & Levasseur, 2020). This leaves only a small percentage of domestic violence offenders that would be eligible for diversion by the police.

Woods and Suzuki (2016) caution that with increased institutionalization of RJ, there is increased inclusion of gatekeepers such as police officers who are not familiar with RJ principles, and who are then responsible for outlining and defining what RJ means to that organization. This appears to be the case with the WPS, the organization defined what RJ means to them by outlining what offences they can and cannot consider for diversion, and interview

findings note the relative lack of education among frontline officers regarding RJ and their unfamiliarity with the practice. This has led to RJ falling by the wayside in some important contexts.

For example, it was identified in this study that RJ is often placed on the backburner of frontline officers because there is usually no top-down pressure to use RJ, and being used exclusively for low level offences. However, it should be noted that frontline officers should not be held entirely responsible for these shortcomings, as discussed above managers and supervisors are in a unique position to bring RJ to the forefront of police thinking. Further, it is important to note that while officers do hold a great deal of discretion, they do not possess the same amount of discretion as a justice or judge would have when considering the sentence of an individual. The crown prosecutor ultimately has more freedom to release and direct people to RJ programs regardless of their offence. The police on the other hand, as the interviews show, are limited by top-down policies and procedures, and are responsible for balancing competing roles of investigations, patrolling and maintaining safety and security within the community. So officers may think that RJ is best used for only less serious offences or non-violent offenders because this might be their first time encountering RJ, and they were taught about the process through a policing first lens which leaves RJ to be defined specifically through the police, and used only according to this definition.

These problems of institutionalization became further apparent in the third theme *barriers to restorative justice*, which contained two sub-themes: *circumstantial barriers* and *occupational barriers*. Officers expressed that *circumstantial barriers* were the barriers that they could not control, which included offenders that do not meet the criteria for the RJ diversion program due to the seriousness of their offence, their criminal history or intoxication.

Interestingly, officers noted that a considerable barrier to their use of restorative justice was the area that they worked in. Officers repeatedly noted that due to the high crime nature of the North End they did not have the opportunity to use RJ more often because of the nature of the situations that they encounter. This was not entirely unexpected, Division 13 is in one of the highest crime areas, with one of the highest concentrations of serious crimes in the City of Winnipeg, and second only to the central district that encompasses the downtown core (WPS, 2019b). It was not surprising then, in light of other findings, that officers in this division found that the area they patrol put up barriers to their use of RJ.

On the other hand, occupational barriers had much to do with the officers themselves, rather than the situations that they come into contact with. Participants noted that fellow officers lacked education and experience regarding restorative justice, and officers only had a cursory understanding of RJ, and were reliant on the WPS policy and their commanding officers for direction in most cases if they were considering RJ. Modern policing requires officer to be knowledgeable on a wide array of policies and procedures, and when considering new policies like RJ, participants noted that officers may be reluctant to use them because they are already familiar with old policies and accepted practices. This may be exacerbated by the fact that RJ asks stakeholders to look at crime through a fundamentally different lens, one which criminal justice practitioners like police officers have a cursory knowledge of at best (Gerkin et al., 2017). Frontline police officers are being asked to shift their roles from that of expertise problem solvers to community facilitators. This shift requires that criminal justice practitioners reimagine their roles, their behaviours associated with these roles, and reorder their priorities (Gerkin et al., 2017). As uncovered from both the interviews and survey responses this is difficult for frontline officers, they seemingly agree that RJ has a place in frontline policing, and they believe that it is

important for police to be involved in this process, but it is difficult for police officers to reimagine their roles, duties, and responsibilities. Frontline officers maintain that their position requires them to fight crime and maintain the safety of the community first and foremost, which takes priority over initiatives like RJ. It is here that police cultural barriers to RJ become evident.

Officers agreed that police culture reinforced solidarity and comradery between officers and created a team environment, that they use as a coping mechanism to share their experience and frustration with one another. It is not surprising to find that there is a police culture within the WPS, and its existence is important to acknowledge because police culture is often cited as one of the reasons why policies like RJ fail (Skogan, 2008; Alarid & Montemayor, 2012). This is the case because officers often bring in their own realities and experiences into their decision making, and if they adhere to destructive aspects of police culture, barriers can be put up in front of restorative justice.

Officers reported that due to the dangerous nature of their jobs they rely on one another for support, to vent, and use dark humor to cope with the stress of their work environments and they relate better to other officers because other officers experience the same things that they do, and understand them better. Campeau (2019) argues that the notion of teamwork is a reigning institutional myth of older officers and that newer, younger officers view it as form of favouritism. However, in this study it appeared that frontline officers viewed teamwork as a positive, and a means of coping with frustrations in their work.

For restorative justice to be implemented in policing effectively, it demands a continued cultural shift at all levels of the police hierarchy to ensure that the implementation of RJ is meaningful for both officers and the public to avoid RJ being subverted by other agendas. Some officers did identify how there can potentially be generational differences between older and

newer officers. This can impact the way that restorative justice is used by frontline officers, if more senior officers are set in their old ways of doing things and neglect to use RJ when available, less senior officers may learn this type of behaviour and in turn continue to neglect restorative justice as an option to better fit into the police team. Further, the frustration that officers expressed regarded the criminal justice system as a whole may always present barriers to RJ. If officers are frustrated with the way that the justice system functions right now, they may not be receptive of new programs or initiatives, because they might not see them as something that can be effective, which in turn, may leave some officers to ask "why bother?" and further develop feelings of cynicism towards others.

There are some hopeful findings regarding RJ use. It is encouraging that officers view RJ as having a place in frontline policing. By them viewing restorative justice as not being any additional work and by viewing it as a tool in their restorative policing tool belt, other officers may become more comfortable with the concept of using restorative justice because they see their "teammates" using the tools at their disposal successfully. This is an encouraging shift in policing, while officers still maintain traditional aspects of police culture, they are not excluding RJ from policing, and see themselves as an important part of the RJ process. Even though officers only consider RJ an option for first time offenders and less serious offences, it is encouraging to see that they report it as a legitimate option in their day-to-day work. While changes in police organizations are characteristically slow and experience difficulties, the fact that officers accept RJ and appear to be expanding their knowledge of it is encouraging.

Conclusion

Frontline officer interviews provided an opportunity for an in-depth exploration of restorative justice and police culture. This process gave officers an opportunity to explain their

feelings and opinions regarding RJ, and police culture, and provided an avenue for a more nuanced understanding to some of the questions that became apparent throughout the survey process. Officers were able to explain how RJ fits into frontline police work, how they use (or do not use) RJ, and the reasons why this might be the case. Officers provided an explanation to how they perceive police culture and how police culture interacts with RJ. The findings here suggest that there are steps police agencies can take to implement RJ more effectively, but the sole focus should not be only on frontline officers. Officers in positions of authority play an important role in the effective use of policies, and further, those responsible for creating these policies and procedures should be aware of their potential pitfalls, and ways that they can be mediated. Restorative justice appears to be the new label that agencies and governments are using to market new initiatives, however, this research brings to light issues related to RJ and its applicability for frontline use. What follows is a discussion drawing on both the quantitative and qualitative findings, this discussion will look to bring to light some of the issues related to the RJ movement that became apparent throughout this research and will provide policy recommendations and suggestions for future research that will look to mitigate some of these issues moving forward.

Chapter 6 – Discussion of Overall Study Findings

Restorative justice is increasingly being implemented in policing and in the criminal justice system more broadly. While some advocates would argue that restorative justice is best thought of as an alternative to the traditional justice system, the current trajectory of RJ implementation proves that this process is firmly rooted in the traditional justice system. Study findings here show a steady, but cautious adoption of RJ in frontline policing. Therefore, it is important to examine the interactions between RJ and pillars of the traditional justice system, like the police, to better understand how restorative justice can work better within the traditional justice system, and how its use can be increased. It is critical to examine all aspects of policing in relation to RJ, especially police culture which is often cited as a major barrier to the implementation of new initiatives and changes within policing (Alarid & Montemayor, 2012; McCold, 2003).

The primary research question of this project looked to investigate the interactions between police culture and RJ, asking: what is the effect of police culture on patrol officer attitudes towards restorative justice? Attitudes inform behaviour, which in turn influences officers' decisions regarding the use of RJ. Officers view their work through the scope of police culture, and how officers view this culture will in turn impact how they perceive aspects of their work, which includes restorative justice. Secondary research questions looked to determine how frontline officers understood restorative justice, how they understood police culture, how they understood their role as a police officers and how this understanding might influence their decisions regarding the use of restorative justice.

This research was conducted in two phases: an initial quantitative phase and then a second qualitative phase that built on and further examined the results from the quantitative

phase. The initial survey phase looked to provide a baseline of officers understanding and attitudes towards RJ and police culture. Several key findings emerged from the quantitative portion of this study. First, officers showed strong homogeneity among shifts as there was little difference between RJ attitude, RJ understanding and police culture variables. Survey results show that there is little connection between RJ and police culture variables. These findings were relatively unexpected as it was hypothesized that police culture would show to have a greater impact on frontline officer's attitudes towards RJ, and that there would be more differences seen across police workgroups. Restorative justice understanding had the strongest effect on restorative justice attitudes, with police culture having little effect on understanding. Results from the survey show that the correlation between RJ understanding, RJ attitude, and police culture variables were in the expected direction but few reached statistical significance. This is most likely the case because cultural adaptions and commonalities are shared by officers in the same workgroup, and there are differences when compared to other workgroups (Ingram et al., 2013; 2018). Research has shown that officers who work in similar environments have a tendency to subscribe to similar cultural tendencies (Ingram et al., 2018). In this case the high crime environment of the North End may have strengthened the solidarity among officers and their opinions on RJ in this division because officers have many of the same experiences working in this area of the city, due to the fact that officers in this division may face more dangerous situations then officers in other areas of the city.

Results also show that officers tended to believe that they had a good understanding of RJ, but also disagreed with many of the core components of RJ, suggesting that officers had a more limited understanding of RJ than they thought. This was consistent with the opinions expressed throughout much of the qualitative section of this research, where officers expressed

that one of the primary barriers to RJ was lack of education and understanding. Survey results also found that frontline officer's attitudes towards RJ are consistent with much of the current literature. The majority of officers reported that the diversion of some offenders away from the CJS is a good idea and agreed that RJ is an important change to our current CJS that can only work through partnerships within the CJS. Officers also seemed to agree that RJ does not take away from their other duties and has become one of their responsibilities as a frontline police officer.

While the increased involvement of police officers in RJ may be seen as a positive for the use and expansion of RJ, some scholars are cautious of the effects that an increased police presence can have on RJ encounters, mainly the expansion of the lower end CJS process through net-widening (Wood & Suzuki, 2016; Hudson, 2002). Hudson (2002) notes that there are several concerns related to the increased presence of police officers in RJ, mainly that police should not be both investigators and prosecutors, that there is potential for officers to be over-dominant in proceedings, that officers may press people to provide more information, they may not be sufficiently sympathetic or even be insensitive towards victims and offenders, for example they may be overzealous when it comes to shaming. In more extreme cases, Hoyle and Rosenblatt (2016) found that when officers dominated the discussion in RJ processes, they often ask questions that are judgemental or end up as moral lectures. In some instances they even reinvestigate the offense, seeking admission for prior offending, or ask questions in attempts to gather criminal intelligence. So, while the increased use and expansion of RJ is encouraging, caution should be taken and there should not be too ardent implementation of RJ in policing in order to avoid potential due process violations (Ikpa, 2007).

The survey also uncovered several expected results as well, mainly that the majority of frontline officers believe that there are factors related to the offender, their attitude or the situation that will impact their decision to use RJ and that the program should be reserved for low risk, non-violent offenders. Most officers agreed that they often take into consideration other factors of the situation when considering someone for diversion, such as the offender's attitude during the arrest. These findings are consistent with other research that found that generally officers have a positive view of RJ, but believe that it should only be used for non-violent, first time offenders (Crocker, 2013; McCold, 2003; Stockdale, 2015; Abramson, 2003). What was unexpected however were the relatively small number of "disagree" responses from officers that believe as many offenders as possible should be diverted from the CJS (21%), RJ should be used only for low-risk offenders (22%) or non-violent offences (25.8%). While this is still only a quarter of all the officers surveyed, it suggests that thinking among frontline officers is beginning to shift. While RJ is arguably still relegated to the "shallow end" of the criminal justice system (Wood & Suzuki, 2016; Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016), the fact that not all officers believe that RJ should be used exclusively for low risk, or non-violent offenders speaks to a slowly increasing acceptance of RJ as a legitimate criminal justice strategy among police. This kind of transition can be seen in the WPS approach to violent crimes like domestic violence for example (Barhout & Levasseur, 2020). The WPS has recently expanded the use of RJ to include domestic violence offence, which is in stark contrast to their traditional zero tolerance domestic violence policy. Even with this expansion of RJ methods, however, the WPS is still taking a very cautious approach to who can be diverted to this domestic phase of the program, focusing on first time, or more low risk cases rather than serial abusers. Even with this potential shift in attitude, it appears that the WPS is still focused on using RJ for those who they deem to be relatively low risk.

Along with being consistent with their opinions regarding RJ, findings show that officers were relatively consistent with their opinions on police culture. In policing the North End of Winnipeg, crime fighting and tough on crime policing tactics were important to frontline officers. This is not surprising because a prominent feature of police culture is the strong sense of the police role in relation to crime (Brough et al., 2016; Loftus, 2010).

Results also show a divide between frontline officers and upper management, a division that is a clear and consistent characteristic of police organizational culture (Brough et al., 2016; Paoline & Gau, 2018). Frontline officers in this study felt the pressure of perceived unrealistic expectations where they often felt asked to do a lot with very little. These increasing expectations often come in the form of administrative duties or knowledge work that officers perceive as not being tied to their actual role of law enforcement (Huey & Ricciardelli, 2015; Chan, 2007). While research suggests that non-legalistic police practices are still present in policing (Fekjaer et al., 2014), officers in this study appeared to be reluctant to step outside of procedural boundaries even if they did believe that there were too many of these guidelines in place.

Paoline and Terrill (2007) have found evidence to suggest that both a college education and on the job experience matter with respect to non-legalistic police practices such as the increased use of force, with higher education and more on the job experience having the greatest effect. The level of education of respondents in this study may explain why most officers reported that they would not participate in non-legalistic measures, only 11.4% (12) officers had only a high school education, while the remaining 88.6% (93) of officers had at least some type of post-secondary education. One unexpected finding was that "machoism" was not a central tenant of police culture for those surveyed (Kurtz & Upton, 2018; Brough et al., 2016; Loftus, 2008). Officers reported that they did not feel the need to act tough during their work or in front

of their peers. This finding does, however, support researchers who argue that the "cult of masculinity" within policing is slowly changing and that studies should explore the multiplicity of gender representations within policing (Silvestri, 2017; Kennedy & Birch, 2018). This finding seems to support the notion that the "machoism" aspect of police culture is not as pervasive as it once was, or at least not so in this Canadian police force.

Building on these findings, the qualitative portion of this study provides a more nuanced understanding of how frontline officers perceive police culture, and how they use RJ in their day-to-day work. Two of the key themes outlined officers attitudes towards diverting offenders, *restorative justice has a place in frontline work* and *restorative justice is another option (for less serious offenders)*. Officers noted that RJ does have a place in frontline police work and does not add any additional work to their duties or sets any unrealistic expectations. This is how officers are able to reconcile the competing goals of restorative justice, crime control, and tough on crime policies that were identified in the survey results. Officers viewed each as having their own place in their day-to-day work, however, it does not appear that restorative justice takes priority over any one duty. Officers believed that they were restrained by the RJ criteria and the high crime nature of their policing environment. Officers stated that they appreciated RJ because it provided them another dispositional tool to use, adding another "tool to the tool belt" when the situation was appropriate. This allows officers to choose the best strategy for the job and in some cases that might be RJ, while in others it may not be. It appears that RJ is predominantly not the proper tool for the job. Officers noted that they did not perceive RJ as an increased burden or expectation, however, with modern policing, it appears that the police "tool belt" is becoming larger and larger. Officers must be knowledgeable and be prepared to use the tools at their disposal, but with the expectations that are put on frontline officers, they are now responsible for

being knowledgeable of more policies and procedures, leaving some tools to be used less or not at all. It is common for officers to conceptualize the law and internal policies as "toolkits" as they have a critical guiding role in their work (Marks et al., 2016). However police knowledge is not fixed, and changes with the daily experiences of police officers, and these "toolkits" or "tool belts" will be deployed differently based on officers' cultural knowledge (Campeau, 2019), and the contextual circumstances at hand (Campeau, 2015).

This helps to explain the variation in some officer's opinions on one hand, and their consistency on the other. There is a sameness in many of the situations that officers in this police division come across. Officers made it clear that RJ is difficult to achieve in the North End because of the types of offences and offenders they encounter. It would not be a surprise then that this cultural knowledge effects officers' opinions and use of RJ. Since this police division is in a high crime, low-income area, many of the situations that officers come across require a tough on crime response rather than a RJ one. These contextual circumstances can then go on to affect officers perception of RJ. The environment that officers work in shapes their opinions about their activities, the way they carry out their activities and the way that officers view themselves; it is these contextual circumstances that shape police culture and frontline officers own police narratives (Carlson, 2019).

The second key theme that emerged, *restorative justice is another option (for less serious offenders),* highlights how officers perceive RJ as another option for offenders that is different than court and provides an opportunity for people to avoid getting wrapped up in the procedures and processes of the traditional justice system. Officers perceived this other option as giving an offender a "break" or a lesser type of punishment. Much like the survey results, officers agreed that the restorative justice "option" is only suitable for less serious offenders with no or minimal

criminal record, that have taken responsibility for their actions. Officers explained that RJ was only an option for people who made a mistake that the officers perceived to be out of the norm of the individual based on their past criminal history. This type of thinking was not necessarily surprising based on the policies that the WPS have in place for their restorative justice diversion program. This is one of the many critiques of RJ, that it is restricted by policy makers to less serious crimes. This limited application to less serious offenders may be due to the perceived leniency of this sanction on offenders (Brooks, 2017) and indeed, in this study officers identified this often. Officers continually related that RJ gave people "a break" rather than sending them to the traditional criminal justice system. Officers inadvertently appear to have created in their minds the ideal type of offender in which they would divert only if they fit their preconceived mold based on the perceived softness of the sanction. Based on their knowledge and policies, frontline officers appear to create a typology of the ideal offender that consists of a range of recurrent personal features and underlying assumptions (Maglione, 2018). According to officers these ideal offenders are ones with little to no criminal history, non-violent, their behaviour is considered by officers as out of the norm for that individual and who is regretful and immediately takes responsibility for their actions. Officers repeatedly commented on the difficulties surrounding policing in the North End and how many of the individuals they came into contact with did not fit the mold of the ideal offender for RJ. This may not necessarily be an issue with the officers themselves, or a reluctance to use RJ, but rather an issue with perception of RJ by policy makers as well as practitioners. The policy maker view may have typified the offenders and offences that are acceptable for its use.

This study showcases what many find troubling with modern RJ, as well as issues related to the control of these programs by criminal justice professionals like the police. New initiatives

are constantly being introduced into the criminal justice system in an attempt to improve existing methods of crime control (Richards, 2014). Many programs set out to be inclusive and to help solve problems that are persistent within the criminal justice system, however these programs are set up in a way that often erroneously dismisses many people from participation who it sets out to help, in this case many Indigenous offenders.

The Manitoba CJSMS outlines how RJ is often culturally appropriate and responsive to the needs of Indigenous communities overrepresented in the criminal justice system. The Government of Manitoba notes that increasing the use of restorative justice in partnership with Indigenous communities is one way of achieving the goal of reducing Indigenous overrepresentation in the criminal justice system. Police services have an important role in making better use of RJ options in appropriate cases (Manitoba Justice, 2018). However, the reality of policing in the North End of Winnipeg means that frontline officers often come into contact with Indigenous people concerning issues related to alcohol, drugs or gangs (Griffiths et al., 2013), which leads to Indigenous people automatically being ineligible for diversion, and largely absent from RJ programs (Broschuk & Weinrath, 2018). They are not being excluded due to their race, but due to the fact that they have committed more serious crimes, have a lengthy criminal record, or both.

This disparity in outcomes indicates a regression away from equality instead of a progression towards it (Van Cleve & Mayes, 2015). Interactions between Indigenous people and Winnipeg Police are often tense, and police officers are often viewed as a means of ongoing colonial interventions within these communities (Dobchuck-Land, 2017). The inadvertent exclusion of Indigenous offenders from programs that are meant to help them brings to light issues of race that are still present throughout the criminal justice system. By not explicitly

acknowledging that Indigenous people are underrepresented in programs such as this and by not addressing issues that disproportionally affect Indigenous communities like their overrepresentation in the justice system, these programs lend themselves to issues of colour-blind racism that denies historically rooted structural underpinnings of racial inequality. The underlying structures of race and colonialism still pervade criminal justice practices in a fragmented and diversified form (Chartrand, 2018). Historically, Indigenous populations have not seen the benefit of targeted responses to reduce overrepresentation and programs like RJ do not seem to be making any type of substantial difference to these systemic problems (Roberts & Reid, 2017).

Measures like RJ have been introduced into the criminal justice system alongside already existing arrangements, making it difficult to address issues of colonialism, race and Indigenous overrepresentation if these systemic issues are reproduced by traditional criminal justice processes. It is important that criminal justice practitioners are able to recognize these issues and work towards addressing them. Transformative justice approaches may be the next logical step to address community issues without the involvement of the criminal justice system. Participation of criminal justice professionals in diversion or other social programs often make over-policed communities uncomfortable and weary of their involvement (Dobchuck-Land, 2017). Transformative justice approaches give these communities an opportunity to address unequal power relationships within the criminal justice system and exercise local agency within their own communities.

Barriers to restorative justice was another major theme that was identified across interviews and consisted of two sub themes. The first sub theme, *circumstantial barriers*, was described by officers as the lack of ability to divert offenders because the offenders simply do

not fit the criteria necessary for restorative justice diversion, and the situations that they encounter in the North End precludes them from considering restorative justice as an option. These situations might include the offenders' criminal history, the offender not being receptive of restorative justice, the offence they committed was too serious, or the offender was intoxicated. The dilemma officers face with either arresting or diverting is common when diversionary practices are introduced into policing, and officers are faced with more than just one option of crime control.

Barberi and Taxman (2019) explain this barrier to diversionary programs as on one side officers wanting to help people, but on the other they need to solve the call for service, keep the community safe and use their time wisely. This appears to be a "problem of displacement" (Woods & Suzuki, 2016: 156), which is the degree that restorative justice has moved into the realm of informal or diversionary criminal justice programs at largely the shallow end of the criminal justice system in terms of lesser offences or youth offending. It is unclear if the growth of RJ has actually lead to the emergence of entirely new programs or practices, or if much of this growth simply reflects a rebranding of already existing interventions, most notably in diversionary and post-adjudicative practices (Woods & Suzuki, 2016). Throughout the survey and interviews, officers identified this problem of displacement as a barrier to the use the RJ program as officers focused on finding the ideal offender with limited to no criminal history, who have made a mistake or committed a low level crime while neglecting those with a lengthy criminal record or committed unsuitable crimes for RJ. So while officers see RJ as a tool or mechanism for them to use, it does not appear that they viewed it as anything new or ground breaking, nor did they see it as much different from other informal practices such as cautioning an offender they decide not to address.

As discussed above, this high standard of RJ referral again involves police in a practice of colour-blind racism, because it is Indigenous offenders who are more likely to show these undesirable traits, arguably ascribed due to over-policing in the North End.

The second sub theme, *occupational barriers*, refers to the officers themselves. Officers reflected how RJ is often neglected because it is too far in the back of their minds due to their position in the criminal justice system where they do not see the restorative process unfold, and that they are already inundated with policies and procedures that they must follow that take precedent over RJ which is highly discretionary. It is important to take into consideration the role of supervisors in how frontline officers use restorative justice. It may be a role for supervisors to introduce RJ as an option in more situations to make up for any lack of education frontline officers may have because they may have more flexibility in the types of offences that can be diverted and changes within police organizations are reliant on effective top-down management (Santos & Santos, 2012).

This is especially distressing when considering that there is evidence to suggest that different ranking officers have a different understanding of RJ. Frontline officers are oriented to concrete knowledge i.e., the practice of carrying out RJ and what is expected of them and can have a difficult time fully embracing RJ due to the difficulties of grasping the practical realities of doing so (Stockdale, 2015). Supervisors are in an important position to introduce frontline officers to the option of restorative justice, as they are responsible for interpreting policies and procedures and often have a better understanding of RJ and the necessary steps required to translate this understanding into something that frontline officers can comprehend and implement themselves (Stockdale, 2015). According to the results of this study and others, the

role of supervisors should not be overlooked when trying to implement RJ because they are responsible for steering frontline officers towards the effective use of restorative justice policies.

The importance of education, experience and direction from supervisors cannot be overstated. Officers are consistent in that they believe RJ is another option for less serious offenders, and circumstantial barriers like a person's criminal history or offence preclude them from considering RJ diversion. However, early research on the Winnipeg program suggests that even when this barrier is not an issue frontline officers still tend to neglect RJ options for less serious offenders (Broschuk & Weinrath, 2018). Although officers work in a high crime area, they are not exclusively coming into contact with people who are ineligible for RJ, but they are still not using it to its fullest potential. It is necessary that supervisors are able to effectively communicate the organizations support for RJ in order for frontline officers to perceive the initiative as legitimate. Organizational leaders are often the primary meaning makers for frontline officers, their definitions and influence are influential in simplifying or constructing ways of thinking (Chan, 2007). Without middle managers reminding officers to think about and use RJ in their daily work, officers continually put it on the "back burner" which was apparent throughout this study. Participants continually noted that there is generally no top-down pressure on frontline officers to use RJ, which officers perceive as a positive because they are already inundated with policies and procedures. However, for the use of RJ this becomes a negative because officers continuously noted that RJ is ignored by officers in lieu of more important policies.

Efforts to increase the use of initiatives like RJ must rest more firmly on efforts to facilitate and guide the practice, rather than on efforts to win over officers more indirectly (Paoline, et al., 2000). Paoline et al. (2000) found the police role conception and officers'

opinions and attitudes towards citizens and police culture were not incompatible with RJ, however their work environment must not impede their ability to use such an intervention. Police leaders should be more actively involved in diversion programs to gain buy-in from all officers. It is important that leaders clarify the goals and purpose of diversion efforts, as well as work with officers to establish incentives for using diversion, and that officers perceive using diversion as a way of helping their police careers, similar to making an arrest (Barberi & Taxman, 2019).

The lack of importance being placed on RJ by frontline officers and supervisors may be due to problems of relevance (Wood & Suzuki, 2016). At its inception restorative justice was seen as a promising means of addressing many of the problems of the traditional criminal justice system like victim involvement and offender accountability, but also many of the larger scale problems associated with the criminal justice system like racial and gender equality, and prison abolition. These goals commit RJ to significant transformations of the legal status quo and demands reforms that empower individuals and communities to assume responsibilities for conflict (Pavlich, 2002). Over the years however, RJ has slowly drifted away from these goals of large-scale change and impact and neglected to take into account many of the problems of the traditional criminal justice system and systemic factors like racism, poverty and unemployment, or challenging the tendency to refer mostly youth or low level crimes for referral (Richards, 2014). RJ has encompassed too many ideals and has failed to live up to the promises that is had made, while remaining largely reactive rather than proactive in trying to achieve these goals (Speed, 2020). It appears now that programs are being branded as "restorative justice" to get attention from policy makers and institutions. Ultimately, this limits RJ to a mere complement to state justice, restricting what sort of change is possible (Pavlich, 2002). In Manitoba, rather than fundamentally change the system, RJ is reproducing many of the same legal assumptions and

objectives as the criminal justice system and is tethered to criminal justice professionals like the police. But if the police are trying to implement RJ within the traditional criminal justice system, they will not use RJ to its full potential.

When discussing how frontline officers conceptualize police culture in the qualitative interviews, officers described how *policing is one big team*. Participants noted how this team environment provides them with an avenue to express their frustration, a coping mechanism to share their experiences without judgement with others who have had similar experiences, and others who are knowledgeable about the nature of policing. This strong camaraderie among frontline officers may speak to the fact that there were not very large effects seen between shifts. Officers may view themselves more broadly as part of a team working in a specific area, rather than separate shifts. The nature of policing in this division may also strengthen the bond between officers because it is identified as a high crime area. Solidarity among police officers is an enduring aspect of police culture (Loftus, 2010; Brough et al., 2016) and while solidarity among police officers may wax and wane (Campeau, 2015) it became apparent throughout this study that officers still rely heavily on this aspect of police culture. In policing, solidarity is a favourable trait because it produces a high degree of teamwork and is an integral feature of "rank and file" police culture (Loftus, 2010: 14).

Solidarity among police officers remains intact due to the fact that many of the fundamental roles of the police are still in place (Loftus, 2010). However, despite these enduring traits of police culture, other scholars have noted that it is important to acknowledge that police may draw on more or less solidarity depending on the circumstances at hand, or may displace this resource in favour of others that are more suitable to the situation (Campeau, 2015). The fluidity of the police culture is supported elsewhere in the literature, where it varies among

officers, and some police officers may align themselves with parts of the "traditional" police culture more than others, depending on the situation (Terpstra & Schaap, 2013; Paoline & Gau, 2018; Reiner, 2016; Paoline et al., 2000; Marks et al., 2016). Campeau (2019) refers to this as cultural inertia where the adherence to many of the old cultural norms are weakened and old-school beliefs grow increasingly precarious as the reigning myths lose legitimacy for the new, diverse, more educated officers who are entering a career that is now marked by professionalism, accountability and oversight.

It appears that the frustration officers feel about their work can reinforce the solidarity between officers. Cynicism among police officers is a commonly reported feature of police culture, in which officers are pessimistic and have suspicious outlooks towards their jobs, the public and society as a whole (Caplan, 2003). Officers continually commented on how they saw the failings of the criminal justice system, for example how they work hard to arrest an offender, follow all the necessary policies and procedures to ensure the arrest cannot be thrown out in court, only to see the person that they arrested get released and then have to arrest them again later in the week. This frustration also led to officers reporting that they often felt that the justice system did not provide enough support for victims of crime, while seemingly favouring the offenders. This was not surprising when considering the survey findings which saw a large percentage of officers disagreeing that restorative justice provide closure for victims, that it is an empowering process for victims, and that it takes into account the needs of the victims of crime. This frustration towards the criminal justice system may affect some officer's decisions to use restorative justice in their work. If they adopt a "nothing works" attitude and are frustrated with the ways in which the criminal justice system functions, they may be less likely to pursue options that they think are "soft" on offenders like RJ.

Policy Recommendations

Results from this study suggest several ways to improve policy. Officers continuously noted that education, or lack thereof, is a major factor to the use of RJ in frontline policing. While officers are given pre-shift seminars about RJ, this may not always be enough. It appears that officer education can be improved, which may come through providing them with more in-depth training about the theoretical and philosophical background of RJ and how they can incorporate this into their work. It is important that RJ is easily accessible to officers because if the requirements are burdensome on police officers, they will not use it. Other options could include having specific officers who are highly trained in RJ, where they can disseminate their knowledge throughout their cohort, and be a resource for fellow officers and aid them in making RJ decisions, or even take over the RJ process from their peers.

Further, the impact supervisors can have on the RJ process should not be understated. By having supervisors more involved in the RJ referral process by bringing it to the attention of officers, frontline officers may begin to bring RJ off of their "backburner" and to the forefront of their work. Either way, there should be more top-down influence from managers to frontline officers to think of RJ more often.

It is important that officers can see the outcomes of the policies and programs that they use in order to avoid them adopting a "nothing works" attitude. To convince officers to adopt evidence-based practices or new initiatives they must experience the benefits of science-based decision making directly (Willis & Mastrofski, 2017). Policies should look to provide officers with more information about the offenders that they have diverted for officers to see an individual's progress through programming. With officers being able to see more of the process, this might change their thinking about how RJ can be effective for both the victim and offender.

Another important issue that should be addressed is Indigenous people's involvement in RJ. Unfortunately, many Indigenous people have had experiences with the criminal justice system and the police which may preclude them from consideration for diversion. Policies should look to increase options for the diversion of Indigenous people away from the formal system. This can be achieved through a different criterion specifically for Indigenous people that acknowledge issues of race and colonialization and offers them increased opportunity to access RJ programs.

Limitations and Future Research

The lack of exploration of the views of police management was one of the primary limitations of this study; this research only considered frontline officers' perspectives of police culture and restorative justice. While this perspective is important because frontline officers are the ones that are most often engaging with and executing policies and procedures, research has found that there are differences between the views of frontline officers and upper management (Stockdale, 2015). It is important to gather information about how management thinks of restorative justice and police culture and how they understand how the two concepts interact. Future research should look to examine this distinction further and explore these differences to gather information on the types of barriers to policies and procedures that occur at a management level, and how they differ from those on the frontline.

Another limitation was that this research only gathered the perspectives of officers in a single police division. This division is located in a high crime, low-income area and there are likely differences of opinion between officers in this area compared to others based on the type of situations that the officers most come into contact with. The potential for difference of opinion among officers in different police divisions was raised by several officers during interviews, as

they noted that officers in lower crime areas may perceive RJ differently. Being conducted in a single police division limits the survey findings generalizability.

Officers who held negative views of RJ may have self-selected themselves out of the surveys and even within the survey pool the qualitative interview subsample may have been comprised of police with more favourable opinions of diversion then others. The scales on restorative justice use and understanding were not factor analyzed nor tested extensively on large samples and their internal consistency could have been stronger on the police culture variables. The barriers identified by officers in Division 13 may occur more frequently in the North End, so some findings may only relate to this policing environment. Further research should examine the attitudinal differences across different police divisions and organizations. Paoline (2003) explicates that organizations that are embedded within an occupation also exert cultural influences on members, therefore it is important to explore these differences in greater detail. Officers in this study were consistent across workgroups, showing littler variation, but that is not to say that officers in other divisions will share the same thoughts and feelings about police culture and RJ. Further, officers in other organizations may maintain different cultural beliefs, and organizational tendencies compared to the WPS. Future research should explore these differences to get a clearer picture of the functioning of RJ and police culture in Canada.

Future inquiry should look to determine how RJ can effectively function within the criminal justice system without being co-opted by the system itself. This should include further research into how police officers use RJ. Future research should also look at the possible generational differences between older and newer officers and their views on police culture, and the effects those experiences have on police decision making. Scholars have identified that old-school officers construct symbolic boundaries and use institutional myths to preserve the status

quo, while new officers are entering a career with increasing professionalism and oversight, and do not attach as much importance to reigning cultural myths (Campeau, 2019). Future research should explore these differences and their impact on restorative justice. Based on their adherence to different cultural myths, do younger and older officers have different opinions on restorative justice and its potential use? Much like Campeau (2019) noted, do younger officers attempt advancement in their policing careers by crossing over these generational boundaries? How does this potentially effect RJ? Future research should examine if this is the case, and how many officers may do this and whether this changes officers' perceptions of restorative justice.

Experience and education play a crucial role in how officers perform their duties (Paoline & Terrill, 2007), and it is important to recognize how these factors may impact the use of RJ. Future research should look to examine how officers level of education and experience effects their perception of restorative justice and police culture; are officers who are more educated more likely to use RJ? Or based on their experience and on the job knowledge, are older officers more likely to use RJ?

Chapter 7 – Conclusion

Restorative justice has achieved a level of support and acceptance by many because of what it promises to provide: a kinder justice system, an alternative to adversarial measures, closure for victims, offenders, and their community, and less use of incarceration. Based on these promises, RJ has expanded extensively within Canada; in the mid-1990's amendments were made to the *Criminal Code* which outlined how RJ principles should be used in the Canadian criminal justice system. In 1996 Bill-C41 or *An Act to Amend the Criminal Code (Sentencing) and Other Acts in Consequence* outlined how RJ principles should be used in sentencing decisions, and in *R v. Gladue* the Supreme Court of Canada outlined that Bill – C41 had two purposes: to reduce prisons populations, and to expand the use of RJ principles in sentencing. At the federal level the *Criminal Code* and other acts like the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*, the *Victims Bill of Rights*, and the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* make reference to and enable the use of RJ processes in the criminal justice system. More recently, Manitoba has incorporated more RJ measures as many have begun to question the provinces' established model of criminal justice. In the spring of 2014, the province of Manitoba introduced Bill 60, the *Restorative Justice Act*, which aims to promote the development and use of RJ programs in Manitoba and enhance community-based solutions to crime by providing a framework for expanding RJ solutions. Since the establishment of the *Restorative Justice Act*, Manitoba has continued to emphasize the use of RJ. In their Criminal Justice System Modernization Strategy, the government of Manitoba emphasized the use of RJ to improve public safety, reduce court delays, and to reduce reliance on incarceration and Indigenous overrepresentation in the justice system. Recently, Manitoba has focused on expanding police participation in early case

diversions to help address the root causes of offenders behaviour and to incorporate more Indigenous cultural practices into the justice system.

The Winnipeg Police Service have since followed suit and expanded their use of restorative justice with the development of their Restorative Justice Diversion Program, where frontline police are responsible for making decisions on whether offenders should be diverted from the criminal justice system into a restorative justice program. With the increased emphasis being placed on police involvement in RJ, this research set out to examine how police culture may impact the use among frontline police officers, as well as their understanding and attitudes towards restorative justice. Police officers hold a difficult position as the gate keepers of the criminal justice system, where they have a tremendous amount of power and responsibility, and the ability to bring someone into or keep them out of the system. This research set out to determine frontline police officers attitudes and understanding of police culture and restorative justice and examine how these two concepts interact and understand whether police culture presents barriers to the use of restorative justice. There is a police culture, one according to this research that is marked by solidarity among fellow officers, feelings of frustration, a belief in tough on crime policing and a crime fighting attitude. Even considering these findings, officers showed a general acceptance and understanding of restorative justice and they did note its importance in the current criminal justice system. Officers perceived restorative justice as a tool, or as a justice mechanism (Daly, 2016) for them to use throughout their duties. However, these perceptions have not resulted in significant use of RJ (Broschuk & Weinrath, 2018) and there were several barriers found to increasing the use of restorative justice. Officers perceived restorative justice as an option other than court for people with little to no criminal history, have committed less serious offences and have accepted responsibility for their actions. Relegating RJ

to less serious crimes likely has the unintended neglect of many Indigenous people for diversion because of their history of involvement in the criminal justice system. This speaks to larger systemic issues of race and colonialism that are still present within the criminal justice system; issues that need to be acknowledged and addressed if there is any hope for initiatives like restorative justice to have any meaningful impact on these communities.

Officers also described circumstantial barriers like their policing environment or the nature of the offence or offender, and occupational barriers like their lack of education and their position in the criminal justice system, as preventing them from using RJ more often. Further, this research uncovered some issues to do with the RJ movement itself, and the difficulty it has in keeping its lofty promises of criminal justice reform. Due to the nature of their position, and the fact that many officers maintain a crime fighting attitude, belief in a tough on crime approach and expressed a strong solidarity with other officers, police culture should not be discounted as an overall barrier to restorative justice. While officers in this study showed a consensus about how they perceived police culture, the fact that police culture is fluid and dynamic, and officers may adhere to certain parts of the "traditional" police culture, while neglecting others should not be ignored.

The barriers uncovered during this research shows implementing effective change in policing will depend on integrating realities and experiences of frontline officers and reducing the power of the negative aspects of police culture. This must occur to have officers change from traditional ways of thinking (Wood et al., 2008). It appears that a one size fits all approach to RJ is not effective; RJ initiatives must be attuned to the realities of the communities that they are implemented in, and frontline officers who work in these communities are in a unique position to make this program successful.

References

Abramson, A. M. (2003). Sustainable relationships and competing values: restorative justice

    initiatives and the police - a case study. *Police Practice and Research*, *4*(4), 391–398.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/777308112

Alarid, L. F., & Montemayor, C. D. (2012). Implementing restorative justice in police

    departments. *Police Practice and Research*, *13*(5), 450–463.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2011.607654

Armstrong, J. (2014). Rethinking the restorative–retributive dichotomy: is reconciliation

    possible? *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice*,

    17(3), 362–374. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2014.944796

Ashworth, A. (2002). Responsibilities, rights and restorative justice. *British Journal of*

    Criminology, *42*(3), 578–595. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/42.3.578

Aston, E., Murray, K., & O'Neill, M. (2019). Achieving cultural change through organizational

    justice: The case of stop and search in Scotland. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 1–17.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895819839751

Barberi, D., & Taxman, F. S. (2019). Diversion and alternatives to arrest: A qualitative

    understanding of police and substance users' perspective. *Journal of Drug Issues*, *49*(4),

    703–717. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022042619861273

Barghout, C., Levasseur, J. (2020, March 6). "They just want the violence to end": Restorative

    justice program aims to stop intimate partner abuse. *CBC News Winnipeg.* Retrieved from

https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/winnipeg-police-restorative-justice-partner-violence-1.5478990

Barrile, L. G. (2015). I forgive you, but you must die: Murder victim family members, the death penalty, and restorative justice. *Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-Based Research Policy, and Practice*, *10*(3), 239–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2014.925022

Bayley, D. H. (2016). The complexities of 21st century policing. *Policing (Oxford)*, *10*(3), 163–170. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw019

Bazemore, G., & Griffiths, C. (2003). Police reform, restorative justice and restorative policing. *Police Practice and Research*, *4*(4), 335–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614260310001631244

Bazemore, G., & Maruna, S. (2009). Restorative justice in the re-entry context: Building new theory and expanding the evidence base. *Victims and Offenders*, *4*(4), 375–384. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880903227446

Bellingham, T. (2000). Police culture and the need for change. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles*, *73*(1), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.11387/jsl1951.2006.65_148

Bennett, R. R., & Schmitt, E. L. (2002). The effect of work environment on levels of police cynicism: A comparative study. *Police Quarterly*, *5*(4), 493–522. https://doi.org/10.1177/109861102237692

Bergseth, K. J., & Bouffard, J. A. (2012). Examining the effectiveness of a restorative justice

    program for various types of juvenile offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy*

    and Comparative Criminology, *57*(9), 1054–1075.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X12453551

Bidois, L. M. (2016). The value of restorative justice. *Commonwealth Law Bulletin*, *42*(4), 596–

    613. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050718.2017.1282213

Bolitho, J. J. (2012). Restorative justice: The ideals and realities of conferencing for young

    people. *Critical Criminology*, *20*(1), 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-011-9150-z

Bolitho, J. (2015). Putting justice needs first: a case study of best practice in restorative justice.

    Restorative Justice: An International Journal, *3*(2), 256–281.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/20504721.2015.1069531

Bolivar, D. (2010). Conceptualizing victims' 'restoration' in restorative justice. *International*

    Review of Victimology, *17*(3), 237–265. https://doi.org/10.1177/026975801001700301

Bonta, J. (1998). *Adult offender diversion programs.* Public Safety Canada.

    https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/ffndr-dvrsn/index-en.aspx

Braithwaite, J. (1996). Restorative justice and a better future. *The Dalhousie Review*, *76*(1), 9–

    31. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315200361-15

Braithwaite, J. (2000). Shame and criminal justice. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, *42*(3),

    281–298. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjcrim.42.3.281

Braithwaite, J. (2002). Setting standards for restorative justice. *British Journal of Criminology*, *42*(3), 563–577. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/42.3.563

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper (Ed.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological.* (Vol. 2, pp. 57–71). https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004

Brooks, T. (2017). Punitive restoration and restorative justice. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, *36*(2), 122–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/0731129X.2017.1358930

Broschuk, B., Weinrath, M. (2018). *The Use of Diversion in an Urban Setting*.

Brough, P., Chataway, S., & Biggs, A. (2016). 'You don't want people knowing you're a copper!'' A contemporary assessment of police organisational culture.' *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *18*(1), 28–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461355716638361

Brown, T. C., Baldwin, J. M., Dierenfeldt, R., & McCain, S. (2019). Playing the Game: A qualitative exploration of the female experience in a hypermasculine policing environment. *Police Quarterly*, *0*(0), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611119883423

Bryman, A., Becker, S., & Sempik, J. (2008). Quality criteria for quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods research: A view from social policy. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *11*(4), 261–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570701401644

Butler, M., & Maruna, S. (2016). Rethinking prison disciplinary processes: A potential future for

    restorative justice. *Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-Based*

    Research Policy, and Practice, *11*(1), 126–148.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1117997

Calhoun, A., & Pelech, W. (2010). Responding to young people responsible for harm: A

    comparative study of restorative and conventional approaches. *Contemporary Justice*

    Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice, *13*(3), 287–306.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2010.498238

Campeau, H. (2015). "Police culture" at work: Making sense of police oversight. *British Journal*

    of Criminology, *55*(4), 669–687. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu093

Campeau, H. (2018). "The right way, the wrong way, and the Blueville way": Standards and

    cultural match in the police organization. *Sociological Quarterly*, *59*(4), 603–626.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2018.1483782

Campeau, H. (2019). Institutional myths and generational boundaries: cultural inertia in the

    police organisation. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*,

    29(1), 69–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2017.1371718

Caplan, J. (2003). Police cynicism: Police survival tool? *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice*

    and Principles, *76*(4), 304–313. https://doi.org/10.1350/pojo.76.4.304.25821

Carlan, P. E., & Lewis, J. A. (2009). Dissecting police professionalism: A comparison of

    predictors within five professionalism subsets. *Police Quarterly*, *12*(4), 370–387.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611109348469

Carlson, J. (2019). Police warriors and police guardians: Race, masculinity, and the construction

    of gun violence. *Social Problems*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spz020

Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol

    refinement framework. *The Qualitative Report*, *21*(5), 811–831.

Chan, J. (1996). Changing police culture. *British Journal of Criminology*, *36*(1), 109–134.

    https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a014061

Chan, J. (2007). Making sense of police reforms. *Theoretical Criminology*, *11*(3), 323–345.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480607079581

Chartrand, V. (2019). Unsettled times: Indigenous incarceration and the links between

    colonialism and the penitentiary in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal*

    Justice, *61*(3), 67–89. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2018-0029

Chatterjee, J., & Elliott, L. (2003). Restorative policing in Canada: the Royal Canadian Mounted

    Police, community justice forums, and the youth criminal justice act. *Police Practice and*

    Research, *4*(4), 1–1. https://doi.org/10.1080/777308109

Cohen, R. (2017). The force and the resistance: Why changing the police force is neither

    inevitable, nor impossible. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Law and Social Change*,

    20(2), 1–19.

Comack, E., & Silver, J. (2006). *Safety and security issues in Winnipeg's inner-city communities : Bridging the community-police divide*. Winnipeg, MB, Canada.

Corden, A., & Sainsbury, R. (2006). Using verbatim quotations in reporting qualitative social research: The views of research users. In *Social Policy Research Unit, University of York*. Retrieved from http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/73217/%0Ahttps://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/pubs/pdf/verbusers.pdf

Courtemanche, Z. T. (2015). The restorative justice act: An enhancement to justice in Manitoba? *Manitoba Law Journal*, *38*(2), 1–16.

Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Fifth edition. Los Angeles: SAGE

Crocker, D. (2013). The effects of regulated discretion on police referrals to restorative justice. *The Dalhousie Law Journal*, *36*, 393–418.

Crocker, D. (2015). Implementing and evaluating restorative justice projects in prison. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *26*(1), 45–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403413508287

Crocker, D. (2016). Balancing justice goals: restorative justice practitioners' views. *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice*, *19*(4), 462–478. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2016.1226815

Daly, K. (2001). Revisiting the relationship between retributive and restorative justice. In H.

    Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Restorative Justice: Philosophy to Practice* (1st ed., pp. 33–

    54). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315264851-10

Daly, K. (2002). Restorative justice: The real story. *Punishment & Society*, *4*(1), 55–79.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/14624740222228464

Daly, K. (2016). What is restorative justice? Fresh answers to a vexed question. *Victims and*

    Offenders, *11*(1), 9–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1107797

Demirkol, I. C., & Nalla, M. K. (2017). How does police culture shape officers' support for

    community policing? *Policing and Society*, *0*(0), 1–14.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2017.1410149

Department of Justice Canada. (2017). *Restorative justice legislation and policy.* Retrieved from

    https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/rj-jr/lp.html

Dobchuk-Land, B. (2017). Resisting 'progressive' carceral expansion: lessons for abolitionists

    from anti-colonial resistance. *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and*

    Restorative Justice, *20*(4), 404–418. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2017.1377057

Doyle, L., Brady, A. M., & Byrne, G. (2016). An overview of mixed methods research –

    revisited. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, *21*(8), 623–635.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987116674257

Duxbury, L., Bennell, C., Halinski, M., & Murphy, S. (2018). Change or be changed: Diagnosing

the readiness to change in the Canadian police sector. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice*

and Principles, *91*(4), 316–338. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258x17740317

Feilzer, M. Y. (2009). Doing mixed methods research pragmatically: Implications for the

rediscovery of pragmatism as a research paradigm. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*,

4(1), 6–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689809349691

Fekjær, S. B., Petersson, O., & Thomassen, G. (2014). From legalist to dirty harry: Police

recruits' attitudes towards non-legalistic police practice. *European Journal of Criminology*,

11(6), 745–759. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370814525935

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods

designs — Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, *48*(6), 2134–2156.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

Gaarder, E. (2015). Lessons from a restorative circles initiative for intimate partner violence.

Restorative Justice: An International Journal, *3*(3), 342–367.

https://doi.org/10.1080/20504721.2015.1109334

Gavin, P., & MacVean, A. (2018). Police perceptions of restorative justice: findings from a

small-scale study. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *36*(2), 115–130.

https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.21235

Gavrielides, T. (2008). Restorative justice-the perplexing concept: Conceptual fault-lines and

   power battles within the restorative justice movement. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*,

   8(2), 165–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895808088993

Gavrielides, T. (2017). The victims' directive and what victims want from restorative justice.

   Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-Based Research Policy, and

   Practice, *12*(1), 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2014.982778

Gerkin, P., Walsh, J., Kuilema, J., & Borton, I. (2017). Implementing restorative justice under

   the retributive paradigm: A pilot program case study. *SAGE Open*, *7*(1), 1–10.

   https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017691562

Gottschalk, P., & Gudmundsen, Y. S. (2008). Police culture as a determinant of intelligence

   strategy implementation. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *11*(2),

   170–182. https://doi.org/10.1350/ijps.2009.11.2.121

Gready, P., & Robins, S. (2014). From transitional to transformative justice: A new agenda for

   practice. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, *8*(3), 339–361.

   https://doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/iju013

Griffiths, C. T., Pollard, N., Frank, R., Kitt, L., & Beckstead, L. (2013). *Policing in Winnipeg:*

   An operational review.

Gundhus, H. I. (2012). Experience or knowledge? Perspectives on new knowledge regimes and

   control of police professionalism. *Policing*, *7*(2), 178–194.

   https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pas039

Hagaman, A. K., & Wutich, A. (2017). How many interviews are enough to identify metathemes in multisited and cross-cultural research? Another perspective on Guest, Bunce, and Johnson's (2006) landmark study. *Field Methods*, *29*(1), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X16640447

Harris, N. (2006). Reintegrative shaming, shame, and criminal justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, *62*(2), 327–346. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00453.x

Hill, R. F. A. (2002). Restorative justice and the absent victim: New data from the Thames Valley. *International Review of Victimology*, *9*(3), 273–288. https://doi.org/10.1177/026975800200900303

Hoyle, C., Young, R., & Hill, R. (2002). Proceed with caution: An evaluation of the Thames Valley Police initiative in restorative cautioning. In *Youth Justice* (Vol. 3). https://doi.org/10.1177/147322540300300108

Hoyle, C., & Rosenblatt, F. F. (2016). Looking back to the future: Threats to the success of restorative justice in the United Kingdom. *Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-Based Research Policy, and Practice*, *11*(1), 30–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1095830

Hudson, B. (2002). Restorative Justice and Gendered Violence: Diversion or Effective Justice? *British Journal of Criminology*, *42*(3), 616–634. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/42.3.616

Hudson, B., Hunter, D., & Peckham, S. (2019). Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap: can policy support programs help? *Policy Design and Practice*, *2*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1540378

Huey, L., & Ricciardelli, R. (2015). 'This isn't what I signed up for': When police officer role expectations conflict with the realities of general duty police work in remote communities. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *17*(3), 194–203. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461355715603590

Ibarra, P. R., & Erez, E. (2005). Victim-centric diversion? The electronic monitoring of domestic violence cases. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *23*(2), 259–276. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.639

Ingram, J. R., Paoline, E. A., & Terrill, W. (2013). A Multilevel framework for understanding police culture: The role of the workgroup. *Criminology*, *51*(2), 365–397. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12009

Ingram, J. R., Terrill, W., & Paoline, E. A. (2018). Police culture and officer behavior: Application of a multilevel framework. *Criminology*, *56*(4), 780–811. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12192

Ikpa, T. S. (2007). Balancing restorative justice principles and due process rights in order to reform the criminal justice system. *Washington University Journal of Law & Policy*, *24*(January), 301–325.

Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, *18*(1), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260

Ivankova, N. V. (2014). Implementing quality criteria in designing and conducting a sequential QUAN → QUAL mixed methods study of student engagement with learning applied research methods online. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *8*(1), 25–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689813487945

Joyce, S., & Thompson, K. M. (2017). Do victim impact panels reduce drunk driving recidivism? *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, *5*(2), 251–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/20504721.2017.1343418

Karp, D. R., & Frank, O. (2016). Anxiously awaiting the future of restorative justice in the United States. *Victims and Offenders*, *11*(1), 50–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1107796

Kennedy, M., & Birch, P. (2018). Changing the perception of police culture: recognising masculinity diversity and difference in a "dirty hands" vocation. *Journal of Forensic Practice*, *20*(1), 54–57. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFP-06-2017-0020

Kennedy, J. L. D., Tuliao, A. P., Flower, K. L. N., Tibbs, J. J., & McChargue, D. E. (2019). Long-term effectiveness of a brief restorative justice intervention. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *63*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18779202

Kim, M. E. (2018). From carceral feminism to transformative justice: Women-of-color feminism

    and alternatives to incarceration. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work*,

    27(3), 219–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313204.2018.1474827

Kim, H. J., & Gerber, J. (2012). The effectiveness of reintegrative shaming and restorative

    justice conferences: Focusing on juvenile offenders' perceptions in Australian reintegrative

    shaming experiments. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative*

    Criminology, *56*(7), 1063–1079. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X11418916

Knaak, S., Luong, D., McLean, R., Szeto, A., & Dobson, K. S. (2019). Implementation, uptake,

    and culture change: Results of a key informant study of a workplace mental health training

    program in police organizations in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *64*(Supplement

    1), 30S-38S. https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743719842565

Knox, S., & Burkard, A. W. (2009). Qualitative research interviews. *Psychotherapy Research*,

    19(4–5), 566–575. https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300802702105

Kurtz, D. L., & Upton, L. L. (2018). The gender in stories: How war Stories and police

    narratives shape masculine police culture. *Women and Criminal Justice*, *28*(4), 282–300.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2017.1294132

Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices:

    A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal*, *85*(2), 127–144.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885505276969

Loftus, B. (2008). Dominant culture interrupted: Recognition, resentment and the politics of

    change in an English police force. *British Journal of Criminology*, *48*(6), 756–777.

    https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azn065

Loftus, B. (2010). Police occupational culture: Classic themes, altered times. *Policing and*

    Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy, *20*(1), 1–20.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460903281547

Lub, V. (2015). Validity in qualitative evaluation. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*,

    14(5), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915621406

Maglione, G. (2017). Embodied victims: An archaeology of the 'ideal victim' of restorative

    justice. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *17*(4), 401–417.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895816677172

Maglione, G. (2018). Immature offenders. A critical history of the representations of the offender

    in restorative justice. *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and*

    Restorative Justice, *21*(1), 44–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2017.1413360

Mainwaring, C. J., Bardi, A., & Meek, R. (2019). A glimpse into the role of personal values

    within the restorative justice process: a qualitative study with restorative justice facilitators.

    Contemporary Justice Review, *22*(1), 60–85.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2019.1576131

Manitoba Justice. (2018). *Criminal Justice System Modernization Strategy.* Retrieved from

    https://www.gov.mb.ca/justice/cjsm/pubs/criminaljusticereform.pdf

Malakieh, J. (2019). Adult and youth correctional statistics in Canada, 2017/2018. *The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2019001/article/00010-eng.pdf

Marier, C. J., & Moule, R. K. (2019). Feeling blue: Officer perceptions of public antipathy predict police occupational norms. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *44*(5), 836–857. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-018-9459-1

Marshall, T. (1999). Restorative justice: An overview. In *Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate*. https://doi.org/10.3109/13682822.2010.496763

Marks, M., Howell, S., & Shelly, S. (2016). The fluidity of "police culture": Encountering the contextual complexity of policing street-level drug use. *Policing*, *11*(3), 318–331. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw048

McCold, P. (2003). An experiment in police-based restorative justice: the Bethlehem (PA) project. *Police Practice and Research*, *4*(4), 379–390. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614260310001631271

McCrudden, M. T., & McTigue, E. M. (2019). Implementing integration in an explanatory sequential mixed methods study of belief bias about climate change with high school students. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *13*(3), 381–400. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689818762576

McGrath, A. (2008). The effect of diversion from court: A review of the evidence. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, *15*(2), 317–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/13218710802014477

Mediation Services. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.mediationserviceswpg.ca/court-

    diversion-program

Miller, S. L., & Iovanni, L. A. (2013). Using restorative justice for gendered violence: Success

    with a post-conviction model. *Feminist Criminology*, *8*(4), 247–268.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085113490781

Miller, S. L., & Hefner, M. K. (2015). Procedural justice for victims and offenders? Exploring

    restorative justice processes in Australia and the US. *Justice Quarterly*, *32*(1), 142–167.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2012.760643

Mirsky, L. (2004). *Restorative justice practices of Native American, first nation and other*

    indigenous people of North America: Part one. Retrieved from

    https://www.iirp.edu/pdf/natjust1.pdf

Montgomery, R. (2019). The role of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police in supporting

    the professionalization of police in Canada. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 1–

    12. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pay105

Moreau, G., Jaffray, B., & Armstrong, A. (2020). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada,*

    2019. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/85-002-

    x/2020001/article/00010-eng.pdf?st=r6X-Se5S

Moss, S. A., Lee, E., Berman, A., & Rung, D. (2019). When do people value rehabilitation and

    restorative justice over the punishment of offenders? *Victims and Offenders*, *14*(1), 32–51.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2018.1539688

Myers, K. K., & McPhee, R. D. (2006). Influences on member assimilation in workgroups in high-reliability organizations: A multilevel analysis. *Human Communication Research*, *32*(4), 440–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2006.00283.x

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613

O'Mahony, D., & Doak, J. (2004). Restorative justice - Is more better? The experience of police-led restorative cautioning pilots in Northern Ireland. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *43*(5), 484–505. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2004.00344.x

Onashowewin Justice Circle. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://onashowewin.com/page1.html

Paoline, E. A. (2003). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*(3), 199–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(03)00002-3

Paoline, E. A. (2004). Shedding light on police culture: An examination of officers' occupational attitudes. In *Police Quarterly* (Vol. 7). https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611103257074

Paoline, E. A., & Gau, J. M. (2018). Police occupational culture: Testing the monolithic model. *Justice Quarterly*, *35*(4), 670–698. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2017.1335764

Paoline, E. A., Myers, S. M., & Worden, R. E. (2000). Police culture, individualism, and community policing: Evidence from two police departments. *Justice Quarterly*, *17*(3), 576–605. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820000094671

Paoline, E. A., & Terrill, W. (2007). Police education, experience, and the use of force. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *34*(2), 179–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854806290239

Paterson, C., & Clamp, K. (2012). Exploring recent developments in restorative policing in England and Wales. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *12*(5), 593–611. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895812441933

Pavlich, G. (2002). Deconstructing restoration: The promise of restorative justice. In E. G. M. Weitekamp & H.-J. Kerner (Eds.), *Restorative Justice: Theoretical Foundations* (1st ed., pp. 451–460). Willan Publishing.

Pindera, E. (2019). Winnipeg murder rate skyrockets in 2019, criminal justice expert points to long-term solutions. *Global News.* https://globalnews.ca/news/6349714/winnipeg-murder-rate-criminal-justice-expert-solutions/

Prenzler, T. (1997). Is there a police culture? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, *56*(4), 47–56. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01445151011029745

Ravenek, M. J., & Rudman, D. L. (2013). Bridging conceptions of quality in moments of qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *12*(1), 436–456. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691301200122

Reiner, R. (2017). Is police culture cultural? *Policing (Oxford)*, *11*(3), 236–241. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw046

Richards, K. (2014). A promise and a possibility: The limitations of the traditional criminal

   justice system as an explanation for the emergence of restorative justice. *Restorative

   Justice*, *2*(2), 124–141. https://doi.org/10.5235/20504721.2.2.124

Robinson, J., & Hudson, J. (2016). Restorative justice: A typology and critical appraisal.

   Willamette Journal of International Law and Dispute Resolution, *23*(2), 335–366.

Roberts, J. V., & Reid, A. A. (2017). Aboriginal incarceration in Canada since 1978: Every

   picture tells the same story. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *59*(3),

   313–345. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2016.E24

Rodriguez, N. (2007). Crime & delinquency restorative justice at work : Examining the impact of

   restorative justice recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, *53*(3), 355–379.

   https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705285983

Rye, B. J., Hovey, A., & Waye, L. (2018). Evaluation of a restorative justice-based, community-

   based program for people who have offended sexually: participant impact. *Contemporary

   Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice*, *21*(3), 276–298.

   https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2018.1494373

Santos, R. B., & Santos, R. G. (2012). The role of leadership in implementing a police

   organizational model for crime reduction and accountability. *Policing*, *6*(4), 344–353.

   https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pas029

Saville Young, L. (2016). Key concepts for quality as foundational in qualitative research:

Milkshakes, mirrors and maps in 3D. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *46*(3), 328–337.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246316630146

Shannon-Baker, P. (2016). Making paradigms meaningful in mixed methods research. *Journal of*

Mixed Methods Research, *10*(4), 319–334. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689815575861

Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Colledge, E., Dignan, J., Howes, M., … Sorsby, A.

(2006). Situating restorative justice within criminal justice. *Theoretical Criminology*, *10*(4),

505–532. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480606068876

Shapland, J. (2014). Implications of growth: Challenges for restorative justice. *International*

Review of Victimology, *20*(1), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758013510808

Silver, J. R., Roche, S. P., Bilach, T. J., & Bontrager Ryon, S. (2017). Traditional police culture,

use of force, and procedural justice: Investigating individual, organizational, and contextual

factors. *Justice Quarterly*, *34*(7), 1272–1309.

https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2017.1381756

Silvestri, M. (2017). Police culture and gender: Revisiting the "cult of masculinity." *Policing*

(Oxford), *11*(3), 289–300. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw052

Skogan, W. G. (2008). Why reforms fail. *Policing and Society*, *18*(1), 23–34.

https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460701718534

Smirl, E. (2019). The Inequality of substance use, problematic use, and drug-related harms. In

    State of the Inner City: Forest for the Trees: Reducing Drug and Mental Health Harms in

    the Inner City of Winnipeg (pp. 4–13). Winnipeg, MB: Canadian Centre for Policy

    Alternatives Manitoba.

Solilak, G. (2017, December 5). Manitoba axes, shrinks 25 government-appointed boards. *CBC*

    News, Retrieved from https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/manitoba-government-

    boards-cut-1.4432693

Southern Chiefs' Organization. (2019). Retrieved from http://scoinc.mb.ca/programs/justice/

Speed, J. (2020). Restorative justice: Emergence, institutionalization, and critiques. *Peace,*

    Justice and Strong Institutions, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71066-2_54-1

Stockdale, K. J. (2015). Police understandings of restorative justice—the impact of rank and role.

    Restorative Justice: An International Journal, *3*(2), 212–232.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/20504721.2015.1069528

Stroshine, M., Alpert, G., & Dunham, R. (2008). The influence of "working rules" on police

    suspicion and discretionary decision making. *Police Quarterly*, *11*(3), 315–337.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611107313029

Taxman, F. S. (2010). Probation and diversion: Is there a place at the table and what should we

    serve? *Victims and Offenders*, *5*(3), 233–239.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2010.485903

Terrill, W., Paoline, E. A., & Manning, P. K. (2003). Police culture and oercion. *Criminology*, *41*(4), 1003–1034.

Terpstra, J., & Schaap, D. (2013). Police culture, stress conditions and working styles. *European Journal of Criminology*, *10*(1), 59–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370812456343

Terpstra, J., & Fyfe, N. R. (2015). Mind the implementation gap? Police reform and local policing in the Netherlands and Scotland. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *15*(5), 527–544. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895815572162

Tomporowski, B. (2014). Restorative justice and community justice in Canada. *Restorative Justice*, *2*(2), 218–224. https://doi.org/10.5235/20504721.2.2.218

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(10), 837–851. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121

Tracy, S. J., & Hinrichs, M. M. (2017). Big tent criteria for qualitative quality. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0016

Van Camp, T., & Wemmers, J. (2013). Victim satisfaction with restorative justice: More than simply procedural justice. *International Review of Victimology*, *19*(2), 117–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758012472764

Waddington, P. (1999). Police (canteen) sub-culture. An appreciation. *British Journal of Criminology*, *39*(2), 287–309. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/39.2.287

Ward, T., & Langlands, R. (2009). Repairing the rupture: Restorative justice and the

    rehabilitation of offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *14*(3), 205–214.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.03.001

Wemmers, J.A. (2002). Restorative justice for victims of crime: A victim-oriented approach to

    restorative justice. *International Review of Victimology*, *9*(1), 43–59.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/026975800200900104

Wemmers, J.A., & Cyr, K. (2004). Victims' perspectives on restorative justice: How much

    involvement are victims looking for? *International Review of Victimology*, *11*(3), 259–274.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/026975800401100204

Willis, J. J., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2017). Understanding the culture of craft: lessons from two

    police agencies. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *40*(1), 84–100.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2016.1174497

Winfree, L. T. (2004). New Zealand Police and restorative justice philosophy. *Crime and*

    Delinquency, *50*(2), 189–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128703252411

Winnipeg Police Service. (2018). *2018 annual statistical report.* Retrieved from

    https://www.winnipeg.ca/police/AnnualReports/2018/2018_wps_annual_report_english.pd
f

Winnipeg Police Service. (2019a). *Winnipeg Police Service strategic plan 2015-2019, 2019*

    update. Retrieved from

    https://winnipeg.ca/clerks/boards/WpgPoliceBoard/pdfs/boardpublications/StrategicPlanU
pdate2019.pdf

Winnipeg Police Service. (2019b). *2019 annual statistical report.* Retrieved from

   https://www.winnipeg.ca/police/AnnualReports/2019/2019AR.pdf

Wood, W. R. (2015). Why restorative justice will not reduce incarceration. *British Journal of*

   Criminology, *55*(5), 883–900. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu108

Wood, J., Fleming, J., & Marks, M. (2008). Building the capacity of police change agents: The

   nexus policing project. *Policing and Society*, *18*(1), 72–87.

   https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460701718583

Wood, W. R., & Suzuki, M. (2016). Four challenges in the future of restorative justice. *Victims*

   and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-Based Research Policy, and Practice,

   11(1), 149–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2016.1145610

Wong, J. S., Bouchard, J., Gravel, J., Bouchard, M., & Morselli, C. (2016). Can at-risk youth be

   diverted from crime? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *43*(10), 1310–1329.

   https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816640835

Zehr, Howard; & Gohar, A. (2003). The little book of restorative justice. In *The Little Book of*

   Restorative Justice. Intercourse, Pennsylvania: Good Books.