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Abstract

This Report proposes a basic model to study the role of institutional dynamics in the context of inter-agency collaboration. It constitutes one of the deliverables of a Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) research project that seeks to develop “high level models of collaboration behaviour and decision making, developing psycho-social conceptual models, and exploring potential mechanisms for overcoming social and cognitive barriers to collaboration. These will contribute to an understanding of how group and individual goals are affected and the effects of team- and organizational-level variables on the collective or shared decision-making process”. The specific purpose of the proposed basic model is to provide a first set of inter-related hypotheses to understand how institutional dynamics can facilitate or hinder inter-agency collaboration in a Canadian domestic context of national emergency, involving among others the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence.

Résumé

Ce rapport propose un modèle de base pour étudier le rôle de la dynamique institutionnelle dans le contexte de la collaboration entre les organismes. Il constitue un des produits livrables d’un projet mené par Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada (RDRC) et qui vise à élaborer des « modèles comportementaux de collaboration et de prise de décisions de niveau supérieur, à créer des modèles conceptuels psychosociaux et à explorer les mécanismes permettant de surmonter les obstacles cognitifs et sociaux à la collaboration. Ces éléments pourront aider à comprendre la façon dont les buts individuels et de groupe sont influencés, ainsi que les effets des variables de l’équipe et de l’organisation sur le processus décisionnel collectif ou partagé ». Le modèle de base proposé a pour but précis de fournir un premier ensemble d’hypothèses inter-reliées permettant de comprendre comment la dynamique institutionnelle peut faciliter la collaboration entre les organismes ou nuire à celle-ci dans un contexte d’urgence nationale canadien où évoluent, entre autres, les Forces canadiennes et le ministère de la Défense nationale.
Executive summary

Understanding the institutional dimension of inter-agency collaboration: The Basic Model

Eric Ouellet; DRDC CSS CR 2012-018; DRDC CSS

Introduction: This Report proposes a basic model to study the role of institutional dynamics in the context of inter-agency collaboration. It constitutes one of the deliverables of a Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) research project that seeks to develop “high level models of collaboration behaviour and decision making, developing psycho-social conceptual models, and exploring potential mechanisms for overcoming social and cognitive barriers to collaboration. These will contribute to an understanding of how group and individual goals are affected and the effects of team- and organizational-level variables on the collective or shared decision-making process”. The specific purpose of the proposed basic model in this report is to provide a first set of inter-related hypotheses to understand how institutional dynamics can facilitate or hinder inter-agency collaboration in a Canadian domestic context of national emergency, involving among others the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence.

Results: This report first introduces the sociological notion of institutional legitimacy in the wider context of understanding how social order is produced and maintained. Some findings from the above mentioned review of the literature will be presented to illustrate how the military and the police forces in Canada, as institutions, founded their social legitimacy. Then the report provides a survey of the three key dynamics upon which institutions are maintaining, reinforcing, and defending their legitimacy. These dynamics, in following the seminal work of Richard Scott,¹ are described as regulative, normative and cognitive. In each case, indicators, sources of data, and methodological issues are discussed. As well, what is known in the literature about the specific idiographic components of these institutional dynamics for Canadian military and police is presented. Lastly, possible rules for encoding these dynamics into a computerized synthetic environment are proposed. The report also looks beyond what Scott’s institutional analysis is proposing, and presents the unconscious dimension of institutional dynamics. In this case too, indicators, sources of data, methodological issues, specific idiographic components of unconscious institutional dynamics for Canadian military and police, and possible rules for encoding are also proposed and discussed. Finally, the report presents a synthetic basic model to study institutional dynamics. Also, it proposes a specific set of hypotheses to be empirically verified on possible points of convergence and divergence between the Canadian military and the police in Canada.

Significance: This report represents a first attempt at formalization of institutional dynamics in a meta-organizational context. Like any formalization process in science, it requires us to leave behind a number of issues to produce a more generic and generalizable analytical construct. It is expected that a more complete model will emerge after the completion of the planned qualitative cases studies. As well, the new data collected through the case study will be integrated into an extensive idiographic dialogue that will help inform some of the micro-sociological dimensions

of inter-agency collaboration. Out of this dialogue, a reinforced and extended formalized model will be generated.

**Future plans:** The inter-related hypotheses presented in the paper will be empirically verified through a series of case studies in a later part of the project, and the content of the basic model will be revised in light of the empirical findings. The ultimate purpose of this model is to provide the transversal “ground rules” for modeling meta-organizational collaboration in a computerized synthetic environment.
Sommaire

Comprendre la dimension institutionnelle de la collaboration entre les organismes : Le modèle de base

Eric Ouellet; DRDC CSS CR 2012-018; RDDC CSS

Introduction: Ce rapport propose un modèle de base pour étudier le rôle de la dynamique institutionnelle dans le contexte de la collaboration entre les organismes. Il constitue un des produits livrables d’un projet mené par Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada (RDDC) et qui vise à élaborer des « modèles comportementaux de collaboration et de prise de décisions de niveau supérieur, à créer des modèles conceptuels psychosociaux et à explorer les mécanismes permettant de surmonter les obstacles cognitifs et sociaux à la collaboration. Ces éléments pourront aider à comprendre la façon dont les buts individuels et de groupe sont influencés, ainsi que les effets des variables de l’équipe et de l’organisation sur le processus décisionnel collectif ou partagé ». Le modèle de base proposé a pour but précis de fournir un premier ensemble d’hypothèses inter-relées permettant de comprendre comment la dynamique institutionnelle peut faciliter la collaboration entre les organismes ou nuire à celle-ci dans un contexte d’urgence nationale canadien où évoluent, entre autres, les Forces canadiennes et le ministère de la Défense nationale.

Résultats : Dans ce rapport, on présente d’abord la notion sociologique de la légitimité institutionnelle pour aider à comprendre de manière plus générale comment l’ordre social est établi et maintenu. Certaines conclusions découlant de l’examen des publications dont on a parlé ci-dessus seront présentées dans le but d’illustrer comment les forces armées et policières du Canada, en tant qu’institutions, ont établi leur légitimité sociale. Le rapport fournit ensuite une étude des trois principales dynamiques sur lesquelles se fondent les institutions pour maintenir, renforcer et défendre leur légitimité. D’après l’ouvrage précurseur de Richard Scott, ces dynamiques sont décrites comme étant régulatrices, normatives et cognitives. Dans chaque cas, on parle d’indicateurs, de sources de données et de problèmes de méthodologie. On présente également les notions relevées dans les publications concernant les composantes idiomorphiques particulières de ces dynamiques institutionnelles adoptées par les forces armées et policières canadiennes. Enfin, on propose des règles qui pourraient régir l’encodage de ces dynamiques dans un environnement synthétique informatisé. Le rapport va au-delà des résultats de l’analyse institutionnelle de Scott, et présente la dimension inconsciente de la dynamique institutionnelle. Ici également, on propose et examine les indicateurs, les sources de données, les problèmes de méthodologie et les composantes idiomorphiques particulières de la dynamique institutionnelle inconsciente des forces armées et policières canadiennes, ainsi que les règles qui pourraient en régir l’encodage. En dernier lieu, le rapport présente un modèle de base synthétique permettant d’étudier la dynamique institutionnelle. Il propose en outre un ensemble précis d’hypothèses qui devront faire l’objet de vérifications empiriques concernant des points de convergence et de divergence possibles entre les forces armées et les forces policières canadiennes.

Importance : Ce rapport représente une première tentative de formalisation de la dynamique institutionnelle dans un contexte méta-organisationnel. Comme dans tout processus de
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formalisation scientifique, nous devons laisser de côté un certain nombre d’enjeux de manière à produire une structure d’analyse plus générique et plus généralisable. Un modèle plus complet devrait être établi suite aux études de cas qualitatives prévues. De même, les nouvelles données recueillies dans le cadre des études de cas seront intégrées à un long dialogue idiographique pour servir de base à certaines dimensions microsociologiques de la collaboration entre les organismes. On s’inspirera de ce dialogue pour produire un modèle formalisé renforcé et plus complet.

**Perspectives :** Les hypothèses inter-reliées qui sont présentées dans le document feront l’objet d’une vérification empirique dans le cadre des études de cas qui seront effectuées dans une phase ultérieure du projet. De plus, le contenu du modèle de base sera révisé à la lumière des conclusions empiriques. Ce modèle a pour but ultime de fournir des « règles de base » transversales pour la modélisation de la collaboration méta-organisationnelle dans un environnement synthétique informatisé.
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1 Introduction

This Report proposes a basic model to study the role of institutional dynamics in the context of inter-agency collaboration. It constitutes one of the deliverables of a research project on the sociological institutional analysis of meta-organizational collaboration, which is itself a component of a larger project entitled “Modeling Meta-Organizational Collaboration and Decision Making”. This project is funded through the Defence Research and Development Canada’s (DRDC) Technology Investment Fund (TIF).

As stated in the project’s original application to the TIF, the overall objective is to develop “high level models of collaboration behaviour and decision making, developing psycho-social conceptual models, and exploring potential mechanisms for overcoming social and cognitive barriers to collaboration. These will contribute to an understanding of how group and individual goals are affected and the effects of team- and organizational-level variables on the collective or shared decision-making process”.

The specific purpose of this proposed basic model is to provide a first set of inter-related hypotheses to understand how institutional dynamics can facilitate or hinder inter-agency collaboration in a Canadian domestic context of national emergency, involving among others the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence. These inter-related hypotheses will be empirically verified through a series of case studies in a later part of the project, and the content of the basic model will be revised in light of the empirical findings. The ultimate purpose of this model is to provide the transversal “ground rules” for modeling meta-organizational collaboration in a computerized synthetic environment. The modeling portion of this research effort will be conducted by other partners involved in this TIF project.

The present basic model has been built on three previously published DRDC Technical Reports, produced under the same TIF project and under the supervision of the writer of the present report. These reports are:

- A review of the literature on sociological institutional analysis entitled “Institutional and Organizational Unconscious Theories: An alternative way for explaining challenges in inter-agency cooperation”;
- A review of the literature of idiographic knowledge produced on the institutional dynamics specific to Canadian military and police forces entitled “The progressive convergence of the military and policing ethos in post-millennial Canada”; and

This report is divided into four sections. The first one introduces the sociological notion of institutional legitimacy in the wider context of understanding how social order is produced and maintained. Some findings from the above mentioned review of the literature will be presented to illustrate how the military and the police forces in Canada, as institutions, founded their social legitimacy. The second section provides a survey of the three key dynamics upon which institutions are maintaining, reinforcing, and defending their legitimacy. These dynamics,
following the seminal work of Richard Scott,\textsuperscript{3} are described as regulative, normative and cognitive. In each case, indicators, sources of data, and methodological issues are discussed. As well, what is known in the literature about the specific idiographic components of these institutional dynamics for Canadian military and police is presented. Lastly, possible rules for encoding these dynamics into a computerized synthetic environment are proposed.

The third component of this report looks beyond what Scott's institutional analysis is proposing, and presents the unconscious dimension of institutional dynamics. In this case too, indicators, sources of data, methodological issues, specific idiographic components of unconscious institutional dynamics for Canadian military and police, and possible rules for encoding are also proposed and discussed. The fourth and last section, in light of the previous sections, presents a synthetic basic model to study institutional dynamics. Also, it proposes a specific set of hypotheses to be empirically verified on possible points of convergence and divergence between the Canadian military and the police in Canada. As stated above, this basic model will be tested empirically at a later date through a series of case studies. However, this basic model is also designed to provide the other partners involved in modeling on this TIF project a starting point and some basic data.

2 Legitimacy, institutions, and social order

The notion of social institution is a fundamental one in social sciences. Society is possible only if there is a degree of cohesiveness and predictability in its fundamental dynamics. Such cohesiveness and predictability are often described as the two pillars of social order. Institutions are in many ways a formalization of these two pillars, as they are made both of rules and sanctions that govern behaviours, and of ways of thinking and feeling that govern attitudes. Behaviours and attitudes, in turn, reinforce each other in maintaining the internal integrity of the institution.

The internal integrity of an institution, however, is never assured, and must be protected, as an institution can also be influenced by environmental forces. Émile Durkheim, the founder of modern sociology, emphasized that any institution can exist only if it serves a social function that can be legitimized. Hence, institutions expend a lot of energy in protecting their legitimacy to face environmental pressures. An institution will engage in substantial adaptation only if the threat coming from the environment against its institutional legitimacy is perceived as presenting more risks to its survival than the risks associated with fundamentally upsetting its internal integrity. In other words, institutions change only if they have no other options available.

The term “institutional analysis” is used by several disciplines, and has several meanings and connotations. This can be very confusing to any new comer into the field, as there is considerable overlap in many of those approaches, and it is more a matter of emphasis than content that really separates the “varieties” of institutional analysis. What they have in common, however, is that they try to explain collective behaviors and organizational arrangements by higher order factors that are not necessarily known to individual agents. Yet, those factors are fully part of the agents’ reality in the form of mentalities, socialization, unconscious norms and values, etc. Institutional analysis attempts, among other things, to uncover those factors to explain collective choices and decisions that appear at first as being counter-productive, if not irrational, without reducing the analysis to the individual’s psyche.

One of the meanings of institutional analysis refers to actual formal institutions. In the biomedical sciences, one can read for example articles with the title: “A multi-institutional analysis of the socioeconomic determinants of breast reconstruction: a study of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network.” Here, the expression “institutional analysis” refers to analyzing data from institutions such as health authorities, hospitals networks, etc. Similarly, in the sciences of education, one can read titles such as “Problems and Possibilities in the Pursuit of Diversity: An Institutional Analysis.” Or, in Public Administration and Governance Studies, articles show titles like this one: “Dawn of e-government – an institutional analysis of seven
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initiatives and their impact.” In these two cases, the term refers to how school boards and
government agencies, respectively, implement policies.

Another meaning refers to institutions as ways of thinking that have a direct impact on collective
behaviors. Under this category, there are several variations and usages of the institutional
analysis. Best known is the analysis of economic institutions to explain why economic behaviors
do not conform to the theory of supply and demand. For instance, this type of analysis tries to
explain why many people prefer to buy expensive Champagne instead of cheaper sparkling wine,
even if they taste the same. This is a relatively old school of thought that has its roots in
economics thinkers of the early 20th century, such as Pareto. One of the most prominent
contemporary figures of this approach is Douglass North, who received the Nobel Prize for
Economics in 1993. Sociology has also been using institutional analysis since its inception to study how social
institutions such as the law or the family evolve over time. The foundational author of this
approach is Émile Durkheim, also founder of sociology as a discipline.

Since the 1980s, however, there is a fair degree of cross-pollination between the sociological and
economic traditions in institutional analysis, led by some organizational sociologists and micro-
economists. Their purpose is to explain how organizations and individuals within organizations
make economic and managerial decisions. Implicit in this approach is the idea that there are non-
 rational and non-economic, and non-psychological factors that explain why organizations in a
given industry or sector tend to organize themselves in similar fashion. This movement produced
what is known as the New Institutional Analysis; however it contains at least two main
“versions.” One of those versions leans more towards the side of economics, and tries to improve
economic models based on the theory of the Public Choice. One of the applications is known
under the expression IAD framework (Institutional Analysis and Development). The other
version is influenced by organizational sociology and tends to integrate Max Weber’s classical
work on bureaucratic mentality (a.k.a. ideal-types). It aims at identifying higher-level factors
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institutional analysis of seven initiatives and their impact”. Journal of Information Technology 22(1): 13-
23.
9 His two seminal books were: Davis, Lance and Douglass North. (1971) Institutional Change and
American Economic Growth. London: Cambridge University Press; and North, Douglass and Robert
University Press.
10 Some key books to understand this approach are the classical Durkheim, Émile. (1995) [1915] The
elementary forms of religious life. New York: Free Press; and (1983) [1922] The division of labour in
11 A key work is Ostrom, Elinor. (1990) Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for
12 A key work for this stream is: Di Maggio, Paul J. and Walter Powell (Eds.). (1991). The new
13 Max Weber is well-known for his study of bureaucracy, and how Protestant ethics is responsible for the
rise of modern capitalism. See Weber, Max. (1978). Economy and society. Berkeley, University of
California Press; and (1976) [1904]. The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism. London : Allen &
Unwin.
contribution to the social construction of organizational realities to interpret the endurance of
taken-for-granted organizational forms and practices.

It is also useful to underline another influential tradition using institutional analysis that has a lot
in common with the New Institutional Analysis in terms of content, but that had a distinct and
separate genesis. The French school of institutional analysis remains closer to Durkheimian
analysis of social institutions, but has a strong anthropological bent along the school of thought
established by Marcel Mauss. It has taken into account, since the early 1970s, the ideas
developed by post-structuralist thinkers such as Cornelius Castoriadis and Michel Foucault.
The main thrust of this approach is the identification of hidden forms of power that institute
behaviors and organizational procedures. This approach has been used extensively in education
to create teaching environments more open to diversity and offering better integration for students
with different learning styles, social class backgrounds, etc.

For the purpose of this project, the sociological “version” of the new institutional analysis will be
the key foundation, as there is already another sub-group of this overall TIF project emphasizing
the economic “version”.

2.1 Institutional legitimacy and the instruments of the state

The military institution as emerged in Europe during the late Middle Ages through a number of
key transformations, of which the creation of national states stands at the core. As Charles Tilly
wrote:

In between tribute-taking empires and city-states stand national states – built around
war, state-making, and extraction like other states, but compelled by bargaining over
the subject population’s cession of coercive means to invest heavily in protection,
adjudication, and sometimes even production and distribution.

In other words, the state and its military power evolved from a context of predatory barons and
lords to one where the ruler had to “negotiate” with the subjects. The foundational legitimacy,
Hence, of the armed forces resides in this balance and negotiation, where the power of using
physical violence is allowed by the rules as long as the subjects can benefit from such power
granting attitude. Overtime, this evolves into a:

14 Marcel Mauss was the nephew and close collaborator of Durkheim. Mauss is one of the founders of
cultural anthropology, and his well-known for his work on the institutional dimension of gift giving in pre-
modern societies. See Mauss, Marcel. (1969). The gift: forms and functions of exchange in archaic
societies. London: Cohen & West.


16 Well-known in social sciences for his work on the history of the genesis of psychiatry and modern

17 Among some key authors of this school are: Lapassade, Georges. (2006) Groupes, organisations,

22.
transition to direct rule gave rulers access to citizens and the resources they controlled through household taxation, mass conscription, censuses, police systems, and many other invasions of small-scale social life. But it did so at the cost of widespread resistance, extensive bargaining, and the creation of rights and perquisites for citizens. Both the penetration and bargaining laid down new state structures, inflating the government’s budgets, personnel, and organizational diagrams. The omnivorous state of our own time took shape.19

It is in this context that the classical sociologist Max Weber declared that “a state is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory.”20 In this light, both the military and police force find themselves at the heart of modern state as an institution. Yet, legitimacy is not something automatically granted, even if both sides deliver their part of the bargain. In the Western world, the source of legitimacy has evolved around the notion of rationality and legality. Once again, as Weber wrote nearly a century ago,

Finally, there is domination by virtue of ‘legality,’ by virtue of the belief in the validity of legal statute and functional ‘competence’ based on rationally created rules. In this case, obedience is expected in discharging statutory obligations. This is domination as exercised by the modern ‘servant of the state’ and by all those bearers of power who in this respect resemble him. It is understood that, in reality, obedience is determined by highly robust motives of fear and hope […]21

This notion that there are rules, necessary to establish legitimacy, and yet there are other “real” factors such as fear and hope upon which legitimacy works is the key to institutional analysis.

2.2 The military

In view of the above, the key question is what are those factors that beyond rules and rationality? And more specifically, what are those factors in the contemporary Canadian context?

The Canadian Forces, as both a formal organization and the salient portion of the military institution in Canada, seek like any other military organization to preserve it legitimacy. In the Canadian context, one of the well-known determinants is the apparent lack of serious military threat to the integrity of the state. Between the end of the Second World War and the fall of the Berlin Wall, the institution was able to invoke Canada’s contribution to fend off the Soviet threat. With the end of the Cold War however, the issue of the legitimacy became once salient. If the armed forces were able to exist in segregated culture from the rest of the society because the tasks of the Cold War were in many ways straightforward, the post-Cold War brought tasks that were substantially more complicated.

19 Ibid, p. 25.
21 Ibid., p. 79.
The Canadian Forces were involved in a number of peacekeeping missions during the Cold War, which required more than simply using “legitimate violence”. But it is mostly after the end of Cold War that new forms of peacekeeping missions emerged, involving the needs for capabilities on the ground (e.g., cultural awareness, political understanding of complex situations, extensive need for quality human intelligence, etc.). In all cases, however, these missions were not critical to protect the survival of the Canadian state.

The Canadian Forces were then facing a double legitimacy challenge. On one hand, the legitimate use of force to defend the state could hardly be invoked in the context of peacekeeping missions. Hence, peacekeeping was to become the “bread and butter” of the institution to justify its raison d’être in spite of being in dissonance with the warrior ethics of being ready to fight conventional forces. On the other hand, the military needed to generate new non-traditional military capabilities that would require significant changes in the collective psyche of the institution, namely having a well educated and intellectually flexible officer corps, and its personnel much more in touch with the Canadian society and the civilian “way of doing business”. This became particularly true after the Somalia affair in the 1990s. Failing the move away from the “automated” responses and profound anti-intellectualism prevalent during the Cold War meant that the armed forces were at risk of losing credibility and legitimacy.

The present mission in Afghanistan represents an interesting case where the military institution although officially engaged in a task akin to peacekeeping where cultural and tribal issues are often invoked to underline the mission’s complexity and human character, it can also assuage its repressed military ethos by pursuing counterinsurgency operations where the use of legitimate violence is authorized. In spite of a number of announcement linked to the creation of psychological warfare, CIMIC, cultural analysis, human intelligence and other capabilities, these remain marginal efforts if compared to energy spent on ensuring the success of the “kinetic” aspects of the mission. What the Afghan mission illustrates is that the military has to ensure legitimacy on two fronts: one external, in doing accepted peacekeeping missions and one internal in allowing the warrior ethos to express itself.

This external/internal legitimacy issue is not unique to the Canadian Forces, as the report of French Army in Algeria, mentioned in the introduction, clearly illustrates. Furthermore, it is also possible to state that, like in the case of the French military, the Canadian military institution is likely to favor internal legitimacy over the external one. This can be clearly shown by the amount of energy that was spent and the time it took for the Canadian Forces to abide to the Somalia Commission compared to the enthusiasm and the relatively quick endorsement of counterinsurgency doctrines and to a lesser extent practice to handle the Afghan mission.

Schematically, then, it can be said that the institutional dynamics of the military follows an order of preferences. Any change or decision leading to increasing conventional military effectiveness remains the favored bias. Second, any change or decision that can allow the warrior ethos to be expressed will be pursued. Last, externally mandated changes or decisions will be implemented. If this is correct, then at the macroscopic level, any inter-agency collaboration to handle a non-military domestic crisis will be pursued to a degree as high as the external threat to legitimacy of the institution will be, but limited intrinsic energy might be spent if it does not have substantial internal legitimacy. In other words, rules and orders from civilian authority will be respected but enthusiasm and commitment are likely to be only on the surface.
2.3 The police

Control of crime, deviance and social order has always been the business of police. In a way, the police represent the internal version of the state’s monopoly of legitimate violence. However, contrary to the military, this violence, actual or potential, is aimed at those who are perceived as undermining the internal foundations of state stability. In turn, state stability is dependent on a stable social order. If the means of coercion have not changed much in the last 150 years, it is clear that the deep narrative supporting social order has changed. Hence, it is not surprising that the police, as state’s institution had to adapt to the new narrative in order to preserve its legitimacy and it is presently in a state of flux.

Pressures for change are particularly visible for the RCMP, Canada’s federal police force. As social liberalism is gaining greater credence, the RCMP’s role in maintaining social order based on older and more conservative assumptions is becoming increasingly dysfunctional, and damaging its legitimacy. In this context, RCMP professionalism, practices and values have gained increasing media scrutiny with such controversies as the APEC “pepper spray” incident, the unprecedented income trust investigation during the 2006 federal election, and the questionable cooperation with foreign organizations in the apprehension and deportation of Maher Arar.

A typical institutional reflex, exercise under external pressures to change, is to retreat to what the institution knows best, and towards the core historical values of the institution. Empirically it translated in its slow response to affirmative action in recruitment, its lost of the national security mandate with the creation of CSIS and attempt to regain it through becoming an intelligence-led police force after 9/11, the low status it gave to community policing, and its reluctance to share intelligence with other “non-national” police force. It appears that the RCMP is unconsciously retreating into its long paramilitary history and its modeling after the Royal Irish Constabulary as a Defender of the Realm.

In the case of the local police force, local pressures tend to be the dominant external forces on the institution. As shown in Toronto and Montreal, the police force had to eventually accept affirmative action in recruiting, and develop new practices in community policing to interact with the increasingly non-Caucasian population living in large urban centers. The flip side of this institutional dynamics is that a local police force’s legitimacy is rarely affected by pressures linked to national issues such as national security. The need to collaborate at that level would only occur on an ad hoc basis when local legitimacy may be simultaneously at stake with national legitimacy, such as major events like the Olympics, G20 summits, and the like.

For the provincial police forces (Ontario and Quebec), it would appear that they are in an “in-between” context where environmental pressure can be both coming for local pressures (e.g. improving response time on highways) and from national issues such as handling aboriginal political actions (such as Ipperwash, Caledonia, and Oka).
Schematically, then, it can be said that the institutional dynamics of the police in Canada is greatly dependent on where the legitimacy base is located. Any change or decision for the RCMP is more likely to occur if it can be crafted along a national security legitimacy framework, and where it can establish a legitimacy preserve of its own, as it is competing with other federal agencies like CSIS. Local police forces are more likely to enact change or take decisions if it is crafted along its local sources of legitimacy such as community relations, and municipal budgetary issues. If these assumptions are correct, then at the macroscopic level, different legitimacy frames will be required to ensure inter-agency collaboration from various police forces. It is possible that such frames may be mutually exclusive, impeding any true collaboration. From that point of view the military institution may not be able to handle different legitimacy frames for each police.
3 Defence of institutional legitimacy

The basic model is built on a number of assumptions that require empirical validation. The following section constitutes a “blue print” to validate the assumptions discussed in the previous section. It is based on Richard Scott’s model of institutional analysis, with an emphasis on developing rules that can be translated into a computational model.

3.1 Regulative dimension

The first pillar is defined as regulative and encompasses the notion of social predictability. It is made of both formal and informal rules, regulations, laws, and sanction systems.

3.1.1 Indicators

- The rise and decline in military and police budget can be used as an indicator to assess the popular support for these institutions, which in turn help to assess how strong or precarious is their respective legitimacy basis.
- The number of complaints to respective Ombudsman, and the qualitative intensity of media coverage of such complaints.
- Qualitative assessment of public statements from public officials discussing the quality of inter-agency cooperation.
- Interviewees’ qualitative comments on how the rules and regulations have affected inter-agency collaboration in previous cases known to them. Rules should emerge as empirical research is conducted.

3.1.2 Possible rules for encoding

- Ongoing increase in military budget reinforces the warrior ethos of the military, and sense of legitimacy. Will demand more adaptation to its own needs when collaborating.
- Ongoing decrease in military budget diminishes the warrior ethos of the military, and sense of legitimacy. Will retreat to issues related to conventional warfare when having to collaborate.
- Ongoing increase in RCMP budget reinforces its national security ethos, and sense of legitimacy. Will demand more adaptation to its own needs when collaborating.
- Ongoing decrease in RCMP budget diminishes its national security ethos, and sense of legitimacy. Will retreat to issues related to national policing when having to collaborate.
- Ongoing increase in local police budget reinforces its crime fighting ethos, and sense of legitimacy. Will demand more adaptation to its own needs when collaborating.
- Ongoing decrease in local police budget diminishes its crime fighting ethos, and sense of legitimacy. Will retreat to issues related to crime fighting when having to collaborate.
- For all institutions, significant increase in negative coverage from Ombudsman complaints or of public statements critical of collaboration will lead to retreating to conventional warfare issues, national policing issues, or crime fighting, respectively.
3.2 Normative dimension

Social cohesion is possible if a number of implicit values and norms are shared about what is desirable and legitimate, and these shared notions form Scott’s second pillar, called the normative pillar.

3.2.1 Indicators

- Increase or sustained number of narratives about internal problems within the institution, in the public domain, which are critical of the non-respect of its norms and values. Usually these narratives are based on lower ranking members’ feelings of betrayal towards the higher up.
- Interviewees’ qualitative comments on how institutional norms and values have affected inter-agency collaboration in previous cases known to them. Rules should emerge as empirical research is conducted.

3.2.2 Possible rules for encoding

- An increased or sustained number of narratives about internal problems within the institution will increase the number of decisions aimed at restoring the image of the institution, irrespective of their actual impact on its efficacy or efficiency in achieving formal mandate. The direct impact is that in such context a lower number of decisions useful for inter-agency collaboration are likely to occur. Conversely, a decrease in such narratives is likely to enable a greater number of decisions useful for inter-agency collaboration.

3.3 Cognitive dimension

The third pillar in Scott’s model, the cultural-cognitive, refers to shared preconceived notions, thought patterns, and worldviews that also contribute to maintaining social cohesiveness.

3.3.1 Indicators

- General level of education between key actors involved in inter-agency collaboration influences the quality of such collaboration.
- Key idiosyncratic themes such as Whole-of-Government (or Comprehensive Approach), Intelligence-based policing, and Community policing are used to frame the nature of inter-agency collaboration.
- Interviewees’ qualitative comments on how institutional cognitive and cultural patterns have affected inter-agency collaboration in previous cases known to them. Rules should emerge as empirical research is conducted.

3.3.2 Possible rules for encoding

- The greater the difference in the general levels of education between key actors involved in inter-agency collaboration, the more difficult the collaboration will be, which will be translated into long timeframes to take decisions. Conversely, the closer the overall education level, the shorter the timeframes for decision-making will be.
• The greater the use of key idiosyncratic themes are used for justifying decisions in the context of inter-agency collaboration, the longer the timeframes to take decisions will be. Conversely, the lesser use of such key idiosyncratic themes, the shorter the timeframes to take decisions will be, which in turn will translate in improved in a greater number of decisions useful for inter-agency collaboration.

3.4 Institutional unconscious

The institutional unconscious can be seen as the deep elements underwriting the normative and cognitive dimensions, which are however unspoken and un-discussed. These elements are profoundly idiosyncratic in nature, but constitute powerful narratives that inform attitudes and perceptions upon which decision are taken.

3.4.1 Indicators

• The ongoing non-discussion, at the public and semi-public level, of central but problematic themes for an institution is symptomatic of unresolved institutional issues. Ongoing unresolved institutional issues tend to enable a greater number of institutional decisions that reinforce “turf protection”. As such central but problematic themes enter the public realm in a substantial fashion, “turf protection” is likely to recede, and inter-agency collaboration more likely.
• Interviewees’ qualitative comments on how institutional non-discussed central and problematic themes have affected inter-agency collaboration in previous cases known to them. Rules should emerge as empirical research is conducted.

3.4.2 Possible rules for encoding

• For the military, the ongoing but un-discussed political decision-makers non-commitment to find an effective solution to the war in Afghanistan reinforces both normative attitudes and cognitive thought patterns prioritizing the military’s effort towards winning the Afghan conflict. In turn, this provides an institutional context where inter-agency collaboration on any other matter is less important, and thus reduces probabilities of effective collaboration.
• For the RCMP, the ongoing but un-discussed “schizophrenic” nature of the institution’s roles, as being both a substitute for local and provincial police forces while being also a national police, reinforces both normative attitudes and cognitive thought patterns prioritizing the higher-end of its national security mandate, where it is in competition for such mandate with other federal agencies. In turn, this provides an institutional context where inter-agency collaboration on the higher-end of its national security mandate is less likely.
• For the local police force, the ongoing but un-discussed increase in militarization (e.g. greater use of SWAT teams, and high power weapons) as a way to focus on the “high-end” of crime fighting reinforces both normative attitudes and cognitive thought patterns prioritizing local criminal issues. In turn, this provides an institutional context where inter-agency collaboration on any other matter is less important, and thus reduces probabilities of effective collaboration.
4 Conclusion

This report represents a first attempt to formalize the findings of this portion of the TIF project. Like any formalization process in science, it requires us to leave behind a number of issues to produce a more generic and generalizable analytical construct. However, the more singular issues related to inter-agency collaboration have not been discarded. It is expected that a more complete model will emerge after the completion of the planned qualitative cases studies. As well, the new data collected through the case study will be integrated into an extensive idiographic dialogue that will help inform some of the micro-sociological dimensions of inter-agency collaboration. Out of this dialogue, a reinforced and extended formalized model will be generated for the modeling members of this TIF project.

It is also important to underline that this basic model, as well as the fuller model to come, should be understood as a “meta-narrative” structure of meta-collaboration that through cascading effects impacts concrete individual decisions. Yet, like any model of collective behavior, it is always open to local and circumstantial influences, as well as to the human capability to reflect and act upon such meta-narrative. Ultimately, this contribution should be considered as a particular installment in a multi-layered project.
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Understanding the institutional dimension of inter-agency collaboration: The Basic Model
This Report proposes a basic model to study the role of institutional dynamics in the context of inter-agency collaboration. It constitutes one of the deliverables of a Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) research project that seeks to develop “high level models of collaboration behaviour and decision making, developing psycho-social conceptual models, and exploring potential mechanisms for overcoming social and cognitive barriers to collaboration. These will contribute to an understanding of how group and individual goals are affected and the effects of team- and organizational-level variables on the collective or shared decision-making process”. The specific purpose of the proposed basic model is to provide a first set of inter-related hypotheses to understand how institutional dynamics can facilitate or hinder inter-agency collaboration in a Canadian domestic context of national emergency, involving among others the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence.

Ce rapport propose un modèle de base pour étudier le rôle de la dynamique institutionnelle dans le contexte de la collaboration entre les organismes. Il constitue un des produits livrables d’un projet mené par Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada (R DDC) et qui vise à élaborer des « modèles comportementaux de collaboration et de prise de décisions de niveau supérieur, à créer des modèles conceptuels psychosociaux et à explorer les mécanismes permettant de surmonter les obstacles cognitifs et sociaux à la collaboration. Ces éléments pourront aider à comprendre la façon dont les buts individuels et de groupe sont influencés, ainsi que les effets des variables de l’équipe et de l’organisation sur le processus décisionnel collectif ou partagé ». Le modèle de base proposé a pour but précis de fournir un premier ensemble d’hypothèses inter-reliées permettant de comprendre comment la dynamique institutionnelle peut faciliter la collaboration entre les organismes ou nuire à celle-ci dans un contexte d’urgence nationale canadien où évoluent, entre autres, les Forces canadiennes et le ministère de la Défense nationale.
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