The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research Volume 11, 2022

Edited by
Steven Kohm, Kevin Walby, Kelly Gorkoff,
Katharina Maier and Alex Tepperman
The University of Winnipeg
Centre for Interdisciplinary Justice Studies (CIJS)
ISSN 1925-2420 (Print)
ISSN 2816-4253 (Online)

"Train up peers, use their experience, whatever your life experience is": Community Mobilization, Peacebuilding, and the "Local Turn"[1]

Mehmet Yavuz (University of Manitoba), Kelly Gorkoff (University of Winnipeg), Nadine Bartlett (University of Manitoba), Natassia D'Sena (University of Winnipeg), and Rebeca Heringer (University of Manitoba)

Abstract

Twelve community mobilization (CM) programs exist throughout Manitoba. CM is a process whereby stakeholders in a community come together to address social issues associated with health and safety, crime prevention, and community development. Based on interviews and document reviews of one CM initiative in the rural community of Winkler, Manitoba and informed by the concept of positive peace (Galtung, 1996) and the "local turn" (Mac Ginty, 2013; Mac Ginty & Richmond, 2013), we describe the Winkler model of CM and examine the presence of peacebuilding indicators. Our analysis shows that CM may hold the potential to enact bottom-up approaches to peacebuilding. We conclude by discussing the possibility of mobilizing communities as a way to build peace by directly addressing causes of crime and attending to problems of liberal equality, standardized governmental control, and the dominance of powerful institutions found in other crime-prevention practices. This paper fills a gap in the literature by seeking to understand the implications of the local turn in community conflict and systemic violence faced by local communities.

Keywords: peacebuilding, local turn, community mobilization, systemic violence, positive peace

[1] In this article, the authors do not make assumptions about the sex/gender of scholars and research participants, thus using they/them pronouns throughout.

Introduction

Community mobilization (CM) initiatives are an increasingly popular type of crime prevention model across much of the Western world. It is a process where diverse stakeholders in a community come together to address social issues associated with health and safety, crime prevention, and community development (Gorkoff, Bartlett, Yavuz, Heringer & D'Sena, 2021). Although often utilizing an individualized risk and case management focus, these initiatives have the capacity to address systemic issues that are strongly correlated with criminal activity, community safety, and well-being. Depending on the social organization of the effort's grounding philosophies, they have the capacity to address systemic social determinants of crime. These determinants are known to lock individuals onto a criminal path, exposing them to increased state surveillance, and include poverty, homelessness, food insecurity, underemployment, colonial trauma, and other conditions of vulnerability.

Responding to this need for community-based prevention, and using models of CM found elsewhere in Canada, twelve CM initiatives were established across Manitoba. These initiatives are all unique, are initiated by local groups, and have developed and/or adapted approaches tailored to local needs. This is important because research into CM has found that depending on how an initiative is organized, it can suffer from standardization, which removes most community input, and can be dominated by a policing agenda that does not allow community agencies to guide the process (Knipe, 2017; Sanders & Langhan, 2019). As such, adapting structures, systems, and services that are deemed to be culturally and contextually appropriate and allowing community needs to guide the process may increase positive outcomes.

In Manitoba, there are different models of CM with each appearing to be firmly located in their respective communities. Although different, common themes among the Manitoba approaches distinguish them from dominant models like the *Hub* and *Situation Tables* found in Saskatchewan and Ontario (Nilson, 2014). These include participant consent, the provision of longer-term support, prioritizing the leadership and participation of community-based organizations, and ensuring the cultural relevance of the support provided.

Literature on peacebuilding focuses on how peace can be brought to communities in conflict. Usually, this conflict is found in a specific national context and is focused on a community at war or in armed conflict (Richmond, 2005, 2014; Chinn, 2013). Studies of crime and peacebuilding tend to focus on how international and organized crime manifests in vulnerable communities such as refugee camps (Braithwaite and D'Costa, 2018). As a way to overcome the reliance on a national/international focus, there has been a shift in peacebuilding literature to emphasize the importance of the local turn. This literature focuses directly on understanding the local environment, local agency, and engagement with local partners. While the local turn has been applied to various international contexts, there is limited scholarship on local peacebuilding in other types of conflict. This paper fills this gap in the literature and seeks to understand the implications of the local turn in crime-prevention programs such as CM. Although Canada is not characterized by war, forced migration, and conflict, it is characterized by high degrees of systemic violence, which manifests in numerous ways including crime and practices of criminalization.

The purpose of CM is to bring all sectors together including policymakers, local state and, federal governments, professional groups, religious groups, businesses, and individual community members to address local issues. Hence, CM initiatives engage in peacebuilding in that their objective is to collaboratively build a harmonious society (Chinn, 2013; Galtung, 1996). In this study, we explore 1) the current debate of local community peacebuilding, 2) how local community peacebuilding is a means of catalyzing local agency, and 3) the extent to which the indicators of local turn peacebuilding are evident in the grounding philosophies and social organization of the Winkler CM initiative, Community Care.

The Definition and Conception of Peacebuilding

Peace is an ideal situation for actors in a conflict, yet conceptualizations of peace are challenging to operationalize practically (Richmond, 2005). States, politicians, international non-profit organizations, institutions, and agencies that consistently focus on peace and emphasize that *peace is the only way* may only manage conflict for a limited period as opposed to transforming communities in sus-

tainable ways. Hence, this approach fails to conceptualize peace. Not only has peace rarely been addressed in detail as a concept in peacebuilding processes by states or its ideological institutions (Byrne & Senehi, 2012), but Richmond (2005) claims the theorization of peace is normally hidden away in debates about how to respond to war and conflict. Although members of communities are invested in everyday peace and prosperity, political elites or states tend to focus on a limited set of interests motivated by needs for security and profit (Richmond, 2014).

In an effort to define peacebuilding, the United Nations Peacekeeping states it as an effort to:

> reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management, and to lay the foundation for sustainable peace and development. It is a complex, long-term process of creating the necessary conditions for sustainable peace. Peacebuilding measures address core issues that affect the functioning of society and the State, and seek to enhance the capacity of the State to effectively and legitimately carry out its core functions. (United Nations Peacekeeping, n.d.)

Although a start, this definition looks like a frame without a picture. It does not define nor specify what actual peacebuilding looks like. Similarly, another UN Agenda for Peace definition defines peacebuilding as an "action to identify and support structures which will tend to solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict" (Boutros-Ghali, 1992, p. 21). In other words, peace is conceptualized as a means to avoid conflict by supporting and upholding measures put in place to ensure order and peace. Özerdem and Lee (2016) ask critical questions about these peacebuilding definitions: "[w]hose peace is it that really matters for peacebuilding actors … what does peacebuilding action look like, who does it?" (p. 1). These questions are vital to understanding conflict and what potential peacebuilding would look like and who benefits from it. Analyzing and questioning this critical part of peacebuilding is crucial for sustainable peace and true reconciliation.

One of the clear and structured definitions of peace was written by

Peggy K. Chinn in their influential book, *Peace and Power*. According to Chinn (2013), peace involves "the commitment to chosen values and actions that consistently bring about harmony, trust, [and] constructive solutions to differences and disagreements … and the process of peace is what you do together" (p. 9). Chinn suggests that the absence of war does not guarantee peace. This notion is closer to what Johan Galtung (1964) argued when they coined the terms "negative peace" and "positive peace" to understand the relationship between peace and violence.

According to Galtung (1996), negative peace is the absence of direct and visible violence and positive peace is social justice. The generally accepted principle of positive peace is the minimization of violence, not only the overt violence of war, but also structural violence (Barash, 2010). Galtung (1996) describes structural violence as the use of force or influence in accordance with established societal structures that prevent people from reaching their full potential and satisfying basic developmental needs. As Galtung suggests, peace should be achieved by harmonious means and create conditions for a sustainable future and a just society. Galtung (1996) further emphasizes the importance of nonviolence and creativeness, and suggests that the transformation (dialogues, conferences, reconciliation, and inside and outside parties) should be peaceful, meaning low on structural and cultural violence. For Galtung, peace is a vital process, hence positive peace goes beyond the absence of war and is concerned with the conditions for lasting peace (Byrne & Senehi, 2012; Galtung, 1996; Mac Guinty, 2006; Richmond, 2014). Galtung's positive peace brings the social justice approach to bear on the impact of power dynamics at both societal and individual levels. This is critical because, historically, most peacebuilding has been liberal, meaning it is controlled by the international/national actors and their institutions. Liberal peacebuilding has not produced peace, but it has traditionally been top-down, and contributed to frozen conflict and structural violence. Peacebuilding, however, requires commitment, action, evolvement, and trust among group members, which contributes to positive peace and a clear and critical vision for sustainable solutions (Chinn, 2013). Therefore, unlike liberal peacebuilding, peace itself requires bottom-up approaches and policies that are developed and implemented with community

members.

Liberal Peacebuilding and the Local Turn Debate

Historically, peacebuilding incorporated a liberal position and relied on top-down solutions in the form of institution-building to achieve its goals (Randazzo, 2017). In liberal peacebuilding, the state and its institutions play a tremendous role to engineer peace. The liberal peace approach focuses on the rule of law, democracy, human rights, vibrant civil society, peace, and security (Richmond, 2014). In liberal peacebuilding, certain actors — typically aligned with the Global North's interests — are involved in peace intervention, which is the dominant form of internationally supported peacemaking (Mac Ginty, 2011). This top-down approach offers a limited picture for sustainable peace because the values of liberal peace are contrary to peacebuilding itself. Liberal peace often reflects the ideological and practical interests (mostly economic) of leading states, international organizations, and international financial institutions (e.g., The International Monetary Fund, World Bank) in the Global North (Mac Ginty, 2011). While this top-down perspective is framed as part of liberal peacebuilding's universalizing inclinations, the bottom-up approach is placed in opposition to those universalizing tendencies (Randazzo, 2017). For instance, traditional peacebuilding relied on liberal state institutions, such as policing and military, for the delivery of services. However, this approach has not worked because policing and the military are designed to maintain order, which does not equate to sustainable peacebuilding. These forces freeze peacebuilding, as demonstrated in Cyprus (Hadjigeorgiou, 2016). More recent examinations of ineffectual liberal peacebuilding were shown to be too shallow, too centralized, or neglected the local context (Leonardsson & Rudd, 2015).

Over the last few decades, the phrase "local turn" has become a buzzword in peacebuilding literature. The term is meant to conceptualize peacebuilding as a local project as opposed to a top-down approach. Many scholars emphasize that national/local ownership is critical to the success of peacebuilding, meaning that peace cannot be forced from the outside but must be progressively developed via a process of accommodation on the part of stakeholders, both public and private (Rosenthal et al., 2015).

Research clearly indicates that engagement in communities and utilizing intersectoral collaboration disrupt traditional security-focused hierarchies and thereby foster inclusion and address inequalities, increasing the possibility for positive peace. Hearing the voices of community members who have lived experience can create lasting peace because sustainable peacebuilding is predicated on locally led systems and processes. A cautionary note: although local stakeholders (both public and private) may comprehend the local dynamics and thus contribute to attaining peacebuilding goals, there is a risk that national ownership may easily slip into control imposed by national/local elites or existing state institutions (Rosenthal et al., 2015).

Lederach (1997) underscores that the greatest resource for long-term peace is always anchored in the local people and their culture. Thus, it is vital to emphasize the importance of local people's visions for peace and acknowledge them as active agents rather than recipients in peacebuilding. In other words, working with locals instead of seeing them as a technical exercise is vital to peacebuilding (Brown & Gusmao, 2012; Randazzo, 2017). Hence, the inclusion of the local context, local communities/actors, and local agencies are stressed in debates about conflict transformation. In situations in which there are ongoing, chronic conflicts, community-based initiatives are particularly beneficial (Braithwaite & D'Costa, 2018; Peace Direct, 2019). Literature, specifically in the field of peace and conflict studies, emphasizes the significant contribution of the local turn in peacebuilding, including decentralization and using local governments, to increase the effectiveness of peacebuilding (Lederach, 1997).

The Local Turn: Bottom-Up Measurements

Sustainable community peacebuilding should always be achieved through local communities (Leonardsson & Rudd, 2015). To do so, peacebuilding practices must be bottom-up. That is, peacebuilding should be proposed, defined, and deployed by local communities (Mac Ginty, 2013). Moreover, Mac Ginty (2013) proposes that peacebuilding should be measured at the local level using bottom-up indicators. The four indicators include: (1) *locally based*: everyday peace indicators reflect the local conditions; (2) *non-prescriptive*:

actions are decided by project participants such as those who have lived experiences; (3) *reflexive and open to change*: practices are flexible and can be modified to achieve desired outcomes; and (4) *safeguarded against elite capture*: actions to reduce the domination by powerful actors and institutions (Mac Ginty, 2013).

Community Mobilization: The Western Context of Crime Prevention

There are many similarities between critiques of non-local, liberal peacebuilding and critiques of Western-based crime prevention. These include the recognition that many causes of crime are housed in structural violence (Chambliss, 1964, 1999; McLaughlin and Muncie, 2006), inequity experienced by communities is conceptualized as a state of conflict (Maynard, 2017; Comack, 2012; O'Grady, 2011), and state institutions, such as policing, courts and corrections, while liberal in their base, do not produce positive peace (Monture-Angus, 1999; Souryal & Whitehead, 2019). CM has been thought to be a locally based solution to crime and community safety and well-being because it activates communities and addresses systems of inequality.

CM programs result from the collective work of a broad range of stakeholders with diverse knowledge, skills, and backgrounds all at the local community level (Jamieson, 2008). These collaborative partnerships and the participation of communities are said to be vital to identify social issues, foster social engagement, and build local capacity and work with the intention to co-produce safety (Minaker et al., 2008; Provan et al., 2005; Roussos & Fawcett, 2000; Hope, 2005). Although intending to mobilize communities to act, these programs have been critiqued as being state-centric and promoting a police agenda (Knipe, 2017; Sanders & Langhan, 2019). Crawford and Evans (2016) state that barriers to successful crime-prevention partnerships include the dominance of a policing agenda, conflicting interests, and the lack of interorganizational trust. Carson (2007) sees the possibility and potential of community and asks how crime prevention can challenge the firm adherence to unreflexive ideas of crime control and encompass practices arising from local contingency and uniqueness in governance. Our research shows that not all CMs are the same (Bartlett, Heringer, & Gorkoff, in press). Opposed to

Ontario and Saskatchewan (which have adopted government-organized, top-down, and centralized programs that tend to be dominated by a policing agenda), in Manitoba, the twelve units operate differently.

Methodology

The current research is a part of a larger two-year study funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) examining all twelve community mobilization initiatives across Manitoba. The purpose of this two-year investigation is to develop a robust understanding of the CM policies and practices, and ultimately to develop frameworks for change. The study received institutional ethical approval from the Education and Nursing Research Ethics Board at the University of Manitoba, and the University Human Research Ethics Board at the University of Winnipeg. For the purposes of this paper, we applied the conceptual framework of the four indicators of local, bottom-up peacebuilding as articulated by Mac Ginty (2013) to Winkler's Community Care program to assess these indicators for relevance to this CM, and to determine if Community Care can be considered a local peacebuilding initiative.

This research employed a qualitative case study methodology. Creswell and Creswell (2018) define a case study as an in-depth exploration of a bounded system; Community Care was the unit of analysis. Data was collected from February 2021–June 2021 during the COVID-19 pandemic when many restrictions for in-person research were in place. The first quarter of the research involved a comprehensive literature review of peacebuilding, including its key indicators, as well as a systematic document review of multiple primary and secondary data sources. The primary sources included policy and program manuals, memorandums of understanding, evaluation reports, brochures, minutes of meetings, funding proposals, and outcome measures associated with Community Care. Secondary sources included websites, community news, and crime statistics from the Winkler area. This information facilitated an in-depth understanding of the local community context, the philosophical underpinnings of Community Care, as well as its organizational structure and processes.

The second quarter of the research involved individual, semi-structured interviews with three representatives of the leadership of Community Care, including two participants who were members of the Steering Committee, and one participant who was a member of the Screening Committee. The interviews were conducted using an online video conferencing tool and were digitally recorded and transcribed. During the interviews, the participants were invited to provide demographic and background information and to describe local needs, the development of the CM initiative, how/whether diverse groups were represented, the leadership and organizational structure, processes and support provided, funding, resources, and outcomes of CM. The interviews averaged ninety minutes each. As the research is ongoing and COVID-19 restrictions are loosening, data is being collected from additional stakeholder groups, including service providers, community members, and individuals who have received direct support from Community Care, which will be reported in subsequent papers.

This case study was informed by a transformative epistemology that seeks to address inequity through social action (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). According to Creswell and Creswell (2018, p. 9), "Transformative research provides a voice for these participants, raising their consciousness or advancing an agenda to improve their lives. It becomes a united voice for reform and change." This paradigm is characterized as political, collaborative, and change oriented.

Analysis

The interview transcripts were coded and deductively analyzed in NVivo using an a priori template of codes approach (Crabtree & Miller, 1999). The template of codes consisted of the four indicators of peacebuilding as outlined by Mac Ginty (2013). According to Gilgun (2013), applying a prior conceptual framework is an important way to conduct qualitative research. They argue that "researchers interested in particular bodies of research and theoretical models cannot nor should they be expected to start anew, or act as if they don't already know something about their areas of interest" (Gilgun, 2013, p. 109). Quotations were analyzed to determine relationships between the indicators of peacebuilding and the

participants' perspectives. Quotations that were associated with each indicator were further analyzed to ensure rigour and agreement through a triangulation among the research team. In order to ensure participants' confidentiality, identifying information (such as participants' specific roles within Community Care) was not included.

Community Care: Winkler's Community Mobilization Program

We begin with a description of the local context followed by a description of Community Care, the CM initiative in Winkler. Subsequently, we use interview data from key stakeholders from Community Care, including two representatives from the Steering Committee and one representative from the Screening Committee, to examine the four indicators of peacebuilding in this context.

The Local Context

Community Care is located in Winkler, which received the status of a city in 2002 and is currently the largest city in the southern Pembina Valley with a population of 12,591 (Statistics Canada, 2016). It was originally settled by Russian Mennonites as well as German and Jewish immigrants in the late nineteenth century, and most of its population continues to be of European origin (73.7 percent) and Mennonite descent. In 2016, 2.5 percent of the population identified as Indigenous, 1.7 percent as South Asian, and 1 percent as Filipino (Statistics Canada, 2016). Winkler is one of the fastest-growing cities in Manitoba, with the population increasing at a rate of 3.9 percent per year over the past fifteen years, and the average age of residents is younger than the provincial average at 32.1 years (City of Winkler, 2021; Town Folio, 2021). Its location in the geographic center of North America has contributed to rapid economic growth in both agricultural and industrial sectors and high rates of in-migration.

The crime severity index in Winkler has been continuously dropping since 2015 — in 2018 it was 54.45 (City of Winkler, 2021). This means that the city has crime rates 37 percent lower than the national average (Area Vibes, 2021). However, these national crime statistics do not reflect the community's experiences of safety and well-being. It is well established that changes in economic conditions and demographics impact crime (Britt, 2019; Wilson, 2018). In 2016, the

police seized a record number of drugs and there was also an increase in violent crime committed by non-residents. In the same year, Winkler's third ever homicide was reported (CBC News, 2017). In 2017, there were thirteen incidents of cocaine trafficking, which on a per capita basis is much higher than the national average. The city is also seeing an increase in methamphetamine use, which is contributing to an increase in other offences including assault and theft (Bruch, 2018). For the purposes of this paper, the social factors contributing to criminal activity can be considered a type of conflict, underscoring a need for intervention. In Winkler's Community Care, the intervention was not focused on an increase in policing and punishment but rather an engagement with the community.

Community Care

In response to increasing needs, in 2016, Central Station, a not-for-profit community center, conducted a needs assessment to obtain the community's perspectives regarding safety and well-being. Through this assessment, the community identified six priorities, which included: mental health; accessibility and awareness of local resources; recreation opportunities; alcohol/drug abuse; crime; and public transportation (Sukkau, 2017). In order to address these issues and other identified issues, including unequal and inaccessible support and service fragmentation, the City of Winkler and local community partners decided to explore models of CM to identify change, target and organize resources, and create and develop strategies to achieve shared goals (Minkler & Wallerstein, 2012). Central Station was identified as the backbone organization to facilitate the process. In 2017, the CM initiative dubbed Community Care was established. Community Care provides case management, service integration, and access to a broad range of natural, community-based supports and professional services, some of which are co-located in Central Station (e.g., a food bank, social housing, counseling, mentorship, parenting support, employment support, and referral to other services). The mission of Community Care is to "bring individuals and families and their supports together to work through complicated life situations and make life better" (Winkler Central Station, 2021a, n.p.). The target population supported by Community Care includes adults with complex needs and multi-

system involvement (e.g., addictions, mental health challenges, housing insecurity, food insecurity, un/under-employment, justice involvement) and their families. Individuals can self-refer or be referred by an agency or someone else.

Organizational Structure

Community Care is composed of Membership, Steering, and Screening committees, several Support Teams, as well as a community development coordinator who is employed by Central Station (See Figure 2 for an overview of the organizational structure of Community Care). Representatives of the Membership Committee include senior leadership from Central Station Community Centre, the City of Winkler, Winkler Police Service, Southern Health, Child & Family Services, Garden Valley School Division, Genesis House Women's Shelter, Eden Mental Health Centre, Dr. C.W. Wiebe Medical Centre, Probation Services, Restorative Justice, and Regional Connections. These organizations have signed a memorandum of understanding agreeing to involvement in the Community Care Program and to the participation of their staff in care planning for the individuals and families who receive support. The Steering Committee is responsible for the governance of Community Care (e.g., policy development, evaluations, and engagement with the broader community). It is chaired by the executive director of Central Station and is composed of the supervisory level of the agencies that are represented on the Membership Committee. The Screening Committee is coordinated by the community development coordinator of Central Station and is composed of direct service providers who are responsible for assessing new referrals to the program and collecting de-identified data about the number of individuals and families supported, the type of intervention provided, and outcomes. The support teams provide direct support to the individual and/or family and are described as the "soul" of the program. The composition of support teams is determined by the individual and family in receipt of support and include both formal services and informal, natural supports. In addition to leading the Screening Committee meetings, the program development coordinator manages the provision of support at the support team level and reports on all aspects of the program to both

the Membership Committee and Steering Committee. There is also one additional case manager at the support team level.

Approach to CM: Canadian High-Fidelity Wraparound

Based on local needs and priorities, Community Care elected to employ a non-traditional, highly individualized, person- and family-centered approach called Canadian High-Fidelity Wraparound (Wrap Canada, 2018). Canadian High-Fidelity Wraparound is a philosophy of care that employs a coordinated approach to service provision guided by fifteen principles (Table 1) and a structured practice model with four distinct phases (engagement and team preparation, initial plan development, plan implementation, and transition). The neighbouring community of Altona, Manitoba employs the Canadian High-Fidelity Wraparound as its approach to CM and served as a model for Community Care (Bartlett et al., in press).

Unlike traditional approaches that prioritize formal services, Wraparound balances the provision of formal services with the inclusion of natural helpers or "the local" (e.g., caregivers, friends, community members, mentors, Elders) in the plan of support. In this regard, the Wraparound process focuses on building the capacity of the individual and family by fostering natural, community-based supports that are sustainable in the long term. Although formal services comprise the leadership and services provided through Community Care, Central Station has approximately 130 local volunteers to draw upon in the provision of direct support, employing a "neighbours helping neighbours" approach when building support teams. Wraparound prioritizes the "voice and choice" of the individual/family in identifying their support team and in determining the plan of support. The areas addressed in a Wraparound plan may include the following: mental health support; counselling (individual and family); addictions support; employability skills; parenting support; access to education; mentorship; and advocacy.

Table 1: Principles of Wraparound

Wraparound principle	Definition
1. Family access, voice, and choice	Wraparound is accessible to at-risk families and individuals and each plan is unique, tailored according to the client's voice and choices.
2. Team-based	The client and their community are part of the team, rather than being led solely by service providers.
3. Natural supports	Each team comprises not only partner agencies but the client's family and friends.
4. Collaboration and integration	Each team member plays a fundamental role that is integrated in the development of a single plan.
5. Community ownership, community-based, and community connectedness	Each plan is based in and carried by the local community in a way that supports and enhances the client's connection to their community.
6. Culturally competent	The process respects and builds on the culture of the client (their values, preferences, beliefs, heritage, and identity) and their community.
7. Individualized	Each plan is uniquely designed to attend and respond to each client's voice.
8. Needs-based	Each plan is designed to respond to the client's needs as identified by themselves.
9. Strengths-based	A client's plan is built on what they can do rather than what they cannot do, their strengths rather than their weaknesses.
10. Safety first	Safety issues are prioritized on a client's plan to address underlying needs.
11. Persistence: Never give up	A client's team persists until the moment in which the client feels that those services are no longer needed.
12. Outcome-based: Do what works	Each plan is designed in a pragmatic way.
13. Communication and planning: Staying ahead of the needs and crises	There is ongoing communication among the team so that needs are outlined and addressed on a regular basis.
14. Agency/organizational support and system partnerships	Each team is supported by partner agencies that have the necessary means to help address clients' needs.
15. Partner with funders and government at any level and whenever possible	Partners that provide financial support to the team are also active agents in a client's plan.

Adapted from Wrap Canada, 2018.

Community Care has obtained training and coaching for the community development coordinator and one other individual to become Certified Wraparound Facilitators. This means that in their case management role on support teams they ensure the high-fidelity implementation of the approach. Wraparound facilitation is important because research indicates that model adherence when implementing Wraparound contributes to positive individual and family outcomes (Cox et al., 2009; Effland et al., 2011).

Outcomes

The Annual Report from Community Care indicates that between October 2018 and June 2019 Community Care facilitated the Canadian High-Fidelity Wraparound process with seventeen individuals and families. Outcomes have been reported for both the individuals and families who have participated in the process. Some of the reported benefits for children include: (a) family reunification; (b) children with Child and Family Services involvement remained in their parents' care; (c) improved or continued school attendance; (d) connection to recreation activities; and (e) access to daycare (Central Station Community Centre, 2019). Outcomes for adults include: (a) obtained/maintained safe and adequate housing; (b) left an abusive relationship/situation improved; (c) reduction in calls for police service; (d) criminal charges diverted and sentencing reduced/probation orders completed; (e) healthcare/other health needs met; (f) accessed job training/workforce/volunteering; (g) financial stability; (h) accessed benefits or services not previously utilized; (h) obtained or completed secondary/post-secondary education; (i) secured transportation/vehicle; (j) received addictions help/counselling; and (k) obtained legal aid/other counsel/mediation (Central Station Community Centre, 2019). These outcomes indicate that to have sustainable and healthy communities, CM can be a significant way to address issues that impact the well-being of communities and reduce conflict. They also demonstrate how CM that employs the Wraparound approach may be used as a tool to get to the root of problems, so that members of the community can partake in their own health and safety.

Table 2: Community Care Program Structure

Membership Committee
Central Station (executive director) City of Winkler (designate) Winkler Police Service (police chief) Southern Health (child and adolescent mental health) Child and Family Services (executive director) Family Services (executive director) Garden Valley School Division (superintendent/assistant superintendent) Genesis House (executive director) Eden Mental Health Centre (CFO)
Steering Committee
Central Station City of Winkler Garden Valley School Division Winkler Police Service Genesis House Family Services Child & Family Services
Screening Committee
Central Station (community development coordinator) Representative(s) from Central Station and/or Garden Valley School Division (family care cases) Representation from an agency submitting a referral
Support Teams
Support teams of individuals or families are the soul of the Community Care program. The teams are made up of: • Individual(s) requiring support • Family members • Central Station (community development coordinator serving as a Wraparound facilitator and one other Wraparound facilitator) • Front-line workers from partner agencies that work directly with the individual(s) or family • Natural community supports

Funding

Community Care receives funding from multiple sources, including

the City of Winkler and donations from local businesses and members of the community. Demonstrating the local commitment to Community Care, a majority of the funding it receives comes from local donors. Funding from local donors has provided a flexible pool of resources that can be used in highly individualized, and creative ways to overcome service gaps and address immediate needs. The ability to use resources to address local needs without having to adhere to rigid funding requirements that are often set by government and state-sanctioned agencies has helped to overcome some barriers to equitable access to support experienced by marginalized individuals and families in this community. In the next section, we examine the indicators of peacebuilding as demonstrated by Community Care.

Indicators of Peacebuilding in Community Care

Mac Ginty's (2013) four indicators of peacebuilding are meant to describe activities that address, and have the potential to overcome, structural and cultural conflict and are theorized as a way to develop conditions for peace. Here, we use these indicators to explain the data from our research and discuss the possibility of CM to overcome unreflexive ideas of Western liberal crime prevention.

Locally Based

According to Mac Ginty (2013), peacebuilding at the national level often lacks the powerful potential of the local. This is crucial because the locals' experiences vary dramatically. In other words, "national level indicators of peacebuilding risk subsuming particularized experiences into a generalized whole" (Mac Ginty, 2013, p. 59). Since the focus of peacebuilding is to create longer-term measures that contribute to resilience, sustainable peacebuilding, and enhancing people's and communities' ability to deal with conflicts non-violently, it is important to create policies and opportunities for local communities to engender a meaningful sense of ownership and responsibility for the project's design and operation (Mac Ginty, 2013). This will enable community members to create space where the policies that are put in place are based on their lived experiences and needs.

We see this indicator in Community Care in a few ways. First, in the

governance model of the Membership, Steering, and Screening committees, and the memorandum of understanding for all stakeholders. This model creates a platform to identify local needs and establishes a structure and process for collaborating across sectors. Importantly, the backbone organization, a local not-for-profit community centre (to support infrastructure costs and facilitate CM through the executive director, community development coordinator, certified Wraparound facilitators and a large volunteer base) is decentralized from the provincial department of justice, police, and other state agencies. Although CMs often involve police, they have been critiqued as advancing a police agenda and co-opting power from the local community (Sanders & Langen, 2019; Holley et al., 2012). Although the leadership of Community Care has representation from the police and other state agencies, the leadership model ensures they do not dominate the operation of the program. Central Station remains at arm's length from state organizations, thereby providing the autonomy to work alongside the local community. The importance of this locally based governance model was confirmed in an interview with a Steering Committee member:

> We're neutral. We're just a non-profit, right? We don't have an agenda. Whereas Child and Family Services has their agenda. The police have their agenda. So, it is amazing how you can facilitate this collaboration within agencies that wasn't there before.

A Screening Committee member also illustrated the importance of having locally based leadership that is "neutral" and highlights the benefit this structure for the population served:

> We are attempting to be a neutral place for people to come to feel. We like to refer to it as like their safe haven or something like that. Just let people know that they have a place to go where they're not going to be judged. And judgment is often built into the agency names, you just assume that there's going to be some kind of judgment there. And so, we're trying to build those relationships, but also stay neutral.

The identification of strong relationships and trust in the local area

may be due in part to the fact that the local community center was regarded as a "neutral" organization. Central station serves as a central point in the community providing a food bank, access to social housing, advocacy, and a variety of other social, physical, and spiritual supports that are available on a drop-in basis. This governance structure appears to align with the locally based peacebuilding indicator in that it empowers the community to be responsible for the design and administration of the project engendering a meaningful sense of ownership by the local community.

Non-Prescriptive Approach to Peacebuilding

The second indicator of bottom-up peacebuilding is the creation of a local, unique, and sustained process through local voices and initiatives. This can be achieved through engagement with local communities to develop solutions, policies, and plans to mitigate the destructive effects of conflict (Özerdem & Lee, 2016). Hence, the path to change can be possible by creating spaces for people to contribute, engage, and shape their communities (Lederach, 2003).

Aligning with the need for non-prescriptive approaches to peacebuilding, local communities in Manitoba have had the autonomy to shape how CM is structured and implemented in their unique contexts (Bartlett et al., in press). Aligning with the tenets of the Wraparound approach, some of the priorities that were expressed by stakeholders in Winkler via interviews included the need for CM to be consent-based and determined by the individuals involved, which supports Mac Ginty's (2013) argument that the project participants and their informants, including family members and fellow residents, should be in charge of peacebuilding. This has meant the need to resist pressure from government institutions' attempts at "prescribed or liberal peacebuilding." A participant from the Steering Committee described these tensions:

> [The Wraparound approach] is consent-based and everything is voluntary. I know we've struggled a bit with the justice department, so justice is heavily mandated to go this direction, right? And yet at the same time, we want people to be motivated to do the work. And so, we've had two, I think

> two members referred by probation, but very firmly saying this isn't an option for them. You can't mandate that they have to do this [participation in CM] as part of their probation. We still want it to be very volunteer.

Reinforcing the local emphasis on voluntary participation and thus being non-prescriptive, Community Care selected the Canadian High-Fidelity Wraparound approach as its model of CM (Wrap Canada, 2018). Unlike other models of CM, such as those that are often police-led, non-consent-based, and focus on short-term intervention to address immediate risk (Nilson, 2017), the Wraround approach involves the development of longer-term, integrated plans of support that are not police-led but are led by the individual and/or family involved. One of the pillars of Wraparound is that the individual's "voice and choice" drives all aspects of the plan. A participant from the Screening Committee illustrated the importance of voluntary participation in fostering connections and shared understanding:

> The primary tenant of our Wraparound is that it is the participant in the driver's seat and from day one when we first meet with the client for the first time, we put them in the driver's seat, we tell them that it's their choice to control their team and who they invite to all of those things. And we listen to them, and we often find that that's the key, is that they've often not been listened to. And that's the first thing that we hear, that nobody is listening.

The support provided through Community Care also demonstrates a non-prescriptive approach to peacebuilding because there is a significant focus on cultivating natural support networks, rather than relying primarily on pre-determined, professional, and/or state-based services. This builds local capacity, and is therefore more sustainable in the long term (Bartlett et al, in press). A participant from the Steering Committee illustrated how local capacity was being built:

> We're developing a peer mentorship program where we're hoping we can train up peers, use their experience, whatever your life experience is. And then hopefully, you know, [when] somebody says, 'Well, I don't have natural supports,' we say 'Here's a pool of people, would you like to be paired

> with someone you could walk alongside?'

The non-prescriptive nature of this CM is also evident in the way that the Wraparound process prioritizes the culture and values of the individual when developing a plan of support. A participant from the Screening Committee described the Wraparound process:

> we do a cultural discovery to find out what is important to them — that might mean that they're Indigenous and would like additional support, that they are atheists, and they don't want any religious support. And so, it's really identifying what it is that is important to that person.

The non-prescriptive nature of CM is seen in two contexts — both in the governance of the overall program and in the encouragement of participants to take the path that is most beneficial to them. What is reflected in CM is a process that respects and builds on the culture of the individual (their values, preferences, beliefs, heritage, and identity) and their community. This has the power to mitigate the destructive elements of conflict that exist in communities. Indeed, if we think about crime as a type of conflict, CM's non-prescriptive nature has resulted in perceptions of conflict transformation.

Being Reflexive and Open to Change

Peacebuilding is an ongoing process, hence peace indicators must be reflexive and responsive to changing circumstances. In any peacebuilding program, if feedback is sought from the community, it may enable community peacebuilders to be responsive to evolving issues faced by the community members (Mac Ginty, 2013). Through this type of feedback, new directions may emerge while others may remain the same. This information may also potentially provide more effective and reflexive paths and assist with more targeted planning, while simultaneously helping to realize the often-stated goals of local participation and ownership (Mac Ginty, 2013).

The value of obtaining feedback from individuals who receive support from this CM was also described as a priority by a participant from the Screening Committee:

> What we do as part of the Wrap process, we do an evaluation at the end of every meeting, just asking, not a formal one, just

> a check-in and if there anything they [the participant and family] would change. And I think that that's something that we do also as facilitators when we meet with our clients in between support meetings, we often check in to see what needs to be changed, make sure we just hear their voice at every meeting.

In addition to collecting feedback from individuals and families who receive support through Community Care, there is a focus on measuring the impact of CM using an array of indicators. A participant from the Steering Committee described some of the outcomes that were being measured to determine the efficacy of the support provided and to bolster the ongoing evolution of CM:

> We would be measuring risk looking at our risk factors of people that are in the program, lack of support system, financial crisis, no work for first addictions, unhealthy family, friends, mental health concerns, trauma or domestic violence, unsafe housing, risk of Child and Family Services [CFS] apprehension or involvement, criminal involvement, legal issues, kids not attending school, adult educational deficiency. And then for children, we would be looking at outcomes of children return to parents' care. Children with CFS involvement remaining with the parents improved or continued school attendance connected to recreation activities and obtained daycare.

Moreover, COVID-19 has posed unique challenges for CM and necessitated increased reflexivity and adaptability to address the barriers posed by the pandemic. A participant from the Steering Committee described how the CM was pivoting in order to respond to local needs:

> With COVID we're seeing a rise in just anger and frustration and isolation at one of our apartment buildings. It's like OK, well, we have to respond to this — it's our responsibility because we want to do housing differently. So, you know, getting into there regularly, phoning the tenants in there, connecting with them, like, how can we help you? [The] kitchen coordinator has been preparing meals. And just

> showing up with a hot meal on a day … because it's like we actually do care about you. You're not isolated.

The aforementioned example illustrates the benefits of CM being a part of a local community center that enabled the provision of immediate, holistic support and demonstrates the importance of local agency and social infrastructure, including information technology, personnel, volunteers, and funding. Through engagement with and participation from locals, CM has great potential to address emergent issues in concrete and sustainable ways.

Safeguarding Against Elite Capture

The role of leaders is critical in peacebuilding. This is because leaders frame the challenges faced by communities, which influences how community members interpret and/or engage with issues (Peace Direct, 2019). When identifying daily peace indicators in divided communities, researchers and practitioners may face the challenge of elite capture and dominance (Mac Ginty, 2013). Similar to the concerns around liberal peacebuilding and the dominance of agency agendas, seeking to be safeguarded against elite capture is meant to ensure that other interests do not overtake the interest of the local community. This echoes concerns about state-centric processes involved in crime prevention and some critiques made against CM units that are dominated by one agency (Knipe, 2017; Sanders & Langhan, 2019).

Community Care has strong local leadership and local funding from the City and donors. This has allowed it to retain some power and autonomy over local initiatives associated with the work of CM. As an example, Community Care took over the management of social housing from the Province because of frustration over the lack of maintenance of housing complexes. A member of the Steering Committee described how local control over housing had not only improved access to affordable, safe housing, but also enhanced the overall quality of life for residents in the community:

> Our whole desire to purchase the Manitoba Housing from the Province was so that we could do housing differently. We are not here just to collect rent and evict people. We are here to provide support to the families that are in Manitoba Housing.

> We've been managing Manitoba Housing for three and a half years. We have ninety homes that we're managing there. We have so many people. I mean, even when you go into support of businesses [local businesses have provided funding], the people in the communities are going, like, 'We would put money into renovating those derelict homes'. And we have contractors that are like, 'We could do that, and we can give back to our own community'. Then with the purchase of them, then we can take the funding any and keep it local. Invest it back into the community, invest it back into building.

Participants indicated that a strength of Community Care has been its ability to engage in progressive peacebuilding with financial support and resources from local donors. This means that it is less dependent upon financial support from the federal and provincial governments to enact progressive social change. A participant from the Steering Committee illustrated this point:

> That's the beauty of being our own organization, we're not as restricted as a lot of organizations … We have grant funding through just a local young guy that's created a grant called Mend the Gap and he is like, you use that however you see fit with these with families. There's a gap, so a poverty offering, and so we could use that funding for families that are in our Community Care program to pay for private counseling. The wait list for public counseling is up to eighteen months sometimes in our area. And so you look at families that are in the Community Care program and you go how in the world are we going to move forward if you have a mental crisis. So you can't wait eighteen months to stabilize it. So we use that funding to pay for private counseling.

However, Community Care has not been completely insulated from elite capture in that its leadership does not appear to include individuals with "lived expertise" and therefore may not represent the needs of all the people served. This is often a reflection of larger power dynamics in society such as patriarchy or the organization of political parties (Mac Ginty, 2013). One participant from the Steering Committee described the leadership structure of the Steering

Committee, saying: "they would all be either the CEO or the ED [executive director], that kind of thing." Another participant from the Steering Committee shared a similar observation about the lack of diversity among the leadership and service providers of Community Care and about the consciousness of groups to this issue and their efforts to mitigate this barrier:

> Unfortunately, I will have to, I'll be honest, there is no representation, even for the most part, in all of the helpers of any type of that level of diversity. I think what I could say is that those of us that are sitting on the Steering Committee, and I believe on the other committees, are trying very hard to always remind each other that the client needs to be driving it, they need to be the center of it. It's not our process. It's the clients'. We are just there to support and give it the structure that it needs to keep it moving forward so that our values don't influence who comes forward.

Based on these observations, approaches that broaden leadership to reflect the local community are pivotal to safeguard against programs being guided by top-down processes and the exclusion of some groups.

Discussion

The data gathered on Winkler's Community Care mobilization project indicates a move away from state-centric, top-down, governmental crime-prevention process toward one that is locally based, non-prescriptive, and reflexive and open to change. All but one of the indicators found in bottom-up peacebuilding practices seem to indicate that positive peace, and in particular overcoming structural violence, are found in this CM project. These include: clear, locally based organizations where local communities engender a meaningful sense of ownership and are responsible for the design and administration of the project; non-prescriptive practices where local communities develop solutions that engage the community; and the ability of the program to meet local changing needs. The one area where peacebuilding was not seen was in safeguarding from elite capture, which echoes the concerns of Rosenthal et al (2015) about the local elite. Although some of the work of Winkler's Community

Care lies in local leadership in the community, this leadership did not incorporate more diverse voices in its leadership model.

In understanding the role of CM and crime prevention, the use of peacebuilding language concepts and practices are particularly important as it allows us to view crime as determined by structural violence manifested as racism, substance abuse, food insecurity, and homelessness. If we think about crime as a conflict in need of transformation — recognizing that it is associated with structural violence exhibiting a patterned social arrangement that prevents people from realizing human potential — solutions align with peacebuilding. In order to achieve peace, we argue that the conflict arising out of these unequal circumstances can be addressed using positive peace practices. As Galtung (1996) explains, structural violence is like an iceberg: the major issues lie below the surface, and one cannot address a conflict's underlying issues without digging below the surface. In other words, we argue that structural violence and its underlying causes can be understood and addressed by seeing conflict through new lenses.

Moving forward, the idea of elite capture can be used to develop decolonial practices, diversifying leadership of Central Station and Community Care and ensuring that they have lived experiences, creating spaces for BIPOC community, 2SLGBTQ+ individuals, Elders, people with disabilities, youth, and immigrants/newcomers. Further, although the outcomes include transformative changes to a participant's circumstances (such as school attendance and family reunification), broader structural issues such as inequality, poverty, and race are significantly modified in a systemic sense. However, the control of housing has produced significant alleviation of social determinants of crime such as homelessness. This is an indication of how a system is strengthened, thereby reducing the risk of relapsing into conflict.

While CM initiatives such as Community Care lack leadership with diverse voices and lived experiences, it is clear that these initiatives have a critical role in mobilizing locals to overcome the challenges they face as a community. Programs such as peer mentorship or Mend the Gap, a locally owned initiative, are contributing to Community Care to reduce poverty and also create local solidarity

with people who are suffering from mental health crises, hunger, homelessness, poverty, and crime. As stated, people who are in crisis or conflict cannot wait for months to receive the services that they need. Therefore, initiatives such as Mend the Gap help people receive counselling so they can stabilize sooner. These examples clearly illustrate the significance of power from below for a more just and durable peace, which can only happen when CMs are supported by locals for locals.

Conclusion

This study used concepts of the local turn in peacebuilding to assess a CM program in rural Manitoba. Peacebuilding literature was used to contextualize the importance of the local turn. This literature focuses directly on the relevance of understanding the local environment, local agency, and the importance of engaging with local partners for successful, positive peacebuilding and conflict-reducing initiatives. Using indicators of peace identified by Mac Ginty (2013) allowed for an analysis of crime prevention that is usually tightly fixated on recidivism rates. These concepts can be used to expand our analytical framework to think about crime prevention as conflict transformation that is associated with positive peace, community values, and actions that focus on harmony and trust, highlighting that the process of peace is what you do together to construct solutions.

This study also illustrates how power asymmetry and inequality can be challenged when locals come together to address issues. As demonstrated in Winkler's Community Care, CMs promote local ownership of peacebuilding and challenge the power asymmetries inherent in top-down interventions. While challenges remain, Community Care in Winkler promotes home-grown solutions to the issues and encourages partnerships to be locally driven.

References

Area Vibes. (2021). Winkler, MB Crime. https://www.areavibes.com/winkler-mb/crime/

Bartlett, N., Heringer, R., & Gorkoff, K. (in press). Harnessing the potential of community mobilization through High-Fidelity Wrap-around: A Canadian case study of CommUNITY. *Peace Research: The Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*.

Barash, D. P. (2010). *Approaches to peace: A reader in peace studies (2nd edition)*. Oxford University Press.

Braithwaite, J., & D'Costa, B. (2018). *Cascades of violence: War, crime and peacebuilding across South Asia*. ANU Press.

Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). *An agenda for peace*. United Nations.

Britt, C. L. (2019). Age and crime. In D. P. Farrington, L. Kazemian, & A. R. Piquero (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of developmental and life-course criminology* (pp. 13–33). Oxford University Press.

Brown, A., & Gusmao, A. (2012). Looking for the owner of the house: Who is making peace in rural East Timor? In O. P. Richmond & A. Mitchell (Eds.), *Hybrid forms of peace: From everyday agency to post-liberalism* (pp. 107–130). Palgrave Macmillan.

Bruch, T. (2018). Rural crime surging in Manitoba: Stats Canada report. *Global News*. https://globalnews.ca/news/4348669/rural-crime-surging-manitoba-stats-canada-report/

Byrne, S., & Senehi, J. (2012). *Violence analysis, intervention, and prevention*. Ohio University Press.

Carson, W. G. (2007). Calamity or catalyst: Futures for community in twenty-first-century crime prevention. *British Journal of Criminology, 47*(5), 711–727. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azm015

CBC News. (2017, January 5). Winkler's 18 police officers face rising crime rate as city grows. *CBC News*. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/winkler-crime-rate-police-1.3922968

Central Station Community Centre. (2019). Criminal property forfeiture grant report [Internal Document].

Chambliss, W. (1964). A sociological analysis of the law of vagrancy. *Social Problems, 12*(1), 67–77.

Chambliss, W. (1999). *Power, politics and crime.* Westview.

Chinn, P. (2013). *Peace and power*. Jones & Bartlett Learning.

City of Winkler. (2021). Statistics. https://www.cityofwinkler.ca/p/statistics

Comack, E. (2012). *Racialized policing: Aboriginal people's encounters with the police.* Fernwood Publishing.

Cox, K., Baker, D., & Wong, M. A. (2009). Wraparound retrospective: Factors predicting positive outcomes. *Journal of Emotional & Behavioral Disorders, 18*(1), 3–13.

Crabtree B., & Miller, W. (1999). *Doing qualitative research.* Sage.

Crawford, A., & Evans, K. (2016). Crime prevention and community safety. In A. Liebling, S. Maruna, & L. McAra (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of criminology (6th edition)* (pp. 797–824). Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th edition)*. Sage.

Effland, V. S., Walton, B. A., & McIntyre, J. S. (2011). Connecting the dots: Stages of implementation, wraparound fidelity and youth outcomes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 20*(6), 736–746. DOI: 10.1007/s10826-011-9541-5.

Galtung, J. (1964). An editorial. *Journal of Peace Research*, *1*(1), 1–4.

Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means peace and conflict, development and civilization*. International Peace Research Institute.

Gilgun, J. (2013). Grounded theory, deductive qualitative analysis, and social work research and practice. In A. Fortune, W. J. Reid, & J. R. Miller (Eds.), *Qualitative research in social work* (pp. 107–135). Columbia University Press.

Gorkoff, K., Bartlett, N., Yavuz, M., Heringer, R., & D'Sena, N. (2021). Networked architectures of crime prevention: Community mobilization in Manitoba. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *63*(3-4), 89–111. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2021-0008.

Hadjigeorgiou, N. (2016). Remedying displacement in frozen conflicts: Lessons from the case of Cyprus. *The Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies*, *18*, 152–175. https://doi.org/10.1017/cel.2016.6

Hope, T. (2005). The new local governance of community safety in England and Wales. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice 47*(2), 369–387.

Holley, C., Gunningham, N., & Shearing, C. (2012). *The new environmental governance*. Earthscan. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315067278

Jamieson, W. (2008). Factors related to successful mobilization of communities for crime prevention. *IPC Review, 2*, 11–33.

Knipe, T. (2017). Exploring the pluralization of community safety: A qualitative analysis of the perceived operation and implications of Situation Tables [Master's thesis]. Wilfrid Laurier University, Department of Criminology. https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/1966

Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies.* United States Institute for Peace Press.

Lederach, J. P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation.* Good Books.

Leonardsson, H., & Rudd, G. (2015). The "local turn" in peacebuilding: A literature review of effective and emancipatory local peacebuilding. *Third World Quarterly*, *36*(5), 825–839. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.1029905.

Mac Ginty, R. (2006). *No war, no peace.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Mac Ginty, R. (2011). *International peacebuilding and local resistance.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Mac Ginty, R. (2013). Indicators +: A proposal for everyday peace indicators. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *36*(1), 56–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2012.07.001

Mac Ginty, R., and O. P. Richmond. (2013). The local turn in peace building: A critical agenda for peace. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(5), 763–783. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.800750

Maynard, R. (2017). *Policing Black lives: State violence in Canada from slavery to the present*. Fernwood Publishing.

McLaughlin, E. & Muncie, J. (Eds.). (2006). *The problem of crime.* Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Minaker, M., Wallerstein, N., & Wilson, N. (2008). *Improving health through community organization and community building.* In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 287–312). Jossey-Bass.

Minkler, M. & Wallerstein, N. (2012). Improving health through community organization and community building: Perspectives from health education and social work. In M. Minkler (Ed.), *Community organizing and community building for health and welfare (3rd edition)*. (pp. 37–58). Rutgers University Press.

Monture-Angus, P. (1999). *Journeying forward: Dreaming First Nations' independence.* Fernwood Publishing.

Nilson, C. (2014). *Risk-driven collaborativeiIntervention: A preliminary impact assessment of community mobilization Prince Albert's hub model*. University of Saskatchewan, Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies.

Nilson, C. (2017). Collaborative risk-driven intervention: Research supporting technology- enabled opportunities for upstream virtual services in rural and remote communities. *Journal of Community Safety and Well-being*, *2*(3), 76–86.

O'Grady, W. (2011). *Crime in Canadian context: Debates and controversies.* Oxford University Press.

Özerdem, A., & Lee, S. Y. (2016). *International peacebuilding: An introduction*. Routledge.

Peace Direct. (2019). Local peacebuilding: What works and why. https://www.peaceinsight.org/reports/whatworks/.

Provan, K.G., Veazie, M.A., Staten, L.K. & Teufel-Shone, N.I. (2005). The use of network analysis to strengthen community partnerships. *Public Administration Review*, *65*, 603–613. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00487.x

Randazzo, E. (2017). *Beyond liberal peacebuilding: A critical exploration of the local turn.* Routledge.

Richmond, O. (2005). *The transformation of peace*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Richmond, O. (2014). *Peace: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Roussos, S. T., & Fawcett, S. B. (2000). A review of collaborative partnerships as a strategy for improving community health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *21*, 369–402. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.21.1.369

Rosenthal, G., A. Bajwa, S. Menon, F. Olonisakin, A. Ould-Abdallah, C. Petrie, & Ssempala, E.G. (2015). Challenge of sustaining peace: Report of the advisory group of experts on the review of the peacebuilding architecture. United Nations. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/968.

Sanders, C., & Langan, D. (2019). New public management and the extension of police control: Community safety and security networks in Canada. *Policing and Society, 29*(5), 566–578. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2018.1427744

Souryal, S., & Whitehad, J. (2019). *Ethics in criminal justice: In Search of the Truth*. Routledge.

Statistics Canada (2016). Census profile, Winkler. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016.

Sukkau, S. (2017, March 13). Survey reveals top five issues in Winkler including public transportation. *Pembina Valley Online.*

https://www.pembinavalleyonline.com/local/survey-reveals-top-five-issues-in-winkler-including-public-transportation

Town Folio. (2021). Winkler. https://townfolio.co/mb/winkler/.

United Nations Peacekeeping. (n.d.). Terminology. https:// peacekeeping.un.org/en/terminology

Wilson, S. (2018). Assessing the impact of economic and demographic change on property crime rates in Western Canada. *Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being, 3*(2), 52–58.

Winkler Central Station. (2021a). Community care. https://winklercentralstation.com/community-care/

Winkler Central Station. (2021b). Programs. https://winklercentralstation.com/programs/

Wrap Canada. (2018). *Wrap Canada creating a community for all: Facilitator training in the Canadian high-fidelity wraparound model*. [Internal Document].